

WOMEN ACADEMICS BLENDING PRIVATE AND PUBLIC LIVES

by

Carmelina Armenti

**A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto**

© Copyright by Carmelina Armenti 2000



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-53860-5

Canada

Abstract

Women Academics Blending Private and Public Lives

Carmelina Armenti

**Doctor of Philosophy 2000
Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto**

This study examines the interconnections between the personal and professional lives of women academics. Through in-depth interviews with nineteen women professors drawn from across various faculties at one Canadian university, I compare and contrast the generational experiences among assistant, associate, and full professors. Additionally, using a critical feminist theoretical approach, I explore interlocking systems of oppression in the women's lives based on gender, race, and class. The women's stories reveal the ways in which privilege influenced their ability to embark on an academic career, the obstacles to full employment for women in academe, the problems associated with combining children with the pursuit of tenure and promotion, and the approaches to celebrating women's contributions to the academy. Generally, the women reported that the academic profession does not allow a basis for the interconnection between women's private and public lives. Women's personal lives — especially issues surrounding childbearing, childrearing, and other aspects of caring — are not considered to be part of women's life course for the purposes of career progression; rather, women are expected to fit into the traditional male life course. The women that I interviewed also noted that issues of privileged lives and contradictory experiences are not part of the legitimate discourse in the halls of academe. In conjunction with the women's stories, I use feminist theory to develop a conceptualization of the taboos that the women professors in this study encounter in the

academy. Moreover, I combine feminist theory with the women's thoughts for improving academic careers to provide a vision of woman-centered academic careers. I conclude by calling attention to how the process of transformation requires a greater sensitivity toward women's personal lives in the public domain of the university.

For Marc,

The magic of love and equity keeps us together forever.

Acknowledgements

With the utmost gratitude and respect, I thank my supervisor, Professor Sandra Acker, for her dedicated support, encouraging feedback, and never-ending advice throughout the research and writing processes of this important academic endeavor. As a teacher, researcher, feminist, mentor, and role model, Professor Acker influenced my thinking in countless ways. From the inception of this project we collaborated on the research design, interview questions, and brief questionnaire. When I moved out of the country we corresponded through electronic mail, on a regular basis, for a period of about four years. If the pieces of my work seemed too difficult to explain in chapter format, she helped me decipher the puzzle. Through her mentoring, I learned to think as a scholar and through her vast academic experience I learned to write as a scholar. I realize that I could not have completed this valuable educational journey without her caring assistance and unwavering commitment to my work.

I was also extremely fortunate to work with two other feminist scholars, Professors Ruth Roach Pierson and Margrit Eichler, who served on my thesis committee. As a student in several of Professor Pierson's courses I learned the history of women's emancipation. These stories revealed historical aspects of women's lives that can only be described as incredible, such as the burning at the stake of women believed to be witches. Other stories were invigorating, for instance the women's suffrage movement which helped me appreciate the efforts of our foremothers. Taking these courses elevated my passion toward studying the lives of women. Additionally, Professor Pierson had a powerful impact on my thinking and writing surrounding issues of race and class privilege in this thesis, for that I am extremely grateful. Being able to work with Professor Eichler was also a great joy. I appreciate her

excellent guidance in helping me to understand and shape issues surrounding family matters in this thesis. Her perceptive insistence that women's depictions of positive career-related aspects should be included in this study was a creative challenge which helped shape and improve the manuscript. Additionally, her feminist insight and savvy encompassing the quantitative issues in this study inspired fresh ideas. It was a great honor and source of pleasure to work with both of these professors and to have their encouragement.

All three of the thesis committee members, Professors Acker, Pierson, and Eichler provided me with rich discussions, insightful critiques, unfailing support, and friendship that helped to reinvigorate my work and inspire its completion. I am also grateful for their encouragement and enthusiasm at the time of my oral defense. For these cherished memories and much more, I thank them.

I owe a debt of gratitude to the nineteen women who participated in this study. Their commitment to this project through their generosity in sharing their limited time and extensive experiences are most appreciated. In permitting me to use their narratives, these women put their heart into the creative process. Their stories have provided new ways of thinking about academic life and have made a difference in my own life.

In the short time that I have known both Professors Jo-Anne Dillabough and Susan B. Twombly, they have made significant contributions to my work. Professor Dillabough provided invaluable recommendations in the areas of theory and methodology that pressed me to rethink and unravel the complexity of these issues. Professor Twombly raised issues that had me thinking about the similarities and differences between Canadian and US universities as well as their link to the labor market. I feel very fortunate to have had these

pertinent challenges and I thank both professors for their strong critical feedback and deeply embedded interest in my work.

I am also grateful to my parents for teaching me to value education. My sister, Julie Armenti, deserves many thanks for her loving support throughout the anxiety-filled twenty-four hours prior to the oral defense of the thesis.

With love and appreciation, I thank my spouse, Marc LeGras, for seeing me through the happy moments and difficult paths of this incredible journey. As a partner, friend, and medical professional he provided steady encouragement and solid support for my work. It is wonderful to be involved in a relationship where love and equity triumph.

Finally, I thank Professors Janice Drakich and Penni Stewart for permission to reprint a set of tables from their publication “A Profile of Women Faculty in Canada: Rank, Discipline and Age 1957-1994,” which appeared in the *Status of Women Supplement, CAUT Bulletin Insert*, Vol. 45, No. 4, April 1998. These tables include: “Percentage of Women by Rank and Year, Percentage of Men by Rank and Year, Percentage of Women by Main Subject Taught and Year, Mean Age of Women Promoted to Current Rank, and Mean Age of Men Promoted to Current Rank.”

Contents

Chapter One

Introduction: Medieval Professional Practices and Ideologies Continue to Disadvantage Women Academics	1
--	----------

Chapter Two

Literature Review: Inequality in the Groves of Academe	35
---	-----------

Chapter Three

Methodology: Theorizing, Designing, and Conducting the Study	90
---	-----------

Chapter Four

Embarking on an Academic Career: Mixed Messages and New Norms	136
--	------------

Chapter Five

Gender as a Barrier to Full Membership in Academe	155
--	------------

Chapter Six

Tenure and Children: The Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon	177
---	------------

Chapter Seven

Career and Children: Finding Inequities Thought to be Extinct 204

Chapter Eight

**Sleeping Models, Sleeping Tales: Approaches to Celebrating Women's
Differences in Academe** 229

Chapter Nine

Conclusion: Engendering Women's Lives Inside and Outside Academe 265

References 311

List of Tables

Table 1

Distribution of Women by Rank and Year (Percentage) 37

Table 2

Distribution of Men by Rank and Year (Percentage) 38

Table 3

Representation of Women by Main Subject Taught and Year (Percentage) 40

Table 4

Mean Age for Women Promoted to Current Rank 43

Table 5

Mean Age for Men Promoted to Current Rank 44

Table 6

Profile of the Participants 96

List of Appendices

Appendix A

Invitation to Participate and Consent Form 297

Appendix B

Interview Questions 301

Appendix C

Questionnaire 308

Chapter One

Introduction:

Medieval Professional Practices and Ideologies Continue to Disadvantage Women Academics

Introduction

This study examines the perceptions of women about their experiences with academic careers. Their stories reveal personal triumphs, critical challenges, and everyday happenings. These are the stories of women attempting to combine a personal and professional life. Many of these women have children or are planning to have children. Their words derive meaning from the personal demands and individual sacrifices encountered by overlapping the private and public spheres. Their stories delve into the world of academe from a female gaze.

Throughout this work the women's stories create a tapestry of realities concerning their lives in the university that make them appear to be *second class citizens* in academia. Their words echo the voices of feminist scholars, such as Simone DeBeauvoir (1952), who called women the "second sex"; Nadya Aisenberg and Mona Harrington (1988), who labeled

women academics as “outsiders” in their chosen profession; Sandra Acker (1994), who described them as the “other academics”; and Jennifer Mather (1998), who portrayed them as “second class citizens.” Not only do the women academics in my study continue to match these descriptions, but they also provide clear and precise explanations for their subordinate status. Indeed, women’s identities in this male profession are murky. They are viewed not as women, nor as men, nor as gender-neutral beings. Instead they are expected to play the role of women when the situation commands and that of men in other circumstances. For example, they must adapt to the male life course for the purpose of tenure and promotion, but they are expected to assume the traditionally feminine role of caregiver and nurturer towards the students. Hence, I begin the voyage by illustrating in this chapter how the academy continues to disadvantage women academics by placing significant emphasis on seemingly medieval professional practices and ideologies. Subsequently, I present a critical feminist theoretical framework consisting of feminist themes, questions, and assumptions that serve to delineate this study. I conclude the chapter by introducing the *taboos in the halls of academe* which have been identified by the study’s participants and which form the basis of my work.

More optimistically, throughout this work, the women’s stories reveal courage, a celebration of individual differences, a desire to transform the academy to meet their particular needs, and both individual and collective resistance to oppressive structures and practices in the academy. There are a total of 19 women academics in this study, ranging in age from 30 to 60, and occupying the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor, at one Canadian university. Some of these women have been involved in the process of transformation for over three decades, others have recently joined the struggle, and still others are unaware that their individual acts of courage result in benefits to society at large.

Despite their many differences, the one aspect which all of these women have in common is the hope that they might successfully combine a personal and professional life.

Living With Inequality in the Academy

Regarding women's place in the academy, Jacqueline Stalker and Susan Prentice (1998: 14) state: "Today, as in the past one hundred years, equity seekers are struggling to break down discriminatory structures and practices precisely so that individuals can finally be seen as unique and valued citizens, unencumbered by stereotypes, myths and prejudice." From the female gaze the academic profession is problematic in a number of ways: for example, stereotypes about the roles of women and men still prevail; women's salaries are lower than those of men; and women feel isolated and unsupported in a male dominated environment. Many of these inequalities can be integrated into two categories of systemic institutional discrimination consisting of oppressive policies, procedures, and practices that serve to impede progress toward equity. One category of systemic discrimination would include forms of injustices that are obvious, overt, quantifiable and therefore undeniable even though the privileged minority sometimes tries to justify the existence of such inequalities by critiquing equity policies and claiming they constitute a move toward reverse discrimination. Another category of systemic discrimination comprises micro-inequities: that is, subtle forms of inequity that create an insensitive workplace culture, also known as the *chilly climate* for women in universities. On their own, subtle inequities seem to have very little effect, similar to the touch of a feather, but their cumulative outcome has been described as a "ton of feathers" (Caplan 1993). Thus, to assess the extent of inequality, one must examine the entire stack of feathers. Below I discuss each of these two categories in turn.

Proof of Systemic Institutional Discrimination

Some aspects of systemic institutional discrimination, also known as structural discrimination, can easily be detected. Quantitative data disclose *prima facie* proof of inequality in the academic profession. Differential treatment of female and male faculty can be found using evidence of employment rates, tenure and promotion rates, disciplines, salaries, and ranks. Moreover, as Stalker and Prentice (1998: 18) note, “the ‘publish or perish’ imperative fails to accommodate the life-cycle needs of academics with young children, and thus has the unintended effect of discrimination against women.”

To this day minorities and women endure exclusion from the ranks of faculty members in Canadian universities. Without stating figures for minorities which are difficult to find or nonexistent, it is obvious that minority faculty are excluded simply by looking at the “whiteness” of the profession (hooks 1984). As for women, for instance in 1921, their representation among full-time academics was 15 per cent (Statistics Canada 1993), and that figure increased only modestly to 22.7 per cent in 1994 (Drakich and Stewart 1998). Interestingly, the representation of undergraduate female students has increased significantly over a similar time period: from 16.3 per cent in 1921 to a majority of 56.1 per cent in 1992 (Saunders et al. 1992). While women earned only about 8 per cent of doctoral degrees between 1955 and 1971, in 1992 they became the recipients of nearly one-third of those degrees (Saunders et al. 1992; Statistics Canada 1993). Despite this large increase of women in undergraduate and doctoral programs, women are not earning doctorates at the same rate at which they are earning undergraduate degrees, nor are they becoming faculty members at the same rate at which they are receiving doctoral degrees.

Moreover, women academics are overrepresented in traditionally feminine disciplines such as the fine arts and humanities and underrepresented in the field of science. For instance, in 1994 Canadian women comprised 33.5 per cent of the faculty in education but only 8.6 per cent of the faculty in engineering and applied sciences (Drakich and Stewart 1998). Women are excluded from these fields for various reasons, not the least of which is discrimination — a desire on the part of privileged white males to maintain an “old boys’ club.”

Women’s capabilities continue to remain undervalued compared to those of their male colleagues. In the past women faculty earned significantly less than men. While in recent years women’s salaries have increased, nonetheless in each academic rank women still earn less than their male counterparts. This devaluation of women’s achievements is further exemplified in their promotion experiences. One study shows that nearly 33 per cent of women compared to about 7 per cent of men had negative promotion experiences (News and Comment 1991). There is also evidence which demonstrates that women must produce double the amount of publications that men do in order to receive the same peer review ratings (Wenneras and Wold 1997).

Figures which are especially disconcerting pertain to the distribution of women across academic ranks. Full-time tenure-track female faculty remain concentrated in the lower ranks, for in 1994 they comprised 34 per cent of assistant professors, 37.5 per cent of associate professors, and only 19.1 per cent of full professors. In contrast, men were more likely to occupy the upper ranks of academe, for in that same year they comprised 15.9 per cent of assistant professors, 34.4 per cent of associate professors and 47.2 per cent of full professors (Drakich and Stewart 1998). One explanation for this discrepancy is that in the

past fewer women were hired into academic positions and therefore only a small number of women were eligible for promotion to the higher ranks. If this explanation is true more women should be promoted to the level of full professor in the future as more women are entering academe.

Even more disturbing is the certainty that power in the academy remains vested in the hands of white men, for few women and minorities hold administrative positions (Sheinin 1998). And women of all races and classes are found more readily than white men in part-time and non-tenure-track positions, which are devoid of job security and decision-making power. Thus, in many ways, the current hierarchy of power in the academy discriminates against women and minorities and reproduces social and economic disparity.

An Insensitive Workplace Culture

Everyone in academia is expected to be productive by publishing countless publications in prestigious journals. As a result the everyday lives of individual faculty members become less significant within the larger scheme of gaining academic recognition through research and funding. Superficially in this “publish or perish” environment we can argue that only faculty members with an unambiguously large number of publications survive; but in reality issues of gender, race, class, age, sexuality, and disability also contribute to academic success (Tierney and Bensimon 1996). For example, within the academic workplace micro-inequities serve to disadvantage women and minorities. These subtle injustices have been discovered through qualitative research which explores faculty members’ experience. Unfortunately, most of these studies have been conducted on the experiences of white women, making it difficult to extend this discussion to minorities. Studies show that these

subtle inequities arise from traditional values and perceptions about gender, such as the expected roles of women and men (The Chilly Collective 1995). Although women who experience them also undergo undue stress, fatigue, illness, and at times leave their employment, subtle inequities are difficult to detect because they are considered to be part of the 'normal' everyday practice in the institution (Wylie 1995). Bernice Sandler and Roberta Hall coined the term the *chilly climate* in 1982. A few years later they stated: "The chilly climate undermines self-esteem and damages professional morale. It may leave women professionally and socially isolated, [and] restrict their opportunities to make professional contributions..." (1986:3).

As part of the insensitive workplace environment, women academics face stereotypical assumptions about their roles as females (The Chilly Collective 1995): they also remain isolated and receive less support from faculty members in their career journeys (Aisenberg and Harrington 1988). Studies also suggest that female academics encounter numerous barriers to tenure and promotion such as the "old boys' network" which fosters the careers of white men (Backhouse et al. 1995), and their capabilities and achievements are undervalued (Wenneras and Wold 1997). It could also be argued that their workloads are heavier than those of their male colleagues (Acker and Feuerverger 1996); they experience sexual harassment (Statistics Canada 1993); and they are blamed for their own disadvantaged status in the academy (Wylie 1995). Moreover, on a daily basis women faculty encounter gender-biased language such as the generic "he," as well as words, gestures, and tones from both students and colleagues indicating that they are less important, powerful, and intelligent than men (Stalker and Prentice 1998). Stalker and Prentice (1998: 22-3) write: "Even the very definition of scholarly knowledge is shaped by patriarchy. Due to the historical legacy of

male domination, masculine concerns construct what is considered ‘normal.’” When men's experiences are seen as the norm, women appear inferior by comparison and they become the *other*. Various aspects of this insensitive climate, such as the excessive workload, stress, lack of support, family responsibilities, harassment, and discrimination, contribute to some women's decisions about leaving academia (Riggs et al. 1993). There are studies, however, which show that women respond to such inequities by using resistance in the hope of transforming the oppressive nature of the academy (Glazer and Slater 1987; Aisenberg and Harrington 1988).

Why Validate the Reality of Women in the Academy?

Within the ivied walls of the academy, the reality of women's lives remains obscure amid efforts to maintain skeletons of the past. The medieval guild is one such skeleton that lingers on despite numerous changes over the centuries, which serve to sometimes weaken but not entirely abolish its impact on the lives of women academics.

The Medieval Guild

Rose Sheinin (1998) points out that there are two factors which contribute to the historical “en-gender-ing” of knowledge. The first aspect centers on the concept of “man” as being gender-inclusive, so that knowledge about man incorporates woman. The second aspect pertains to the scientific revolution, which demanded that only scientific methodology be used to advance knowledge. Further, she notes that from the beginning the church was authorized to guard societal knowledge; however, over time the university became an essential member of this guild. She writes (p. 96):

The concept of the university as a guild is an important one for understanding the changing space for women in academe. A guild is a 'confraternity or association formed for the mutual aid and protection of its members or for some common purpose,' or perhaps both. Universities were given the status of a medieval guild in the sixteenth century in the Bavarian Hanseatic towns, by the Princess Elizabeth of Bavaria, as she sought to bring order and law into the battles between the towns and the gowned men of academe. The medieval guild often became 'an incorporated society in a town or city having exclusive rights of trading within the town.' Indeed, the guild even became 'the governing body of the town.'

With a slight change in wording, such that 'town' and 'city' are replaced by 'university' and 'college,' one begins to understand that the professional faculty associations of today, like their ancestors of yesterday, should and do have very considerable power in, and responsibility for, their community. The professional guild, like its forerunners, self-defines and self-selects in all dimensions, including gender. And this is the key to the changing space for women in academe.

In 1255, the gender of the university became male when the church barred all women from the institution and decreed that the theory and practice of knowledge would be governed by the misogynistic philosophy of Aristotle (Allen 1985; Lindenberg and Westman 1990). Scholarship became defined as research conducted by male academics and specifically excluded the private sphere of women (Noble 1992). The scientific method substituted rational knowledge for that which was characterized as emotional (Keller 1985). The maleness of the profession resulted in the exclusion of women and their issues from the scholarly body of knowledge. By the end of the 1800s, women and men struggled to gain justice, equality, freedom, suffrage, and an education (DuBois 1978). As women became professors in the early 1900s, initially in women's colleges which were dedicated to the higher education of women (Rossiter 1982), the spectrum of women's efforts to alter universities was large, for at one end they merely sought to integrate women into the pre-established male model and at the other end the radical feminists were intent on transforming the scholarship to fully include research by and for women (DuBois et al. 1992).

Later, the efforts of feminist scholars during the 1970's, 1980's, and 1990's resulted in establishment of women's studies programs intended to develop and disseminate knowledge of importance to women (Backhouse and Flaherty 1992). Recently, studies about women are being integrated into various disciplines and feminist scholars are insisting on gender inclusiveness as a measure of the excellence of any particular field of knowledge and of its scholars (Goggin 1992). During the same time period, second wave feminist activists helped establish legislation such as employment equity, pay equity, and educational equity which were applied to universities and became important components for en-gender-ing knowledge (Baines 1980).

Today both women students and professors are entering universities in growing numbers. Nonetheless, these institutions remain structured largely on the male lifestyle and scholarship course (Sheinin 1998). Even the timeframe for career development is based on the prototypical male's opportunity to devote himself to a lifetime of work in pursuit of knowledge, while the partner (usually female) attends to his other needs. Sheinin asks (p.103): "How excellent can the senior academic administration of a university be if it continues to accept, as the appropriate paradigm of academe, the monastic, all-male model created and enshrined in law in 1255 specifically to exclude women?" Given this background it seems particularly important to recruit and retain more women in academe, especially those committed to issues of equality and diversity. It is also crucial that academic men and students are aware of the university's commitment to this goal. Indeed, there is a need for more women in administrative positions in academe so that students and faculty members alike can view women in positions of power and see a reality that includes women in all aspects of life.

The Need for Alternative Models of Academic Careers

Women-friendly policies and practices are not often taken into consideration by the male-dominated leadership in academic institutions. According to Judith S. Glazer (1997: 62-3): “Women in higher education are caught in a dilemma, largely excluded from full participation based on their perceived difference, and included with the expectation that they will adapt to existing institutional norms and accommodate their differences.” From a feminist perspective, those in positions of power have the ultimate authority to encourage or derail efforts to achieve gender equity; and gender hierarchies continue to slow women's progress toward equity. What are considered gender-neutral policies and practices typically reinforce the male-defined culture (MacKinnon 1989). For instance, the fact that childbearing and tenure track years often occur simultaneously for women faculty is not an issue that has received much attention by the powers that be in academe; hence the tenure and promotion system remains unaltered, continues to favor the male lifestyle, and appears to be gender neutral by virtue of its focus on merit.

The necessity for change is obvious when we consider the low proportion of women faculty in the upper echelons of academe. Since women have limited access to academic administration, their ability to obtain presidencies, chairs, full professorships, and large grants is left to the discretion of males in positions of power. But at a time when those in power are concerned with efficiency and diminishing resources, gender equity seems to be a low priority (Glazer 1997).

A transformation in academic careers and campus culture is essential to respond to the needs of the increasing numbers of women students and professors. Sandra Acker and Grace Feruerverger (1997) interviewed women academics who perceived themselves to be

overworked and undervalued in their departments. These women performed much of the caring work such as the supervising, advising, and counseling of the students. To explain the women's situation, Acker and Feruerverger (p.136) note:

Our view is that institutional practices are more to blame for inequities revealed in our study than are personal preferences of the women themselves. [I]t is what the university stands for, and what it rewards and what it ignores, that is at issue. The disadvantage women encounter is more systemic than it is intentional -- though no less problematic for all that.

Woman-friendly career paths would consider women's roles in combining work and family. Judge Rosalie Abella (1984) argues that child care facilities are a necessity if women are to achieve employment and educational equity. The Canadian National Child Care Study reports that in about 95 per cent of the families surveyed the woman describes herself as being primarily responsible for the management of child care arrangements (Goelman et al. 1993). Universities continue to lag behind feminist policy suggestions in providing adequate child care to accommodate the needs of women faculty (Hornosty 1998). University child care centers tend not to accept very young children, nor do they provide for flexible hours such as after-school care. Jennie M. Hornosty (1998: 187) writes:

Not only does the limited nature of child care facilities create a problem for women in university, but often the attitudes and assumptions also cause problems. Without institutional values that support a meshing of family and career, a woman's decision to combine motherhood with an academic career is not legitimized.

Petra Tancred and Susan Hook Czarnocki (1998) find that women faculty who leave the academy do so because of three main reasons: the "intolerable" patriarchal or harassment workplace atmosphere, the discrimination, and the competition between academic and family responsibilities. The authors define "mechanisms of patriarchy as the means whereby men in positions of power ensure their continuing domination over women" (p.123). As a brief description of patriarchal mechanisms, the women in their study spoke of being ignored, not

being taken seriously, feeling invisible, and having their qualifications undervalued, as well as feeling isolated and marginalized due to an extensive workload and predominant male language. The women also identified atmosphere harassment — an overemphasis on the male-defined culture — and quid pro quo harassment — which are seen as advantages offered in exchange for sexual favors. Further, the women noted that they were denied employment in departments where less qualified men were hired instead. The authors discovered that all but one of the participants who left the academy went in search of and found “a higher level of comfort in a female-dominated workplace” (p. 131). One of the main criticisms that the women reported was the lack of acknowledgement in academia of the tensions between family life and academic work. Tancred and Czarnocki write (p. 131):

[T]he women firmly stated through their actions that triple responsibilities -- work, husband/partner and children -- are beyond realistic expectations, and this prompts one to ask whether the nature of work responsibilities, rather than personal responsibilities, could not be modified. ... Otherwise, the 'revolving door' will continue to operate and post-secondary educational institutions will fail to reap the full benefits of women's talents.

To recap, even with the large increase in the proportion of women undergraduate and graduate students the faculty members remain disproportionately male. Salary inequities persist for women academics and the glass ceiling is difficult to break for would-be women administrators. Additionally, university policies fail to facilitate the combined roles of work and family life. To create women-friendly careers and universities, major attitudinal and behavioral changes are required. Glazer (1997: 70) states:

Rather than assert that women are more likely to work part-time than to earn tenure-track appointments, to teach more and publish less, to obtain their doctorates in the humanities rather than the hard sciences, to remain single or childless, to leave rather than remain at the university, to be assistant and associate administrators rather than in leadership positions, it would be appropriate to determine what it is about institutional structures that make them more compatible with men's lives.

The Study

In this section, I discuss my use of a feminist theoretical framework to guide this study, as well as the feminist themes, research questions and assumptions, and the importance and significance of the research. At the end of this section, I outline several critical self-reflections as well as the limitations of the study.

Feminist thought “expresses its intellectual and political commitments to women” (Tong 1998: 1). A central assumption of feminist theory is that androcentric thinking and structures oppress women both socially and psychologically and create a need for social change. Feminists therefore envision a society without the social, political, and economic oppression of women. In view of the fact that there are many feminisms, many feminist theories, and many feminist methods, I wish to clarify that my own work is closely linked to a “critical feminist” perspective (see Marshall 1997; Brooks 1997; Eggins 1997; Marshall 1997; Glazer 1997; and Stage 1997). According to Estela Mara Bensimon and Catherine Marshall (1997: 6), a feminist critical analysis entails “a recognition of how patriarchy is manifest in the control of women’s identities, including the identification of women within the private sphere, for example, portrayals of women academics as terrific teachers and unproductive researchers, and men within the public sphere.” These feminists reject traditional analysis on the grounds that it is androcentric. The notion of androcentrism implies that women’s experiences and beliefs are neglected to the point where their existence becomes invisible and the lives of privileged men inform us of the typical human experience. Androcentric studies compare women to male norms and values and thereby find women deficient. According to such studies the solution is simply to have women become more like men. In fact, in her survey of three major higher education journals from the 1960s to 1980s, Barbara

Townsend (1993) finds most articles (742 out of 772 examined) show that women must consistently prove themselves better than men in order to be successful. Ample research has compared the productivity rates of female and male academics, but these studies have not concerned themselves with the impact of a male dominant context on the publication productivity of women. For instance, issues of childbearing and rearing facing women faculty are not considered in these productivity studies (Finkel and Olswang 1996). Critical feminists include in their studies an analysis of gender as well as class, race, sexuality, and disability, because it is argued that the construction of identities should incorporate the missing voices of the other(s). In examining authors using a feminist critical policy analysis (i.e., Brooks 1997; Eggins 1997; Ferber and Loeb 1997; Marshall 1997) Susan Twombly (1999: 442) writes:

The four books reviewed here, responding to criticisms that earlier feminist research focused on a homogeneous group of middle-class white women who were presumed to speak for all women, reflect a postmodern attention to difference and power, more clearly emphasize what Marshall (1997) calls 'power and politics feminism,' and give greater attention to policy. Furthermore, a growing body of international research provides a perspective of academic women that challenges the earlier monolithic definitions of feminism and accounts of discrimination and disadvantage described by U.S. women. This new scholarship recognizes that understanding the relationship between power, gender, culture, and policy is important to changing women's status in the academy. Moreover, this new scholarship collectively suggests that women's place in the academy is much more complex than earlier research has suggested.

Feminist critical analysis explores issues of individual self-identification and resistance to oppression. According to Bensimon and Marshall, power and politics feminisms (including radical, socialist, poststructuralist, and postmodern), postpositivist feminisms (such as poststructuralism and postcolonial), as well as liberal, and cultural feminisms and can partake in feminist critical analysis.¹ However, they note that (p.5): “despite having different preferences for conceptual frameworks the common thread across these works is that they

share the intellectual and political agenda of power and politics feminism: to conduct rigorous research on women and the academy in order to transform it.”

My own theoretical framework includes some of the beliefs of both *power and politics* and *cultural feminisms*. From power and politics feminism I draw on the notion that men use their power to construct social identity placing themselves at the center, and labeling women as the *others*. In other words, gendered hierarchies are created in which women become subordinate or support workers. These feminists look for alternative and more progressive ways of viewing the world in order to transform systems of oppression, in this case within the academy, for they believe in Audre Lorde’s (1984: 110) claim that “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.” In this sense, I seek to identify the overt and subtle structural mechanisms that allow men to maintain the power to control the policies and activities affecting women in academic institutions. Bensimon and Marshall (1997: 6) write:

We see the project of feminist critical analysis as being twofold: 1) to critique or deconstruct conventional theories and explanations and reveal the gender biases (as well as racial, sexual, and social class biases) inherent in commonly accepted theories, constructs, methodologies, and concepts; and 2) to conduct analysis that is feminist both in its theoretical and methodological orientations.

From cultural feminism I adopt the view that due to the process of socialization women and men take on different roles associated with their gender. Thus, females learn to develop attributes of nurturing by focusing on relationships and making decisions based on an ethic of caring (Gillian 1982; Noddings 1984; Belenky et al. 1986). I believe that “women’s ways” (Belenky et al. (1986) should be recognized and valued in the marketplace. However, one of the problems with this theory is that that caring and nurturance have been historically relegated to the private sphere, making them both “essentially” female and invisible. This view also limits potentials for social transformation in that an emphasis on women’s ways in

a male-defined culture may serve to legitimate stereotyping. Carol Gilligan (1982, reprint 1993: 17) points out that mainstream psychology considers personal autonomy to be the backbone of maturity and adulthood. Therefore women's concern with relationships is assumed to be a weakness instead of a personal strength.

[W]omen not only define themselves in a context of human relationship but also judge themselves in terms of their ability to care. Women's place in man's life cycle has been that of nurturer, caretaker, and helpmate, the weaver of those networks of relationships on which she in turn relies. But while women have thus taken care of men, men have, in their theories of psychological development, as in their economic arrangements, tended to assume or devalue that care.

In the final chapter, using tenets from both *power and politics feminisms* and *culture feminism*, I attempt to identify women-centered academic careers from the women's stories. Bensimon and Marshall apply a critical feminist approach to policy analysis by taking a broad view of what constitutes policy (including written and unwritten policies, procedures, and practices). In a similar sense, I use this approach to examine the androcentrism embedded in everyday activities, campus culture, and professional ideologies, policies, and practices in higher education. I seek to analyze differences, subjectivity, and context in order to understand power relations and help bring about change. Feminist critical analysis is a broad category in which I locate my approach; however, my intent is not to embrace all aspects of the above two theories, but rather to focus on specific feminist themes, questions, and assumptions derived from these theories and highlighted below.

Feminist Themes

My own critical feminist conceptual framework focuses on the following two themes: a gender analysis, and an analysis of difference. First, my model is concerned with a "gender analysis," which Acker (1999: 3) refers to as one which "puts the emphasis on social and

cultural expectations and the ways they are incorporated into everyday life as well as providing a foundation for enduring social structures.” This approach stresses the gendered consequences associated with cultural beliefs about women. In contrast, Acker notes that a “‘sex difference’ approach” would highlight presumed natural and/or essential differences between women and men. A gendered analysis posits that the distinctions between the feminine and masculine are socially produced. Consistent with the feminist project of revealing and valuing women’s experiences, gender is placed at the center of the analysis in an effort to understand and expose the overt and subtle ways in which gender influences personal experiences, as well as the processes and practices of institutions.

The second aspect of this critical feminist framework involves an “analysis of differences” based on gender, race, class, sexuality, and physical ability. A significant contribution to feminist thought is made by Audre Lorde’s conceptualization of the “notion of difference,” that is, the ability to recognize that differences among people can serve as an empowering human force which facilitates real social change. Lorde (1984) notes that women are exposed to various oppressions in society but the oppressions of women are not necessarily identical. However, a recognition of the concept of differences among women permits the organization of women towards a common goal. These differences arise from another important feminist concept, that is, the “multiple subjectivity” of individuals, which emphasizes differences due to gender, race, class, sexuality, age, and disability. With respect to privilege Lorde writes: “As white women ignore their built-in privilege of whiteness and define woman in terms of their own experience alone, then women of Color become ‘other,’ the outsider whose experience and tradition is too ‘alien’ to comprehend” (p.117). Lorde believes that white feminists must begin to recognize difference as a strength in order to

abolish patriarchal practices. “In our world, divide and conquer must become define and empower” (p.112). Maria Lugones and Elizabeth Spelman (1987:242) agree with Lorde and believe in the strength of unity among women regardless of race. “[W]omen need to be unified in order to bring about the wanted changes in the world, and if we compete among ourselves, that only amounts to performing for the oppressors the task of keeping us divided and weak.” Recreating the world, Lorde believes, depends on all women learning to define and express their own identities and to relate across their differences.² In short, Lorde envisions a world that embraces equality in the areas of race, gender, and sexuality. There is much to be done before that vision is fully realized.

My “analysis of difference” also involves examining the differences between women and men, largely as represented by the perceptions and experiences of the women in this study. Feminist scholars point out that women’s experiences in academe differ from those of men, as depicted in reports of *chilly climates* which use such terms as isolation, devaluation, and victimization to highlight the university experience for women (Wylie 1995). The ideal professional is also attributed with characteristics usually linked with masculinity such as power, status, and individualism (Glazer 1991). Cultural feminism (also referred to as both relational and difference feminism) posits that within the public life the preferences of women are subordinated to the inclinations of men toward traditional ways of building careers as well as organizational cultures. Stemming from the work of Nel Noddings (1992) who believes that caring should be an important aspect of teaching and Carol Gilligan (1982) who attributes an ethic of care to women, cultural feminism celebrates the differences that women bring to the professions, such as attributes of nurturance, caring, and kindness. Cultural feminists also believe that women have particular “ways of knowing” and

organizing the world (Belenky et al. 1986). Bensimon and Marshall suggest that in order to attain equality the differences between the sexes must be recognized, so that women's differences can be valued. They write (p. 10):

This is in direct contradistinction with the assumption that gender blindness is a prerequisite for achieving equality between men and women. It declares false the widely held belief that gender blindness — the claim that the professor's sex is invisible — constitutes equal treatment for female and male academics. It declares that gender equity and nonsexist academic workplace cannot be attained unless conscious attention is given to women's individuality as well as to relations between women and men.

Ascribing feelings and aspects of caring to women as opposed to men is a controversial issue in feminism. For example, critics have faulted Gilligan's work for making sex-based generalizations about women's and men's moralities. Duly noted have been the negative outcomes of attributing an ethics of care to women and an ethics of justice to men, for associating women with caring promotes the view that men are not responsible for this task because it is not in their nature, whereas women care by nature (Tong 1998). Critics have also noted that Gilligan does not address the differences among women. For instance, Carol Stack (1986) finds that black women and men place equal value on the ethic of care. The essentializing of the emotional and the rational to one gender or the other seems unsubstantiated by the current literature. Rather, it could be argued that often (but not always) women tend to be socialized to express their emotions and exercise acts of caring more readily than men. Thus, I would argue that women's differences, even though they are socialized and by no means inevitable, should be valued.

Feminist Research Questions and Assumptions

The feminist questions that reflect my research endeavors are as follows:

Main Question

- How do women academics describe their careers and experiences, including the inter-relations of work, home, and other aspects of their lives?

Related Questions

- To what extent do they perceive inequities related to family and home?
- To what extent do their accounts reflect the chilly climate, power relations, and marginalization described in the literature?
- To what extent do they perceive positive as well as negative aspects of their careers and experiences as academics?
- To what extent do their accounts differ according to academic field and rank status?
- To what extent do they understand their experiences in terms of race and class privilege or disadvantage?
- To what extent do their accounts indicate countervalues or strategies for resistance and change?

Behind these questions is a set of assumptions derived from feminist theory. The first assumption is that women can tell their own stories, which in turn tell us about how the university and society operates. Feminist theory has been developed in response to the conditions of women's lives and aims to interpret the role of gender in society; hence women's personal narratives are important sources for feminist research because they reveal women's lived experiences (Personal Narrative Group 1988). This view challenges the androcentric thought found in traditional disciplines, which has constructed the white, male

experience as the norm. Lorde (1984:45) notes “it is axiomatic that if we do not define ourselves for ourselves, we will be defined by others — for their use and to our detriment.” Lorde believes in revealing all of her multiple identities, such as Black, lesbian, and feminist. In her life and in writings, Lorde clarified the notion that everyone possesses multiple identities. Lorde’s concept of women’s silence and self-definitions ties in well with this assumption for without the use of our own voices, women’s stories become invisible and distorted. Telling our stories leads to self-definition instead of silence and to revealing precisely who we are through our multiple positions. Feminist interpretation of personal narratives is therefore concerned with analyzing and enunciating women’s voices and experiences (Ferguson 1993). Indeed deep interpretation may create an enhanced understanding of women’s lives (Gluck and Patai 1991).

The second assumption is that women academics are part of an institution that reproduces social and gender division, and incorporates power and hierarchy. Power and politics feminist theory assumes that there exists a gender hierarchy of male supremacy and female subordination, as well as a race and class hierarchy, both of which are socially created. Women’s personal narratives permit us to understand the ways in which lives are both individually and socially constructed. In other words, women’s stories can lead to an understanding of women’s oppression, which is the first step toward the possibility of social change (Personal Narratives Group 1988). Feminist theory assumes that careers are gendered, raced, and classed; that is, they are embedded in the interaction of gender, race, class, and power. Feminist scholars also portray the academy as a patriarchal system of institutionalized male dominance (Rich 1993). This patriarchal ideology is preserved by men in powerful positions who by and large select those chosen to study, teach, and do research,

as well as the most appropriate subjects for teaching and research (Rich 1993). Mainstream scholarly journals also serve to maintain patriarchal ideology, for powerful men who determine what scholarship to publish operate them (Moore and Sagaria 1993). Research on the content of journals in higher education demonstrates that only a few articles focus on women and those portray women as the “other.” According to Townsend (1993), women are either lacking a certain quality and must compensate for it (compensatory literature) or they are compared to male norms (bifocal literature). For example, compensatory literature describes the small number of women faculty as being a consequence of their childrearing responsibilities and their tendency to be less career-ambitious than men (Park 1996). These types of literature are problematic for they blame women for their own situation and encourage them to assimilate into a system embedded in sexism, rather than seeking transformation in patriarchal structures. Bensimon and Marshall (1997: 12) write: “Possibly one of the most important contributions of feminist policy analysis is that of showing that men are considerably more able to fit into the academic system as presently organized whereas for women fitting in depends on their ability and willingness to become more like men.” One way in which inequality is reproduced in academe is through a curriculum which reinforces traditional gender roles and the invisibility of women (Rich 1993). Thus adding more women in positions of power will not transform the system so long as those women continue to go through university with internalized gender codes and uneducated about the male-defined culture and ideology which influence their experiences and knowledge base (Moore and Sagaria 1993).

The third assumption in this study, also drawn from power and politics feminism, is that women academics can exercise resistance to inequality and bring about change in the

university and society at large. Some of the ways in which they can accomplish these feats are by disrupting power hierarchies and writing beyond the ending. Feminist analysis seeks to disrupt patriarchy “primarily through the research strategy of gendering everyday practices and traditions through which academic culture is created and recreated” (Bensimon and Marshall 1997: 14). Critical feminists choose to deconstruct the system rather than accept prevailing practices and traditions. Conventional research about the academy explores issues of productivity and time commitment to explain why women are less likely to achieve tenure than men. Instead feminists focus on the structures, policies, and practices that serve to disadvantage women academics, because they have found that supposedly gender blind policies and practices result in cumulative advantages for men and cumulative disadvantages for women (Clark and Corcoran 1986). For instance, Shelley Park (1996) asks how the criteria for tenure might produce differences in success rates for women and men, thereby implying an institutional problem rather than a woman problem. Similarly, Acker and Feuerwerker (1997) ask why the reward system undervalues women’s extra work in academe.

To abolish oppression by writing beyond the traditional or “fairy tale” endings women need alternative discourses for understanding reality. Within the lived experiences put forth by women, poststructural feminists (who according to Bensimon and Marshall are included in power and politics feminism) have found an array of contradictions mostly due to women’s limited discourses within patriarchy. The historical omission and invisibility of women in literature, and their continued underrepresentation in language, predisposes women — without alternative discourses of their own — to reproduce patriarchal fictions. This repetition of patriarchal thought serves to divert energy and inhibit change (Lorde 1984). The invisibility of women and their voices creates the need for alternative languages of

storytelling. Women can construct women-defined and women-centered discourses. The concept of resistance implies that women are actors in social institutions and their actions or choices serve to create meaning (Gaskell 1985). Feminist transformation theory assumes that women do not only resist various forms of oppression, but they also consciously and collectively fight against inequality. According to Patti Lather (1984), feminist writings and feminist teaching in women's studies programs serve to oppose hegemony and transform society. Feminist theory is therefore grounded in a movement which makes the personal political, and which believes that the struggles of everyday life are struggles that can ultimately transform society.

The feminist framework which I propose advocates the importance of women's experiences and perceptions in understanding academic careers and creating a system of higher education which is inclusive of their needs. In view of the fact that culture is produced in both the private and public spheres, to ignore women's cultural worlds is to understand and acknowledge only part of society's culture and corresponding resistance. While in the past women's experiences were excluded from the creation of knowledge and social structure, today feminists claim women's stories as pertinent in a broader understanding of reality. Thus, in this work I use a feminist critical perspective and several feminist themes, questions, and assumptions to examine women's everyday experiences in the academy and the ways in which they resist inequality and thereby attempt to bring about change.

Importance and Significance of the Study

What I hope to add to the growing literature on women academics through this study is my understanding of the respondents' perceptions surrounding the present structure of academia, their role as women and academics within that structure, their level of comfort amid a male-dominated hierarchy, and their vision for the creation of women's cultures in the ivory tower. I hope that my reflections on the women's stories contribute to the discussion about the difficulties women faculty encounter in balancing work and family life, the lack of acknowledgement provided by the male-defined culture to the tensions inherent in work and family responsibilities, the social sacrifices women are expected to make either for their children or for their career, and the resistance to genuine progress in this area. My work incorporates the political agenda of better understanding women's experiences and of seeking to enhance their lives.

I chose to study women academics because their entrance into tenure-track and tenured positions is relatively uncommon. They have been and continue to be viewed as *outsiders* and *others* in the academic realm. Compared to their male colleagues (especially white, middle/upper class men) they occupy a position of difference, which problematizes both their professional and personal lives because these aspects of their lived experiences are intertwined. I wanted to learn about women's thoughts and experiences, making this study exploratory and descriptive in nature. More specifically, I was interested in understanding women's career paths especially after they enter the academic profession. A question that loomed large in my mind was: why is it that so few women become full professors?

Sandra Harding (1987) describes three types of feminist scholarship: work that recovers neglected and invisible writings and stories of women theorists; work that explores women's

contributions to society; and work that examines the oppression of women under male dominance. My research overlaps the boundaries of the latter two types of work that Harding reports. I chose the participants due to their successes as tenure-track or tenured scholars. I was interested in learning about the ways in which successful women overcome obstacles in their career paths and balance professional and personal lives. To understand fully their successes and their contributions to academic life, it was virtually inevitable that I begin by understanding their struggles with inequalities in their lived experiences. Through the women's stories I was able to develop new ways of categorizing their experiences, which I refer to as *taboos*, as well as to illustrate the ways in which the women in this study successfully overcame and continue to use strategies to overcome those taboos. In this sense my work makes a contribution to feminist scholarship by exploring not only the inequities that women academics encounter but also by celebrating the contributions that they make to academic life.

Critical Self-Reflections and the Study's Limitations

Leslie Rebecca Bloom (1998: 148) states: "by disclosing and analyzing her identity and values, the researcher asserts both that what she knows cannot be separated from who she is and that her warrants for making knowledge claims are subjectively situated and historically contextual." Although I would currently describe myself as a white, middle-class woman, I was raised working-class and I still feel a deep connection with and concern for working-class women. Thus, I would classify myself simultaneously as working and middle-class based on my history and current status. Certainly, I could identify with the lives of the three white working-class women in my study when they spoke of their parents, siblings, and

education. On the other hand, the early lives of the middle-class and minority women seemed foreign in my experience. Hence, I was particularly disappointed to find that very few working class women participated in my study, perhaps as a result of their low level of representation. The explanation for the low number of working-class women faculty in the academy seems to be an issue worth pursuing in future research. In a study about seven women who exited the academy, Tranced and Hook Czarnocki (1998: 131) conclude that: “Based on the fact that three of the respondents were from working-class backgrounds, one is encouraged to reflect upon the possibility that two devalued statuses — being of blue-collar origins and female — are more than the academy can include.”

Some of my multiple subjectivities include my role as a woman, my place as a student, my racial identity as white, and my social/economic status. Critical self-reflection helped me to understand my responsibility and social location as a student, working-class woman, and feminist in relation to the women in the study. Thus, as a student, woman, and feminist, I was motivated to undertake this study by my interest in exploring and deriving meaning from women's experiences. Being a feminist, I was surprised to find that many of the women in this study refused to identify themselves as feminists even though upon further discussion they could clearly be classified under the label of feminism on the basis of their values, language, and behaviors. Some refused the feminist label because of what they referred to as its “negative connotation,” while others were not sufficiently familiar with the feminist agenda to consider supporting the cause. The department in which I am currently a Ph.D. student is clearly feminist oriented. Stepping out of that supportive world and discovering reality as I write my thesis in a different country and as I begin to teach other students about gender issues is a difficult process. Based on my feminist values, my desires are to help

make changes in the university environment to create equity for women. However, the changes that I foresee as being necessary may not necessarily be the changes that the women in this study are seeking. Below are a few of the questions that I kept in mind during the writing phase of this work.

How can we ever know (and predict) whether the results of a research study will benefit women -- that is, whether it is truly for women? Who chooses emancipatory goals and why? Whose desire is it to empower? What does the desire to empower others say about researchers? Unless we learn to ask these questions and become reflective and self-critical, we are in danger of imposing our desires, our goals, and our worldview upon others, despite and against our best intentions (Kirsch 1999: 46).

Moreover, the format which I am using for writing is that of a multi-vocal text, “a text that endeavors to fully and fairly represent several (even many) voices speaking on a topic of professional interest” (Kirsch, p. 66). Authors of multi-vocal texts link their interpretations to the proof found in the women's words — making the inclusion of interview excerpts within the text very important. The goal is to preserve the voices of others and their meanings. Multi-vocal texts cross the boundaries of traditional forms of academic writing and allow the reader to view or peek into the reality of the participants and thereby form her own interpretation. According to Gesa E. Kirsch, multi-vocal texts have two serious limitations. First, she cautions that the authors' presence cannot be underestimated for they retain a great deal of control over the choice of the interview excerpts. Researchers are responsible for the representation or misrepresentation of their participants. Texts can be misleading if the authors gloss over historical, cultural and material differences of individuals. Since any given story is a social construction, it can be transformed into a different story simply by applying another interpretation. Similarly, interview excerpts can be interpreted in different ways. Because it is important that the researcher not risk the imposition of her own values on others, I sought to limit this risk by answering the questions cited above as outlined by

Kirsch. In other words, since the participants are the ones who should ultimately choose the emancipatory goals, I asked related questions in the interviews and I used the women's responses to guide my writing. Second, Kirsch argues that multi-vocal texts can be elitist by demanding that readers “synthesize multiple perspectives if they are to draw any conclusions from their reading” (p. 72). By asking readers to conduct interpretive and analytical work, the authors may leave out some members of the general public (such as policymakers and parents) who lack the interest, time, or training to invest their efforts in these texts.

Despite these limitations “multi-vocal texts are necessary and important as we explore new ways of including the voices of others, of representing their experiences, and of situating ourselves in our writing” (Kirsch, p. 75). Kirsch further notes that even though issues of interpretive responsibility are difficult to resolve, researchers can learn to make decisions about when to write and when to avoid writing multi-vocal texts based on the anticipated audience and the goal of the work. In the case of my own study about women academics, my intent is to reach other academics and administrators within universities, and therefore a multi-vocal strategy seems appropriate.

The Taboos

Taboos in the halls of academe are those issues that to this day are forbidden legitimacy in the system. Tabooed subjects and practices are often hidden and voiceless, but they are not forgotten by the women faculty who are constantly dealing with the resulting silence surrounding specific inequalities, such as aspects of combining a personal and professional life as well as other differences that distinguish them from the pre-established social and structural norms. These women tend to experience everyday struggles. On the basis of the

data derived from the women's stories in this study, I have identified five distinct categories of taboos: naming privileged lives, raising engendered contradictions, childbearing, childrearing, and mentioning the value of caring. This section serves as an overview of the subsequent chapters.

Naming Privileged Lives Among Women in Academia

Virginia Woolf (1938, reprint 1992) shows us how academia honors masculinity and constitutes a man's world through its language, concepts, and conventions. These academic roots appear to have remained intact, for bell hooks (1989) notes that women entering academe feel obligated to act or pass as men who are heterosexual and middle class. In this sense, the academy serves to reinforce established frameworks of domination. Stalker (1998: 211) writes: "If it is still a predominately male establishment, the merit system at the institution, and at universities and colleges generally, is considering only half of the population meritorious." Clearly, there is much discussion of the privileged lives led by white, middle-class, heterosexual men in academia. But naming privileged lives among women academics is less common. In chapter four, "Embarking on an Academic Career," the white, middle-class women — as well as the working-class and minority women of which there are a few in this study — discuss the ways in which their relatively privileged lives enabled them to acquire an education and become academics.

Articulating Engendered Contradictions in Academia

Within the current system faculty members must conform to the academic rules of employment, tenure, and promotion. Yet these rules are not neutral; rather, they are

gendered and contextually specific. Rules allude to sexual scripts, which include performance, dress codes, and so forth (Fineman 1994). Women in the academy are overburdened with additional workload typically including the feature of emotional labor (Walsh 1995). Women who focus on nurturing their students and neglect establishing networks with their colleagues risk losing out on promotion possibilities. Yet conformity to organizational codes requires women to become men, by disguising specific aspects of their womanhood which stand in contradiction to departmental rules of membership. There are many contradictions in academic life that women experience but which remain invisible, such as the conflict they confront when dealing with an excessive workload and the pursuit of tenure and promotion. These contradictions — which tend to form obstacles in women's career paths — are revealed by the women in this study in chapter five, “Gender as a Barrier to Full Membership in Academe.” Their stories expose the silence encompassing women's contradictory experiences in the towers of academe.

Childbearing as a Taboo in Academic Life

Research which attempts to explain the low level of representation of women faculty in Canadian and US universities focuses both on the chilly climate within universities (Chilly Collective 1995) and on publication productivity differences between women and men (Cole and Zuckerman 1987). Fewer studies examine the effects of childbearing on women's career advancement. In chapter six, “Tenure and Children,” the women highlight their perceptions and experiences with childbearing and academic careers. All of the women abide by a principle of carefully planning the timing of childbirth so as to not risk their career prospects. They believe that the actual practice of bearing children is unwelcome in the academic world.

Childrearing as a Taboo in Academic Life

The private and public lives of individuals remain separate and distinct in the academy, despite the efforts of feminist scholars. Women, and perhaps men too, who find these two aspects of their lives to be interwoven, experience a silencing of their personal lives in order to succeed in their professional lives. Studies which focus on women's dilemmas with childrearing and faculty work often explore the virtues of better child care facilities (Hornosty 1998). Few studies focus on other aspects of combining a private and public life, which is the topic of the women's discussion in chapter seven, "Career and Children." Accommodations for childrearing, especially on an individual basis, are rarely allocated to the women academics in this study. Childrearing is part and parcel of one's personal life and appears to be designed as a practice separate and distinct from professional life.

Is Valuing Caring Work Taboo Too?

Park (1996) believes that the academy encourages a gendered division of labor whereby research is viewed as "men's work" and is therefore valued, while teaching and service are seen as "women's work" and therefore undervalued. She presents US studies which show that women do more teaching and service activities, and men do more research; hence the promotion and tenure system which primarily rewards publications tends to disadvantage women. Further she notes that research represents rational and paid work which fits into the public sphere whereas teaching and service represent nurturing activities which historically have been allocated to women's private sphere and not rewarded. Along these lines in chapter eight, "Sleeping Models, Sleeping Tales," the women discuss the extra work that they do, which they believe differs from the workload of their white male colleagues. And

they highlight a vision for transforming academic careers to suit their lifestyles. It seems that assigning value to caring work is forbidden in the academy and this tabooed subject is rarely discussed in the halls of academe.

Before addressing the women's experiences with the above noted taboos in the towers of academe, I begin with a thorough review of the relevant literature in chapter two, and an in-depth description of the methodology in chapter three. In the last chapter, "Engendering Women's Lives Inside and Outside Academe," I present a discussion of the major findings in an attempt to conceptualize the taboos and weave the women's reflections on the various struggles in academic and family life into essential knowledge and a framework for future research on women academics.

Endnotes

- 1 It is beyond the scope of my work to delve into the specifics of each type of feminism, but for a detailed description of the various feminisms see Tong, 1998.
- 2 The notion of differences among women is important because in the past women of color argued that their experiences were missing from feminist analysis. In other words, what constitutes equality differs on the basis of gender, race, class, and sexuality.

Chapter Two

Literature Review:

Inequality in the Groves of Academe

Introduction

The specific literature on women academics can be grouped according to various themes. There are six categories of literature that are most useful for my research. First, there are statistics which show women's career progression relative to men's and address such questions as whether women are hired at the same rate as men and do women climb the academic ladder at the same pace as men. Second, there are other important studies which indicate how the university structure has changed (if at all) to accommodate the growing number of women faculty. In particular I examine literature about the effects of childbearing and childrearing on women's careers and the relationship between having children and publication productivity. Third, there is much literature to show that women are marginalized in this profession. Studies focus on the rules and games in academe that serve to disadvantage women, the chilly climate that women encounter in the workplace, and the larger workload that women academics carry relative to men. Fourth, there are studies that

demonstrate how, to improve their everyday lives, women academics act as “agents of change” by resisting taken for granted assumptions of male domination in various ways. Fifth, in recent years there is a growing body of literature surrounding women’s greater emphasis on emotional labor (teaching and service) and men’s focus on intellectual labor (publications). This approach attacks the heart of the evaluation system in academe by arguing that women’s emotional labor tends to be undervalued in tenure and promotion processes. Finally, there are studies which show that educational restructuring in universities may have an impact on equity issues and women academics’ work. I discuss each of these areas in turn and conclude by noting the gaps in the literature and the connections to my research.

Climbing the Academic Ladder

Over the last decade, women scholars have begun to conduct quantitative studies that focus on the progress of women faculty in Canadian universities. By examining the processes of employment, promotion, and tenure these scholars seek to determine whether women faculty are as successful as their male colleagues. Janice Drakich and Penni Stewart (1998) find a positive pattern over time in the data documenting Canadian women’s promotion through the ranks. They write (p. 7):

Over the thirty-seven year span of our data, as women have entered the university in greater numbers the career path of women is now more like their male colleagues, whether this finding reflects women’s own career related behavior or the organizational culture of the university remains to be explored. Discrimination in recruitment, salary structures, and promotion is still present in Canadian universities but their impact may have declined.

Statistics show that during the last four decades women have been integrated into the professorial ranks. Table 1 illustrates how women working full-time are distributed across

the ranks. Women associate and full professors represented 56.6 per cent of women faculty in 1994 versus 29.4 percent in 1957. It is important to note, however, that women have made less noteworthy advances into the rank of full professor. In 1957 10.7 per cent of women were full professors and 18.7 per cent were associate professors. By 1994 these figures had changed to 19.1 percent and 37.5 per cent respectively. As the proportion of women who hold assistant professorships has remained relatively stable at about one third over the last four decades (see Table 1), the changed profile results from the steep decline in proportions of women who held ranks below assistant professor.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN BY RANK AND YEAR (PERCENTAGE)

Women by Rank	1957	1960	1965	1970	1973	1982	1988	1994
Lower Ranks	36.5	39.7	45.8	38.6	28.4	18.6	15.3	9.4
Assistant Professor	34.2	31.7	32.5	39.5	41.1	34.1	35.3	34.0
Associate Professor	18.7	19.5	15.2	16.6	23.1	35.5	35.1	37.5
Full Professor	10.7	9.1	6.5	5.3	7.1	11.7	14.4	19.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Drakich and Stewart (1998:7). Percentages are for full-time positions only.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF MEN BY RANK AND YEAR (PERCENTAGE)

Men by Rank	1957	1960	1965	1970	1973	1982	1988	1994
Lower Ranks	20.2	19.3	19.4	14.5	9.8	5.6	4.8	2.5
Assistant Professor	26.0	30.5	33.6	36.0	32.5	17.3	17.2	15.9
Associate Professor	23.0	23.1	25.1	27.7	32.7	39.3	35.9	34.4
Full Professor	30.9	27.1	21.9	21.8	24.9	37.8	42.0	47.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Drakich and Stewart (1998:7). Percentages are for full-time positions only.

In contrast, the proportion of male faculty in the assistant rank declined to the level of 15.9 per cent in 1994 from 26 per cent in 1957 (see Table 2). But men increased their percentages in the higher ranks of associate and full professor to 81.6 per cent in 1994 from 53.9 per cent in 1957. This decline in the proportion of junior men and increase of senior men results from an aging male faculty and the retirement and non-replacement of academics. Unlike women, men have made major advances into the rank of full professor (47.2 per cent in 1994 from 30.9 per cent in 1957). In the lower echelons of academe the percentages of both women and men decline, although there are still more women (9.4 percent in 1994) than men (2.5 per cent in 1994) in these non-tenure stream, full-time positions.

In short, over time women academics have increased their representation in the senior ranks, maintained stable proportions in the assistant rank, and reduced their percentage

distribution in the lower ranks. Nonetheless, women are more likely to be concentrated in the untenured ranks than men (43.4 per cent versus 28.4 per cent respectively in 1994). Tenured women comprised 56.6 per cent of total women faculty in 1994, while the comparable figure for men was 81.6 per cent. Thus relative to men, women still hold lower level positions in academe; however, this situation may slowly change for more women have entered the lower ranks and over time will, one hopes, climb to the top.

Another way of understanding women's progression in academe is by examining a different set of data which sheds a less favorable light on women's current status: that is, the change in the representation of women faculty over the last few decades. It appears that women have made advances in terms of educational attainment. Canadian women have become the recipients of a growing share of all doctoral degrees: 35.5 per cent in 1990 versus 27.4 per cent in 1982 (Wannell and Caron 1994). Yet the proportion of women in faculty positions has not increased dramatically in the last thirty-seven years. Table 3 shows that in 1994 women comprised only 22.7 per cent of full-time tenure-stream faculty members in Canadian universities. Moreover, during a period of twenty-five years the figures show only a minimal increase in the representation of women academics: from 10.8 per cent in 1957 to 15.2 per cent in 1982. It appears that from the mid-1980s on, women are recruited at a slightly higher rate fostered by: 1) changes in the social and cultural status of women as a result of consciousness raising efforts of the women's movement and women scholars, and 2) employment equity initiatives (Drakich and Stewart). Table 3 also shows that by the nineties, women's representation in almost all disciplines has increased. Yet women remain concentrated in traditional disciplines and grossly underrepresented in nontraditional fields.

TABLE 3
REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN BY MAIN SUBJECT TAUGHT AND YEAR
(PERCENTAGE)

DISCIPLINE	1957	1960	1965	1970	1973	1982	1988	1994
Education	25.6	28.7	25.9	20.1	20.8	23.9	27.8	33.5
Fine Arts	20.0	15.2	14.0	14.6	18.4	21.7	24.2	30.8
Humanities	10.3	10.8	16.0	16.9	16.0	18.5	22.4	28.7
Social Science	9.0	8.4	8.6	9.3	10.1	13.9	17.7	23.4
Agriculture and Bio Sc.	15.8	18.9	17.0	15.9	15.4	15.4	16.9	20.7
Engineering and App. Sc.	0.4	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.5	2.5	5.4
Health Professions	25.6	28.7	25.9	20.1	20.8	21.9	24.3	28.9
Mathematics and Phy. Sc.	3.1	3.9	4.6	4.4	3.7	4.5	5.8	8.6
Overall	10.8	11.4	12.7	12.8	12.7	15.2	18.0	22.7

Source: Modified from Drakich and Stewart (1998:7)

Table 3 shows that in 1994 women academics were concentrated in such disciplines as Education (where they constituted 33.5 per cent of faculty members in that discipline), Fine and Applied Arts (30.8 per cent), and Humanities (28.7 per cent), but they had a low level of representation in Engineering and Applied Sciences (5.4 per cent), and Mathematics and Physical Sciences (8.6 per cent). There seems to be very little change in the concentration of women in these fields since 1957: Education (25.6 per cent), Fine and Applied Arts (20.0 per

cent), and Humanities (10.3 per cent), Engineering and Applied Sciences (0.4 per cent), and Mathematics and Physical Sciences (3.1 per cent).

Since 1992 there has been a decline in the total number of full-time Canadian faculty members. These full-time positions have been replaced by an increasing pool of part-timers. StatsCan Daily (1998) reports a decline in faculty of 7.9% over the academic years 1992/93 and 1996/97. This decreasing number of faculty is attributed to a “climate of budget restraints, declining enrollments, and more reliance on part-time teaching staff” (p. 1). Women academics are significantly more likely than men to be employed as part-time teachers in universities. Part-timers are not part of the faculty association and therefore they can be easily terminated. In 1988 Anne Innis Dagg and Patricia Thompson (1988: 75) pointed out that part-timers worked for incredibly low salaries such as \$9000 for teaching three courses “while a full professor earns \$70 000 for three courses, committee work, and research.” Unlike women, men who are part-timers usually are professionals, and they may teach just one course and hold lucrative full-time positions (such as lawyers, physicians). Often part-timers do not receive benefits, sabbaticals, or research time. They are not eligible for tenure and rarely are promoted to full-time tenure stream positions. According to the Committee on the Status of Women (1988: 94):

Figures for part-time faculty are hard to come by, though women are obviously represented much more heavily in part-time than in full-time positions. Many part-timers are people with (sometimes more lucrative) second jobs/careers. However, of the “reluctant part-timers,” that is those who would rather be full-time faculty, probably significantly more are women. They, too, need to read and research to keep up with their subject, but are only paid for their actual teaching time -- part-time refers to employment status, not to the number of hours worked. Part-timers may be seen as less deserving than external (full-time) candidates when vacancies arise.

Across Canada women academics in the 1980s earned less than their male counterparts. For example, the data for full-time faculty in Ontario universities for the academic year

1985-86 reveal that on average women instructors, lecturers, assistant, associate, and full professors earned \$29,060, \$33,124, \$37,390, \$48,113, \$59,432, respectively; compared to their male counterparts who earned \$33,188, \$35,996, \$39,267, \$49,643, \$63,537, respectively (Committee on the Status of Women 1988: 7). Salaries also vary by sex according to field, after controlling for rank. Dagg and Thompson (1988:74, citing Statistics Canada 1986 for all provinces except Quebec) note that: "Full-time university women teachers in the 'hard' sciences and health professions earn less than four-fifths of what men earn; they earn slightly more than four-fifths of men's salaries in the fields where there are traditionally more women..."

In 1996 the average salary for women assistant, associate, and full professors in universities was \$53,567, \$67,081, \$83,000 respectively; compared to their male counterparts who earned \$56,249, \$70,659, \$88,379 (StatsCan Daily 1998). Thus, within each rank women's average salary remains lower than men's at a rate of 5-6%.

To understand further women's current status in the academy, it is important to look at women's *age at promotion* (Drakich and Stewart 1998). Statistics Canada has provided these data from 1973 to 1994. Table 4 shows that the average age at which women were appointed to the rank of assistant professor in 1973 was 36.5 years and in 1994 that age increased to 37 years. In contrast, the average age of appointment to associate and full professor decreased between the years 1973 and 1994: from 42.0 to 41.3, and from 47.9 to 44.9 respectively. The figures also show that the number of years between promotions declines over time. The average number of years to promotion from assistant to associate professor decreased from 5.5 in 1973 to 4.3 in 1994; and from associate to full professor a similar decline occurred from 5.9 to 3.6 years. These numbers suggest that women are climbing the academic ranks

at a faster pace in recent years. Moreover the average age for the women in each rank was higher in 1957 than in 1994 (i.e., assistant 43.7 versus 40.4; associate 50.5 versus 47.1; and full 53.5 versus 52.1 years). For men the average age for appointment to assistant and associate professor increased by three years and remained the same for appointment to full professor during the period of 1973 to 1994. Table 5 shows that for male academics the average number of years between appointment to a rank and promotion also declined from 1973 to 1994. In recent years, therefore, women and men are climbing the academic ladder at a similar pace.

TABLE 4
MEAN AGE FOR WOMEN PROMOTED TO CURRENT RANK

Women by Rank	1957	1960	1965	1970	1973	1982	1988	1994
Lower Ranks	na	na	na	na	32.3	34.4	35.9	37.6
Assistant Professor	na	na	na	na	36.5	35.5	36.1	37.0
Associate Professor	na	na	na	na	42.0	40.6	40.6	41.3
Full Professor	na	na	na	na	47.9	46.0	45.5	44.9

Source: Drakich and Stewart (1998:7)

TABLE 5
MEAN AGE FOR MEN PROMOTED TO CURRENT RANK

Women by Rank	1957	1960	1965	1970	1973	1982	1988	1994
Lower Ranks	na	na	na	na	30.9	33.7	35.0	37.3
Assistant Professor	na	na	na	na	32.3	33.7	34.5	35.3
Associate Professor	na	na	na	na	37.4	38.0	38.8	39.4
Full Professor	na	na	na	na	43.2	42.6	42.8	43.3

Source: Drakich and Stewart (1998:7)

This outline of women academics' career progression in Canadian universities reveals that positive changes have occurred. In large part, these changes are "attributable to women's activism and scholarship within and without the academy" (Drakich and Stewart, p.11). The career advancement of women academics in the 1990s appears comparable to their male colleagues with respect to age at promotion and years in rank. Women entering academe are likely to encounter more equitable hiring practices and pay structures, and a network of female colleagues. Numbers, however, reveal only part of the picture — narrative interpretations seem particularly useful towards acquiring a better understanding of women's experiences in academe. Several issues that the numerical data do not address include: 1) What are the daily lived experiences of women in the academy? 2) Why are women who are employed full-time still underrepresented (22.7 per cent in 1994) in the profession compared to men? 3) Why are women over-represented in part-time academic positions? 4) Why are

very few women academics found in nontraditional disciplines? The literature presented below begins to explore some of these questions.

Since this study deals with Canadian women academics, I have cited only Canadian statistics. However, there is very little Canadian research concerning the issues of women faculty, and therefore I include literature from other countries in the following sections to help explain the situation of women in academe. Many of the studies which I cite are American and the situation of American women faculty resembles that of their Canadian counterparts. For example, based on a recent US survey of 378 colleges and universities, and 33,785 faculty members, Denise K. Magner (1999: 3) states: “women are far less likely to be tenured than men, and more likely to hold positions at a lower academic rank — assistant professor or lecturer. While 25 per cent of female faculty members are lecturers, only 13 per cent of the men are.”

Women’s Life Course

Ruth Roach Pierson (1990) utilizes the term “women’s life course” to acknowledge the changes and complexities in women’s lives which she argues remain unrecognized in the life cycle approach. This terminology, women’s life cycle, suggests biological determinism. That women are the principal child rearers in many cultures and classes is more likely a result of the ways in which society is organized which assign women these roles and responsibilities. Pierson explains the distinction between the terms women’s life cycle and women’s life course as follows (p. 19):

Between the early and the late twentieth century, the stages in women’s lives have repeatedly changed. In particular, the pattern of women’s connection to the paid labour force has undergone important changes. In the 1920s and 1930s, young women tended to retire from paid work on marriage. During the second world war,

married women were needed to offset the severe labour shortages caused by male military enlistment. Then, although the labour force participation rate of women dropped in 1945 and 1946 to pre-war levels, there was no reversal of the higher proportion of the female labour force made up of married women. Retirement from paid labour now tended to occur at the time when one's first pregnancy became visible. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, a tendency to re-enter the labour force after the last child had started school was emerging. By the end of the 1960s, women were beginning to stay on the job through marriage, maternity, divorce and remarriage. Furthermore, women's average life expectancy has lengthened faster than men's. Therefore, we have substituted "life course" for "life cycle" as organizing principle...

Citing a Canadian survey (1989-90) of women graduate students in history, Pierson (1992: 138) notes that the women experienced marginalization primarily as a result of the need to conform to the male model of life in the academy, which was defined as devoting all of one's time to her studies and pursuing those studies unencumbered by family commitments. Even male graduate students with children fit this model since it was assumed that their partners would care for the children. Seventy percent of the female graduate students did not have children and many of those women indicated that their reason for this choice was based on two factors: the lack of financial resources and the insufficient time for child care.

According to Pierson (1992: 138):

[I]n the face of two powerful assumptions, the assumption that the good graduate student should be free to spend all of his [emphasis included in original] waking hours in the library or archives, and the assumption that children are primarily women's responsibility, trying 'to live up to the male model' meant, for many women graduate students, postponing plans to have children or abandoning such plans altogether.

Until recently, women striving for gender equity have placed little emphasis on the differences between women and men, especially surrounding issues of caring, childbearing, and childrearing responsibilities (Reskin and Roos 1987; Hare-Mustin and Marecek 1990). They have downplayed these differences largely because stereotypically feminine roles, often relegated to the private sphere, have been undervalued. It was thought by liberal feminists,

who focused on abolishing gender discrimination, that women wanting to succeed in academe would fit into the historical model of the male academic (Sandler and Hall 1986). This model was problematic in that the traditional university structure was left uncriticized and it did not seek to understand or accommodate the differences that women bring to the academy.

In this section I present some of the recent literature on childbearing as well as the more established work on childrearing issues specific to women academics. I conclude by examining the discourse revolving around the problematic relationship between children and publication productivity.

Childbearing

At the time that I conducted this research in 1996 there were only two sources of information on the relationship between childbearing and academic careers. The first type of literature was provided by women's associations and committees and sought to highlight the potential problem of linking women's entrance into academic careers with their childbearing years. Both the Canadian Association of University Teachers (1986) and the Committee on the Status of Women (1988) pointed out that to a certain extent neither academic careers nor contemporary families had evolved to meet the changing needs of these women. Careers and families essentially functioned on the basis of the male norm which required the "wife" to remain at home and care for the children and household duties to help advance the career of the male academic. There was little recognition in the academic profession that women's career courses can be different from those of men. According to the Canadian Association of University Teachers (1986):

The most critical period in the life of a young scholar is the period which precedes her or his eligibility for tenure. For many academic women, on average already in their thirties when first hired, this period corresponds with childbearing years.

The Committee on the Status of Women (1988) also recognized the dilemma that junior women entering academe might face in terms of maintaining high levels of research productivity during pregnancy (due to potential illness) as well as when they assume the primary responsibility of caring for a newborn. As a result the Committee recommended that “the probationary period be extended one year for each pregnancy. Parenting care policies need to be developed for men and women” (p. 105). However, in 1990 Jane Gordon and Helen Breslauer reported that while Canadian universities had policies to accommodate maternity leave, paternity leave policies were rare and where they existed they had a tendency to be of shorter duration. Gordon and Breslauer concluded that for male academics, the lack of paternity leave policies in universities helps reinforce beliefs that family¹ responsibilities should be discounted.

Other literature that was published before the field research was conducted in 1996 merely cited statistics to show that women academics, like other professional women, were more likely to remain single and childless, or have fewer children compared to their male colleagues or other women of the same age in the general population (Cole and Zuckerman 1987; Committee on the Status of Women 1988; Caplan 1993; Duxbury et al. 1993). Paula Caplan (1993:185) noted that while some women leave academe due to family-related responsibilities, “nearly half the women who stay are either single or childless”. Similarly a US study by Teresa Cooney and Peter Uhlenberg (1989) showed that 44 percent of white women faculty between the ages of 30 and 34 and 31 percent between the ages of 35 and 39 were childless.

Since 1996 a few scholars other than myself have focused on this controversial issue of the relationship between childbearing and women's entrance into the academic profession. In Ann Orel and Robin Whitmore's (1998) so called *Baby Book*, nineteen women academics have unveiled their own experiences with childbirth. Some common themes emerge from these stories. First, department chairs had "wide discretionary power ... to make decisions about the length and nature of a woman's leave time" (p. 1). The chairs tended to be men who made little attempt to understand the childbearing situation from a woman's perspective. Second, there was "variability in what women expect and requested and in what the departments were willing or able to accommodate (p. 1)." Third, the childbearing leave policy was interpreted and implemented differently across departments. Fourth, untenured women seemed particularly vulnerable in their ability to seek and receive parental leave due to fear of reprisal.

Another scholar, Robin Wilson (1999), writes about the link between childbirth and the academic calendar. She notes that female academics tend to plan childbirth to coincide with the summer months.

With ovulation kits and fertility books in hand, a remarkable number of academics manage to give birth when classes let out. There are no nationwide or campuswide statistics on the matter, but academics say they routinely try to schedule the arrival of their children during the summer break, whether they are giving birth or adopting (p. A14).

Wilson describes the story of one woman academic who was aiming to have her baby by the end of spring quarter, but the delivery was five weeks early and an adjunct was hired to complete her classes. The woman stated (p. A15), "People jokingly made comments like, 'Why would you have a baby during the semester when these things can be planned?' " We must become more aware that childbirth is not an exact science as some advocates of the

latest technology would have us believe. Some women have difficult pregnancies or complications, some babies are born premature, and others arrive later than expected. And what about those women who have difficulty conceiving and will be very willing to accept a child born in the middle of a teaching term. With so many unknowns surrounding maternity, why should women academics have limited options in terms of the timing of childbirth?

Childrearing

Little research has focused on the relationship between childrearing and career advancement for women in academia. Scholars who have addressed this issue, however, find that childrearing can act as a possible obstacle to the career progression of women academics. Susan Kolker Finkel and Steven Olswang (1996) report that women assistant professors perceive the “time required by children” as a serious detriment to tenure, especially if the children are young. After surveying 124 women assistant professors at one American university, they write (p. 131):

Of the possible impediments perceived by over 40 per cent of women assistant professors as ‘serious,’ only ‘time required by children’ is not an essential part of academic work; 43 per cent of all women assistant professors indicated that this variable presented a serious threat to tenure. When we examined only the responses of women with children, 59 per cent of the subsample reported that ‘time required by children’ was a serious threat to tenure. Significant differences were found between women assistant professors with children under six and those with children six and older. More than 82 per cent of women assistant professors with at least one child aged under six reported ‘time required by children’ to be a serious threat to tenure, while 43 per cent of the women professors whose youngest child was six or older reported time with children as a serious threat to tenure...

In a study at Carlton University, Linda Duxbury, Louise Heslop, and Judith Marshall (1993) find that women academics devote more time to child care and household duties and they report that they have less time for research, teaching and leisure than their male

colleagues. Women are also more likely than men to experience a “work-family conflict” as a result of assuming the multiple roles of worker, spouse, and parent. According to Duxbury et al. the women academics are more likely than their male counterparts to experience work overload, and to report that their careers and family roles interfered with one another.

Similarly, Mary Deane Sorcinelli and Deborah Billings (1993) find that pretenure women academics have more difficulty than men in balancing work and family activities as they are adjusting to academic life.

Karen McElrath (1992) notes that women academics may subordinate their professional careers to those of their partner by accepting part-time research or teaching positions, and/or by interrupting their careers which reduces their probability of obtaining tenure. The primary reason academic women "subordinate" their careers is to assume childrearing responsibilities. Several US studies find that women are more likely than men to abandon the academy to care for children (Chused 1985; Hensel 1991; McElrath 1992).

Clearly, women academics with children must choose whether they will disrupt their career during childrearing years or support a triple workload of child care, household duties and career-related activities. Some negative consequences of this large workload include excessive stress and exhaustion. Professors juggling child care, home duties and an academic career may work over 70 hours per week, while in contrast the typical academic works about 55 hours per week (Hensel 1991).

Paula Caplan (1993) points out that many Canadian universities do not provide adequate child care facilities to help academic mothers reduce family and work conflicts. Although most universities in Canada do have sponsored on-site child care programs, these centers are

not necessarily high-quality, flexible, and affordable. Many centers have long waiting lists, do not accept infants or toddlers, lack flexibility concerning hours, and charge high user fees.

Childrearing may further limit the careers of women academics in that they tend to be less mobile for job-seeking purposes (Deitch and Sanderson 1987; McElrath 1992; Caplan 1993). Women academics are more likely than men to decline better job offers in other locations to avoid uprooting their families and because their (academic or career oriented) partners would then face the prospect of having to search for a job in a tight labor market (Teevan et al. 1992). Interestingly, however, the male partner's job is likely to determine the family's place of residence because women academics are more likely than their male counterparts to be mobile for the purpose of advancing their partner's career (Brooker-Gross and Maraffa 1989) even if it means leaving a tenured position (McElrath 1992). These women experience conflict over geographic mobility because quite often they are faced with prospects of either underemployment or unemployment. To resolve this dilemma the studies cited above suggest that universities establish policies to become actively involved in helping the partners find acceptable employment.

Family commitments may also inhibit women's possibilities of taking sabbaticals away from home. Sabbaticals are extended to academics for the purpose of conducting research. Often sabbaticals are taken in places away from one's home and work place. Gordon and Breslauer (1990) in their Canadian study note that in this area academic women with families are disadvantaged. A double standard exists for it is socially acceptable for a man to expect his family to follow him during a sabbatical but this is not necessarily so for a woman. In the latter situation the male partner may also have career obligations and therefore expect his family to remain at home.

Research Productivity and Career Advancement

Tenure represents a commitment on the part of the university to extend secure employment to the faculty member. The tenure and promotion system was developed to protect academic freedom, thus allowing professors to carry out intellectual inquiry without threat of dismissal. However, William Tierney and Estela Mara Bensimon (1996: 27) point out that: "Tenure as protection for academic freedom has also become somewhat questionable. It obviously does not protect the untenured; the increasing number of part-time, adjunct, and affiliate staff receive no support from a system that excludes them." The tenure and promotion system tends to socialize pre-tenure candidates to the organizational culture for if they deviate from established norms, they risk losing the opportunity for tenure. Tierney and Bensimon (1996: 36-7) write: "We view socialization as a ritualized process that involves the transmission of organizational culture. Tenure is the strongest example of a socializing mechanism for new faculty in that it involves the exchange and definition of thought and action." They further note that if individuals are permitted to express their diversity, then it is possible to change the culture of the organization.

The essential activities included in faculty work are research, teaching, and service. Each of these aspects of work are vague in terms of their requirements for tenure assessment. Junior faculty are socialized to think that teaching is not important or at least undervalued; research is important but there is a certain mystery surrounding the productivity demands for tenure — no one seems to be quite sure of the quantity and quality of publications necessary; and service is not formally rewarded but it has symbolic importance in that it permits senior faculty to become acquainted with junior faculty (Tierney and Bensimon). In terms of faculty work Tierney and Bensimon (1996: 70) find that: "Institutions are unsure of their

mission, and in turn faculty are not sure what to do, or how to evaluate their own work and the work of their colleagues.”

Although Tierney and Bensimon believe that the majority of assistant professors are confused by the tenure process, certainly academic career progression from non-tenured to tenured stages depends largely on one’s performance in the area of research productivity. In numerous studies gender has served as the category of analysis concerning the matter of scholarly productivity, which is typically measured on the basis of quantity (number of journal articles) and quality (considered in terms of number of citations to those articles) of publications (Davis and Austin 1987, 1990; Zukerman 1987; Long 1992; Long et al. 1993). However, the “quantity of publications is far more important than various measures of quality of publications in predicting rank advancement” (Long et al. 1993: 703). Moreover, Caplan states (1993: 54): “publications count far more for tenure and promotion than do teaching and service to the institution, the profession, and the community.”

Many American studies are concerned with the notion of whether or not women and men publish at the same rate. Briefly, earlier studies that examine the rates of productivity in the 1970s show that women produced less than men (Cole 1979; Over 1982; Persell 1983; Cole and Zuckerman 1984; Fox and Faver 1985). To date, research shows that women scientists still produce less than men (Zuckerman 1987; Long 1992; Long et al. 1993). In contrast, some more recent studies in the 1980s and 1990s reveal that successful women in the social sciences are just as productive as men (Davis and Austin 1987, 1990). It is important to note that Diane Davis and Helen Austin not only focus on successful women but also include in their calculation of productivity the publication of chapters in books, which most researchers on this topic tend to omit.

The issue of productivity is an extremely complex one, for the results depend on how productivity is measured and who is included/excluded from the sample. In large samples, however, where all faculty are included and where the basis for analysis is taken as articles and books, women publish at a rate significantly lower than men (Carnegie Foundation 1989,1990; US Department of Education 1991; Boyer 1990; Allen 1994). For example, between 1986 and 1988 women produced 50 per cent fewer articles and books than men (US Department of Education 1991). However, this does not mean that women in US research universities publish less than men for the studies do not distinguish among types of universities.

Why is there a discrepancy in the publication rates of women and men in the US? One of the main arguments revolves around the conception of women's and men's work in the academy. There is evidence to the effect that female and male academics show different patterns in terms of conducting research, teaching, and service. Women academics typically devote more of their time to the activities of teaching and service and men typically spend more time on research (Austin et al. 1991; Allen 1994; Billard 1994). On average, these women are assigned heavier teaching loads, teach more undergraduate courses than graduate ones, devote more time to advising and supervising students, and have more service responsibilities than men (Park 1996). Moreover, these women typically have less access to research and travel funds, laboratory equipment, and research assistants (Carnegie Foundation 1990; Wunsch and Johnsrud 1992). Thus, when it comes time for tenure and promotion women face a disadvantage relative to men as a result of the practice of using research productivity as the most important criterion for success and devaluing teaching and service — this practice serves to “separate the men from the women” (Park 1996: 55). As in

the home, women academics are assigned domestic and emotional labor in the workplace, whereas men receive the “thinking” duties. Hence, we can say that because women academics manage the domestic and caring responsibilities within the academic milieu (as does the wife at home), male academics are freer to devote time and energy to intellectual matters. For many men in academe, the social nature of women’s work is virtually invisible. Shelley Park (p. 55) states: “inside the university, as outside it, we find a gendered division of labor wherein women assume primary responsibility for nurturing the young and serving men, but receive little credit for doing so.”

Perhaps one of the major reasons for overall discrepancies in publication rate between women and men relates to an area which has not been sufficiently researched in this regard, that is, subject field. Some women are in fields where the typical number of publications is less than in others (e.g., arts rather than sciences). Even within a broad field, subfield variations may take the same shape. Why would this be the case? Margit Eichler (1992) compares Canadian and American publication figures by gender in the fields of sociology and anthropology. She specifically examines the “sex composition of authors” in the Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology (CRSA) versus the American Sociological Review (ASR) and the American Journal of Sociology (AJS); and finds that (p. 81):

... female authors in the CSRA are very slightly ahead of their U.S. counterparts... The differences are, however, no more than one to two percentage points. In both cases, the female authorship in the official journal of the respective national organization is significantly lower than the overall presence of sociologists (in the Canadian case, as expressed in the participation of women in Association meetings).

For the Canadian case, Eichler rejects the three explanations put forth for the discrepancy in the American case; namely, the *seniority hypothesis* (women publish less than men in the prestigious journals because they tend to be in junior positions), the *placement hypothesis*

(women teach fewer graduate courses which tend to foster publishing), and the *age hypothesis* (junior academics are less interested in the types of publications found in AJS and ASR). Eichler believes that in Canada there is no evidence to clearly support any of the above explanations. She proceeds to explore a fourth explanation which she refers to as the *discrimination hypothesis*, that is, the possibility that women's submissions are reviewed more critically than those of men. She suggests that the difference in publication rate between women and men cannot be explained by this hypothesis for the rate of female authorship is not significantly lower than their rate of submissions. An alternative approach which, according to Eichler, serves to explain the discrepancy in publication rates between women and men is to compare women's rate of publications with their overall rate of representation within universities. In terms of the rate of publication for female sociologists in the CRSA (1985-86) she finds that: "women authors are represented proportionately to their overall representation in university faculties" (p. 84). Eichler concludes that: "Seen in this light, then, women authors are reasonably well represented in the official journal of the Association... If this explanation is correct, we should see a continuing increase of female authors in the CRSA" (p. 85).

Several important themes flow from the above literature surrounding research productivity. First, the Canadian (and some US) literature suggests that there is a relationship between discipline and women's and men's research productivity. Since Eichler notes that this can be measured by comparing women's rate of authorship in a particular journal with their faculty representation, more research is required in this area. Second, the assumption that women still produce fewer publications than men in the US can be partly explained by the gendered division of labor in the academy. Future research, however,

should place particular attention on *type of university* and *academic rank*. Third, these studies compare women's and men's productivity over a couple of decades but there is no link to women's experiences with combining children and research productivity. Indeed, most of this work is quantitative in nature which characteristically excludes women's voices.

The Relationship Between Children and Productivity

A few studies specifically examine the influence of children on a woman's research productivity. Given the childbearing and childrearing obstacles in the career paths of women academics (not to mention the subtle workplace gender-related inequities discussed in the subsequent section), another surprising finding is that the married women in Davis and Austin's sample are highly productive. Davis and Austin (1990: 99) explain that the reason for this enhanced productivity is that women academics "generally have highly educated spouses, [and] even if their spouses are not academics, they may provide intellectual stimulation and support for intellectual activities as well as sufficient income to relieve them of 'normal' household and family responsibilities." Angela Simeone's (1987) study of women academics supports this suggestion. She finds that highly successful women tend to be in non-traditional marriages where the spouse contributes to household and family responsibilities. As well, these women are more willing to uproot their family for personal career advancement.

Despite these findings, it is important to note that in Davis and Austin's survey women, and not men, identify "family responsibility" as an inhibitor to research productivity. Svein Kyvik (1990) also finds that family responsibilities inhibit productivity during the critical stages of a woman's career course. For example, a woman who leaves the academy for long

periods of time to care for children may suffer cumulative disadvantage across her career. McElrath (1992: 277-8) shows that the effects on tenure are negative for a woman who interrupts her career: "the probability of obtaining tenure decreases and the length of time to tenure increases." McElrath speculates that the reason for this pattern is that tenure committee members may perceive work disruptions as an indication that the academic woman is not taking her work seriously; hence they believe she may further interrupt her career in the future.

It is not surprising that women academics are more likely than their male colleagues to be single and childless when we consider the potential impact of child care, household labor, and spouses on their career advancement. Simeone (1987) finds that women academics remain single because of the difficulty of finding a relationship in which the two partners are truly equal. She also finds that women academics are more likely to divorce than their male counterparts and suggests that "for academic women who have attained high levels of achievement within professional spheres, it may be even more difficult to play a subordinate role in their relationship" (p.128). Duxbury et al. in their Carlton University study find that none of the women academics are in traditional (male as head of the household or spouse at home) relationships but 17.2% of the male academics have such relationships.

The emphasis on research performance in universities can have detrimental effects on the careers of women academics who are mothers. This productivity requirement combined with the primary responsibility for childrearing and the unequal division of household labor² serve to increase the burden of workload experienced daily by women academics with children. To date, these issues have not been sufficiently nor carefully addressed. While this section

has focused on the relationship between career and family life, in what follows I turn to an examination of the way in which women academics experience the workplace environment.

The Marginalization of Women Academics

The literature reveals that there are at least three ways in which women academics experience marginalization. First, the professional ideologies of merit and service often have a different meaning for women and men and contribute to women's disadvantage (Glazer and Slater 1987). Some of these ideologies are rooted in the "old norms" which help establish the rules of the game in academia (Aisenberg and Harrington 1988). Second, within universities a "chilly climate" permeates which is characterized by such phenomena as gender stereotyping, devaluation, exclusion, and revictimization (Wylie 1995). Third, minority women academics may experience multiple forms of oppression on the basis of their race, class, and gender (Hill Collins 1991). Fourth, women academics often find themselves with a heavier workload relative to their male colleagues (Task Force on Resource Allocation 1994; Monture-Okanee 1995).

Rules of the Game

Some qualitative studies include the narratives of women's experiences and speak specifically to the written *rules* that govern the practices in academe as well as the unwritten rules or *games* that further complicate the day-to-day work experiences of women academics. A few book-length studies have examined women's experiences in academe in great detail. I focus on three of these studies, two American by Penina Migdal Glazer and Miriam Slater

(1987) and Nadya Aisenberg and Mona Harrington (1988) and one Canadian by Mary Kinnear (1995).

The study by Glazer and Slater (1987) describes the historical (1890-1940) entrance of women into four distinct professions (university teaching, medicine, scientific research, and social work) primarily by exploring the past lives of nine women through the use of documentation available in the libraries and archives. The authors identify four career management styles used by the women professionals to achieve success: superperformance, subordination, innovation, and separatism. The *superperformers* demonstrated extraordinary efforts, ability, and achievement. Many were willing to sacrifice a private life for the sake of their careers; that is, they tended to forego traditional relationships and had no children. Women tended to accept *subordinate* positions in male dominated fields because particular professions prohibited the entry of women. A third strategy that the women used was *innovation*, wherein they found new fields of interest which often did not attract men because these jobs were poorly paid and/or served people in the lower class. In particular the American women pioneers in teaching used a career management strategy which Glazer and Slater identify as *separatism*. They established separate women-controlled universities designed for the purpose of educating women and employing professional women. Separatists lived on the premises of the universities and they were willing to sacrifice a private life outside the university for their careers — they had no children and tended to forego traditional relationships. The separatists' approach came under social attack because the women academics rejected marriage. As Glazer and Slater put it: "What the separatists failed to address was the durability of marriage and motherhood as compelling traditions that were reinforced by all the major structures in society" (p. 221).

On the basis of all four professions studied, Glazer and Slater (1987: 241) discover four factors that serve to explain the asymmetry in professional experience between women and men. They point out that “the creation and distribution of expert knowledge” or the development of the “scientific method” meant that those people with scientific authority gained prestigious high level positions which usually placed women and minorities at a disadvantage. Women also tended to rely substantially on the merit ideal as means to professional success. This overreliance worked to their detriment because the professional ideology of merit worked differently for women and men – for men this ideology led to prestige and reward, but for women it was used to legitimize restricted entry into “jealously guarded” professions and/or higher positions. The pioneer women professionals did not challenge the premises of meritocracy and objectivity. The women believed that if they were “‘good enough’ ultimately they would be given recognition,” and they adhered strictly to humanitarian goals (p. 228). Moreover, women professionals were unable to secure places for future generations because there were not enough women in positions of power and women were excluded from decision making committees. The final factor which served to marginalize women in these professions was “the tendency of experts to recruit colleagues similar to themselves” so that the new members did not question “the rules of the game”; ultimately this led to the creation of the “old boys club” or a homogeneous group of men in prominent positions. Glazer and Slater conclude that to bring about change, we must understand the meaning of the professional ideology of merit which to this day serves to marginalize women professionals.

Another important study was conducted by Aisenberg and Harrington (1988) who interviewed 37 US women academics and sought to explain why women either leave

academic careers or do not achieve tenure-track positions. They discover certain patterns of attitudes and activities which serve to maintain women's disadvantage: the forces of the old norms and the rules of the game. The *old norms* still seem to dictate that marriages are for women and careers are for men. Aisenberg and Harrington write (p. 18): "the dilemma of the professional woman is that she cannot easily fit either conventional mold — not the ancient mold of womanliness, nor the prevailing male mode of professionalism." The message of the old norms is that women must choose between family life and work and their choice should be for family life. The old norms further indicate that women's intellectual abilities are inferior to those of men. Moreover, the old norms indicate that women do not have a voice of authority. According to the old norms women are subordinate to men in the public sphere. Like Glazer and Slater, Aisenberg and Harrington find that women academics encounter academic policies and practices as obstacles to their career endeavors, otherwise known as the "rules of the game." In other words, the institutional structure of academe involves a set of formal and informal rules for employment and personal advancement which are dictated by the leaders (formal rules) and the "old boys network" (informal rules). Aisenberg and Harrington note that women lack guidance in the actual rules of the game for they lack professional mentors.

Aisenberg and Harrington (1988) conclude that women academics establish a professional countersystem (which they refer to as *countervalues*) in order to resist hierarchies. They describe several *countervalues* used by women academics. First, they resist the *rules of the game* by shunning academic politics, believing in the merit system, and preferring decentralized decision-making. Second, they exercise their professional voice in the classroom and through public speech by engaging in discourse. Third, they produce

unconventional scholarship by choosing subject matter and methodologies that resist practices of social exclusion. Fourth, they integrate their personal and professional lives. In short, Aisenberg and Harrington believe that women who enter the academic profession encounter two major obstacles, the forces of the *old norms* and the *rules of the game*, and they resist these obstacles through a professional system of *countervalues*.

Kinnear (1995) interviewed women professors who had been working at the University of Manitoba before 1970. She found that they encountered significant informal barriers in terms of hiring and promotion procedures as well as stereotypical attitudes towards women's roles. Unlike the two studies reported above, however, Kinnear's study shows that these women did not employ strategies of resistance nor did they use strategies for advancement such as superperformance or innovation. Instead, they accepted the terms of the university, being fully aware that they were not treated like the men, and they experienced personal suffering by dealing with the unfairness. While on an individual basis the women were aware of their subordination, they lacked the power of collective awareness. Ironically, Kinnear describes the women as superperformers in the way they balanced motherhood and academic work. Kinnear concludes that (p. 52): "The respondents' testimony puts into question the relevance of attributing conscious career management to women who had little direct influence over their career progression." I disagree with this statement for although it may be true that the women in Kinnear's study did not demonstrate collective forms of resistance, nonetheless much of our progress in the area of gender equity in education is due to the efforts of our foremothers.

The Chilly Climate

Another way in which women are marginalized in academe is through what has become commonly known as the *chilly climate* for women in universities, which consists of many micro-inequities. A Canadian study, reported as part of a book edited by the Chilly Collective (1995), points out that the workplace environment constitutes a source of inequity for women academics. Alison Wylie (a member of the Collective) defines the factors that create a chilly climate as “a ‘host of subtle personal and social barriers’ which operate ‘below the level of awareness of both men and women’ or when recognized are perceived as ‘trivial or minor annoyances’, ‘micro-inequities’ whose pervasiveness and cumulative effects are ignored” (1995a: 38). Wylie places these “chilly-making factors” into four categories: *stereotyping, devaluation, exclusion, and revictimization*. First, the message behind *stereotypes* about women’s roles and capabilities is that they are unwanted intruders in academe, that they are still expected to assume the roles of “good” wife and mother. Second, the unsubstantiated notion that women are incapable of high achievement leads to a *devaluation* of their competence, sometimes by superiors, colleagues, and students. Third, as tokens³ women experience *exclusion* from the social networks of their departments, where the men often learn the unwritten rules of career advancement. Fourth, women academics who speak out against such inequities can become the victims of *revictimization*; that is, their credibility can be attacked by university administrators and colleagues. In short, the chilly climate serves to maintain the subordination and marginalization of women academics.

Claire Young and Diana Majury (1995) discuss the climate chills they experience as lesbians in academe. Lesbians are doubly oppressed due to their gender and their sexuality and those who are of minority or disability status experience even greater oppression. Like

other women academics, lesbians also feel the chills of *stereotyping, devaluation, exclusion, and revictimization*. According to Young and Majury (p.353): “Given the marginalization of lesbians and lesbian issues, ...informal anti-lesbian practices and policies tend to be even further ‘below the level of awareness’ and more easily dismissed as trivial and isolated incidents.” They point out that lesbians experience five different forms of institutional chills. First, the presumption of heterosexuality causes university members to ignore lesbian issues. Second, this same presumption forces lesbians to disengage from “social chatter” - they remain silent about their weekend activities. Yet their privacy is subject to gossip or speculation which often occurs behind their backs. Third, there is pressure to conform to typical stereotypes concerning women’s appearance. Fourth, they experience the threat of violence. Fifth, “there is also the construct of the ‘good lesbian/bad lesbian,’ a dichotomy fostered by the institution and having the effect of isolating and discrediting activist lesbians” (p. 356).

Additionally, minority⁴ women academics seem to be particularly vulnerable to harassment from students. For example, Roxana Ng (1993) and Homa Hoodfar (1992), both visible minority women academics (employed at OISE and Concordia University respectively), provide case studies depicting their own experiences with student harassment. Patricia Monture-Okanee, an aboriginal law professor, faces constant harassment from her students. She writes (1995:21):

In every class I have taught over the last five years, there are at least half a dozen students who challenge my authority. The easiest way to alleviate the conflict my presence creates (that is, as Mohawk woman) is to delegitimize me. Coupled with the failure of university structures and procedures to recognize that I am not (as others are not) “any” professor, this delegitimation complicates my experience.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) study the process of socialization for junior faculty and find that US universities do not accommodate diversity, but rather new members are expected to conform to the organizational culture. Using a postmodern framework that stresses the importance of differences among individuals, Tierney and Bensimon suggest that academe should move toward the establishment of “communities of difference” which do “not demand the suppression of one’s identity in order to become socialized to abstract norms” (p. 16). In other words, we must recognize the multiple interpretations or realities of different groups such as women and minorities in order to understand new ways of organizing academia. Under the current structure taken-for-granted practices discourage respect for individual differences.

Moreover, Tierney and Bensimon (1996) find that in order to adapt to a culture dominated by their senior male colleagues, junior women hide their identity by doing “smile work” and “mom work.” “Smile work entails the symbolic management of behavior to present oneself as being pleasing and agreeable” (p. 83). Mom work consists of the “imposition of nurturing and caretaking roles on women” (p. 85). Tierney and Bensimon believe that universities exhibit institutionalized sexism by being indifferent rather than openly hostile to women. They write (p. 96-7):

Even though department chairs, deans, and vice presidents spoke about affirmative action and efforts to recruit women, almost none of these academic leaders stated that the dismantling of institutionalized forms of sexism was one of their priorities. The reason was not that they did not care, rather the state of ‘communal unconscious’ that develops from the internalization of the ‘invisible paradigms’ that structure the culture of the academy and the disciplines prevents senior faculty and administrators from seeing how their very practices might create and reproduce institutionalized forms of sexism. In other words, it is possible for academics leader to target recruitment efforts toward women and minorities without giving much thought to transforming male-identified departmental cultures. The meritocratic discourse of promotion and tenure is effective camouflage for the gendered aspects of seemingly neutral practices. As a consequence, individuals in positions of authority,

power, and influence construe affirmative action as a matter of 'adding women' to a presumably gender-neutral structure. Just as feminist scholars have pointed out that making the curriculum more inclusive is not simply a matter of adding women to syllabi but rather demands the 'deconstruction and reconstruction' of the disciplines in order to be truly transformative, the same can be said about the integration of women into the professoriate.

Indeed, the chilly climate can be devastating to the emotional well-being and physical health of women academics. These women may experience "anger, anxiety, self-doubt, and loss of confidence" and some even leave their place of employment (Backhouse et al. 1995: 129). They may also experience a lack of motivation and a fear of working late because of the threat of sexual assault (Dagg and Thompson 1988; Caplan 1993). Their physical health can also be affected, in that they may suffer headaches and/or insomnia (Paludi and Dedour 1989). The chilly climate disempowers women academics because their authority is constantly being challenged. Overall, it reinforces the status quo and maintains the subordination and marginalization of women academics.

Workload

The existing structure of university life appears to require that women carry a larger workload than men, which can be explained by a number of interrelated factors. The low representation of women academics makes what they have to offer, in terms of research interest and quality of help, in great demand by the relatively large female student population. Women, especially in the early stages of their careers, tend to teach more courses than men. As tokens, women academics (especially those in senior positions) are required to be on numerous committees in order to represent the interest of women, which may not be in their own best interest due to the time demands of various tasks such as teaching, committee work, and research.

The President's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women, University of Saskatchewan (1995: 180), cites the following respondent with regard to the workload of women academics:

The relative high visibility of women at the University serves the University very well. The names and faces of women involved in university work, disproportionate to their numbers, help to spare the University the embarrassment of hiring so few women. By doing double duty, the women permit the university community to imagine the presence of women faculty at two, three or four times their actual numbers.

The Task Force on Resource Allocation (1994: 28) reports that academics in Ontario universities work "between 50-60 hours per week during the teaching term.... [and] teach between two and three courses per term." These working hours are typical for academics in other North American universities. During the academic term professors allocate 49% of the time to teaching, 26% to research, 14% to administration, and 11% to community service. The task force finds that not only do women tend to spend more time on teaching and service related duties, but they also spend less time on research. For example, women academics on average spend "about 7 percent [2.8 hours] more per week on teaching than men and about the same amount less on research. In general, the differences in time allocated to teaching, research, and administration across tenure status, rank, gender, and discipline are not large" (p.18). Nonetheless the Task Force concludes that these figures show that teaching and administrative duties take time away from research; that is, as women devote more time to teaching and service they devote less time to research.

Moreover, women academics in temporary teaching positions have little access to the tenure track because they are not provided with the resources to conduct research adequately (grant/travel funds, research leave time) and they carry heavier teaching loads. For example, at one Canadian university limited term appointments are held disproportionately by women

according to Constance Backhouse, Roma Harris, Gillian Mitchell, and Alison Wylie (1995: 103-4) who write:

One respondent was a woman who held a term position for five years (before moving out of the province to take a tenure-track job). She described the situation as one where three-quarters of the permanent faculty were men, but women made up a much higher proportion than this among the term appointments. She clearly perceived an emerging caste system with an obviously gendered dimension. In her department this was coupled with a range of exclusionary and discriminatory practices. Since term appointees were seen as 'just passing through,' little effort was made to involve them in the life of the department. They frequently arrived to find a heavier teaching load than they had been promised, and collectively they carried a much higher proportion of students than permanent faculty did.

Part-time faculty members at the University of Western Ontario are also mostly women (Backhouse et al.). Their salary reflects the number of courses they teach and is much lower than that paid to full-time faculty. Many departments at Western cannot function without part-timers because they carry such a large teaching load.

Excellence in teaching, teaching experience, student-advising, and committee work are not recognized in promotion decisions to the extent that productivity counts. According to the Committee on the Status of Women (1988: 106):

Women may be more often assigned to undergraduate teaching, which is less likely to generate research; teaching experience may not be given due weight, compared with publication, in promotion decisions; women faculty may perhaps be asked and expected to work on maintaining the university by serving on committees rather than focusing on the development of their careers by attending conferences, publishing, networking and so forth.

Advising and mentoring students is an important function which women faculty are more likely than their male counterparts to perform (Hall and Sanders 1983; Menges and Exum 1983; Acker and Feuerwerker 1996, 1997). Since the female graduate and undergraduate student population significantly exceeds that of female professors, to the extent that women students seek women advisors, women professors must do more than their fair share of

mentoring duties. Again this heavier workload takes time away from performing research. There is no official recognition, however, of faculty time invested in mentoring students. Kathleen Day Hulbert (1994) suggests that the empowerment of students through mentoring/advising should be a primary mission of faculty members, one which should be given its due credit.

It is important to note that, as tokens, minority faculty (both women and men) experience a hidden workload consisting of a disproportionately heavy load of advising responsibilities and committee work to satisfy a commitment to their cultural group and the demands of ethnic representation. This hidden workload remains unrewarded and has also been referred to as “cultural taxation” (Padilla 1994). Below Tierney and Bensimon (1996: 117) write about the experiences of a black male junior professor:

A less-talked-about form of cultural taxation has to do with the commodification of race or ethnicity to make an institution look good. An administrator said, ‘We got one,’ in reference to an African American. ‘He has social skills that most other people don’t ... he is very charismatic and very photogenic ... every time there is an activity, it’s so nice to have him out there in front ... and he gets asked all the time ... He loves that kind of stuff.’ Even so there is a concern that despite his being ‘enormously popular with students’ and ‘actively involved in service,’ this assistant professor needs to give more attention to research and scholarship and concentrate on publications.

Patricia A. Monture-Okanee (1995: 19) describes this excessive workload from her point of view as an Aboriginal law professor: “professors with experiences of ‘other’ are in great demand within the student body, on the conference circuit, and on committees within the school.” Moreover, minority faculty members may take on extra service work to join informal networks that help alleviate their feelings of loneliness and exclusion (Tierney and Bensimon). However, if universities in general and academic departments more specifically

established an ethos of inclusiveness, minorities would be less likely to feel as though they were excluded from informal networks and therefore missing out on information.

Although the problem of excessive workload for women/minority academics can only truly be resolved if more women and minorities are hired and promoted, a more immediate solution would be to place a greater value on teaching and service in the tenure and promotion process. Sandra Acker and Grace Feuerverger (1997) find that women academics are being good department citizens, yet they believe that their work remains unnoticed and unrewarded. They interviewed Canadian women associate and full professors and write (p. 135):

We might have expected these academically successful women, if comparing their lot to women in general, to feel exceptionally privileged. What seems to happen instead is that the women more often compare themselves to male colleagues. Their sense of injustice comes from this comparison. The argument in this chapter has been that the women feel they do a disproportionate share of the caring and service work required to keep their departments functioning and their students happy. Yet institutional practices do not give credit for alternative ways of being an academic.

I believe that it may be possible to condense all of the inequities (rules of the game, chilly climate, and workload) discussed in this section within the single category of an insensitive (gendered, racist, classist) workplace environment for women academics. Sandra Acker, Amy Sullivan, and Margaret Kamau (1996) argue that the scope of the chilly climate is too narrow because some of the issues that the women in their study highlighted did not fit comfortably into any of the four categories used by Wylie (1995): stereotypes, devaluation, isolation, revictimization. They suggest that the scope of the chilly climate be expanded to include concerns about overwork, health, and inequities in the tenure and promotion system. With respect to workload, they write (p. 21):

[T]here is in our study a persistent concern with the gendered division of labour in the university, with women at least believing that they are doing more work overall

and more of specific types of work such as looking after students and service roles in the department. This work is often "chosen," given women's traditional commitments to caring and organizing, yet it becomes an extra layer of work which is resented.

In my view, including more issues under the auspices of a gendered, racist, classist workplace environment would enhance the visibility of some of the inequities discussed earlier. For example, this category could be further expanded to incorporate some of the findings on academic rules and games that hinder career advancement for women. Indeed, issues that are important for women but remain invisible, such as childbearing and childrearing, should also be considered a part of the insensitive environment for women in universities. Many of these issues, surrounding academic work and family life, require further research to remedy in large part the omission of the voices and experiences of minority women academics.

There are deeply embedded assumptions in the academic environment about female and male attitudes, behaviors, likes and dislikes, roles, and expectations. These assumptions are further extended to incorporate the race and class status of women and men. However, these deceptive notions tend to be largely unintentional (socialized, sometimes even patronizing) implying an insensitive environment, rather than being intentional injustices which would seem to constitute a hostile or chilly environment.

Resistance and Change

In the previous section we saw that according to Glazer and Slater (1987) pioneer women faculty used numerous strategies for change, including superperformance, subordination, innovation, and separatism. More recently, the Aisenberg and Harrington (1988) approach suggests that women academics use resistance and creativity by employing countervalues

against old norms and rules of the game. Numerous other studies demonstrate that women in the academy strive to improve their situation. Louise Morley and Val Walsh (1995: 1) explain the notion of change accompanying feminist academic work as follows: “Feminisms are located as creative energy for change and critique, empowering women to apply political understanding to methodologies for teaching, learning, research and writing in the academy.” They suggest that the feminist analysis of academic politics concerning issues of power, pedagogy, curriculum, discourses, policies, and relationships, “creates a framework for deprivatizing women’s experiences and influencing change.” Feminist scholars have demonstrated how gender inequality invades individual frameworks, policies, organizations, and the production of knowledge. They have highlighted how oppression in the private sphere is reproduced in the public sphere. They have demonstrated the problematic nature of a discourse of equal opportunity without equal outcomes. For a transition to a state of equality to occur we must begin with a better understanding of the connections between gender, power, and knowledge. Feminist academics are innovative in that their project involves both politics and a sense of caring — making them *creative agents for change*. Morley and Walsh (p. 2) elaborate:

In a culture where emotional literacy is discursively located in opposition to reason, feminist academics frequently have to repress pain and anger, and hide the contradictions and tensions that arise from being members of subordinate groups in powerful institutions. Discrimination in the academy can reinforce and restimulate women’s wider experiences of sexist oppression. Feminist consciousness can act simultaneously to sensitize and heal. In postmodernist thought, power can be both oppressive and generative. The creativity comes when one recognizes that this hurt can be transformed into knowledge, action, analysis and energy for change.

Ironically, feminists in the academy can become more vulnerable by focusing on their gender while virtually simultaneously strengthening their position by joining a movement for change. How can oppression and discrimination lead to creative and political energy rather

than depression and despair? Several scholars have tackled this question. Barbara Brown Packer (1995) notes that for women in the US academy, the pursuit of women's issues can lead to opposition from department members. In spite of this opposition she finds that in any given department the women academics with beliefs in women's issues maintained those interests, thereby acting as agents for change. Packer (p. 54) explains:

Many women professors told stories about how their involvement in women's issues had adversely affected their career advancement. But those who became interested had remained involved nonetheless. In the perception of the women faculty I interviewed, male senior faculty resist the entrance and progress of women professors within the research university. Those senior women professors who were tokens in the natural sciences joined the male faculty through their silent acceptance of the status quo.

Celia Davies and Penny Holloway (1995) argue that the equal opportunities campaign, the increase in numbers of feminist academics, and the institutionalization of women's studies are powerful ingredients that help transform the culture in academe. These avenues of resistance and change are important not solely for the purpose of increasing the number of women academics (undoubtedly a critical matter) but also to raise awareness about the nature and depth of inequality that women encounter and thereby erasing myths that universities, with the allowance for flexible work hours, are kind to women. Insofar as there are a growing number of women in powerful positions in universities, and insofar as new feminist scholarship is empowering, and insofar as students provide positive feedback toward women professors, opportunities for change are present, constant, and rejuvenated.

Avril Butler and Mel Landells (1995) discuss how research on the sexual harassment of women academics acts as a form of resistance. Most obviously, the research reveals the extent of harassment which this group of women suffers and permits the establishment of recommendations directed toward policy-makers. The questionnaires they used allowed the

women to voice their experiences in an anonymous way, without fear of retribution. And the women were able to participate in a support group on a voluntary basis. The authors identified themselves as researchers with an interest in sexual harassment which enabled individuals to approach them for advice on related issues. The research was presented, published, and made accessible to women in universities. Below Butler and Landells (p. 166) elaborate further on the potential benefits of their research.

The descriptions of harassment we have recounted will, we hope, contribute to the growing body of women's voices speaking out about harassment ... and encourage us to be brave enough to take offense. As our research has been supported by our employing institution, the process of producing both the report and the working paper has meant that a range of senior men, and some women, have read our work prior to publication, thus placing the issues on the agenda in our own institution.

Black feminists, lesbian feminists, and disabled feminists have pointed out the importance of including and supporting diversity in feminist research, teaching, and relationships (Collins 1991; Matthews 1994; Young and Majury 1995; Randell and Verdun 1997). They have also written about the racism, homophobia, and ablebodiedism which they have experienced, including at the hands of women academics. By understanding their experiences, "women can take pleasure in the knowledge that working together to transform traditional ways of teaching and learning, evaluation and assessment, and knowledge production, creates an excitement which sustains hope, energy and affection even inside academia" (Walsh, p.96).

bell hooks (1989: 5) suggests that as she grew-up: "'Back talk' or 'talking back' meant speaking as an equal to an authority figure" by disagreeing or having an opinion. As part of the demands of femininity, some girls give up back talk during adolescence. And some of these women find their voices in later years (Walsh 1995). Feminist academics tend not only

to talk back but also to encourage their students to talk back as part of the learning process which emphasizes critical thinking in the struggle to stop domination.

Patricia J. Gumpert (1990) discusses the struggle of feminist scholars to gain recognition. She calls the early second wave feminist scholars “the pathfinders” – those who began graduate schools between the years 1964 and 1972. She concludes that these feminist scholars not only constructed a “new area of knowledge,” but they also “tried to gain control over the criteria and means with which to evaluate their own intellectual products” (p. 433). Criteria for evaluating scholarship are socially defined by experts with authority in the academic community. To gain tenure and promotion for innovative scholarship, these women had to show that their work was “relevant yet unique.” More recently, Gumpert believes, the struggle has shifted from the inclusion of feminist work in academic programs to “influencing such contested academic terrains as faculty hiring and promotion, peer review of publications and grants, and doctoral students’ research training and dissertation advising” (p. 434). Some of these terrains comprise the topic of the following section.

Caring and Reward Systems

To begin this section I would like to return to a few important points discussed earlier in the chapter. That is, numbers show that many women in academia are located in the less prestigious, low paying positions such as those of non-tenure track junior faculty and adjunct instructors. The view presented in the preceding literature demonstrates that sexism embedded in the norms, policies, and structures of the university serves to disadvantage women faculty relative to men. Some organizational theorists have likened the gendered division of labor in the university workplace to that of the home (Calas and Smircich 1993;

Johnsrud and Heck 1994; Park 1996) and other organizations (Kanter 1977). “Men’s work” is thought to be more difficult and complex than “woman’s work” (Kanter). In universities women tend to do more of the work associated with caring for others, whereas men tend to do more of the intellectually oriented research and publication work.

Arguing Academic Merits

The three criteria (research, teaching, and service) used to evaluate academics for tenure and promotion are not weighted equally. Research publications are the most important factor in decisions for tenure and promotion (Kasten 1984; Carnegie Foundation 1989; Boyer 1990; Daly 1994; Verrier 1994), especially in research-oriented universities. Shelley M. Park (1996) argues that this rank ordering of faculty activities provides a foundation for institutionalized sexism by establishing gender roles and gender hierarchies. As she puts it: “A gendered division of labor exists within (as in outside) the academy wherein research is implicitly deemed ‘men’s work’ and explicitly valued, whereas teaching and service are characterized as ‘women’s work’ and explicitly devalued” (p. 17). She further notes that there are two lines of arguments which serve to maintain the prestige of research activities. The first argument is that “everyone teaches and serves”; thus, publication productivity is the only factor which distinguishes academics who are considered equal in other areas. This assumption ignores the fact that (in US universities) relative to men, women faculty teach more courses or spend more hours each week in the classroom (Austin and Snyder 1982; Menges and Exum 1983; Boyer 1990; Sandler 1993). Likewise, service activities differ according to gender. Women faculty serve on more committees to satisfy the criteria for a female representative imposed by equity policies (Menges and Exum 1983; Sandler 1993).

Hence, by saying that “everyone teaches and serves,” we tend to conceal the sexism inherent in tenure and promotion policies. Park writes (pp. 51-2):

In treating teaching and service as undifferentiated activities, the argument for prioritizing research utilizes a technique commonly used to devalue women’s work and, thus, rationalize the unpaid or underpaid status of that work. It assumes that there is no difference between good and bad teaching (and service) or, that if there is, this difference is unaccounted for by levels of skill, because these are activities that are ‘instinctual’ or ‘natural’ for those who perform them. ... The notion that anyone can teach well, like the notion that anyone can parent (or more specifically mother) well, assumes that these activities are uncreative, unchallenging, and unskilled. Similarly, the notion that anyone can perform service activities well, like the notion that anyone can be a good housekeeper or waitress, assumes that such activities are unskilled and require little thought or effort.

According to Park the second argument raised against increasing the prestige associated with teaching and service is that these areas are difficult to evaluate. However, she points out that the tenure and promotion committee can look at quality and quantity of teaching and service in a number of ways, such as considering the number of courses prepared and taught, time spent advising students, quantity of new courses developed, student theses, number and time in administrative positions, number of committees, and so forth. The difficulty with this argument is that trying to quantify this information plays into the performance-indicator, surveillance oriented university and its numerous problems for it turns universities into overly demanding workplaces (see Schmidt 1999).

Caring as Women’s Work

Sandra Acker (1999: 277) finds that women academics typically follow a “‘caring script,’ a set of expectations that mimics women’s traditional work in the home.” Caring for others inevitably produces a larger workload. The women in her study, who are members of faculties of education, report that they are working hard, supporting others, and being good

department citizens. Yet they believe that they are being taken-for-granted by their students and working too hard for too few rewards. In other words, Acker suggests that they are “doing good and feeling bad” (see also Acker and Feuerverger 1996, 1997). She concludes that the women’s awareness of the contradictory nature of caring ultimately instills a sense of feeling bad not about the work which they are doing but rather about the lack of reciprocated appreciation.

[T]he women academics cannot help but know that they are in a man’s world. When they look around for an apt group with which to compare their situations, they see the men in their own faculties. When they see these men apparently contributing much less to the smooth running of the department and the nurturing of the students, yet more readily receiving rewards such as promotions and high salaries, they react unfavourably. (Acker 1999: 291)

One of the reasons that some women place a greater focus on teaching and advising is because of their interest in redressing inequities in traditional curricula which have made women’s perspectives invisible. In addition to content, the style of traditional pedagogy can also exclude women. Mary Field Belenky, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Mattuck Tarule (1986) have suggested that women’s ways of knowing can be suppressed by traditional teaching techniques such as lectures which allow the students little access to the process of how knowledge is created. In traditional lecture formats the professor assumes a position of supreme authority, and her words are accepted at face value as the truth. This technique silences women in the sense that they are treated as inactive receptacles of the teacher’s knowledge. Insofar as generations of men have informed women that they have lesser powers of rationality than males, “a woman needs to know ... that her own ideas ... are ‘very good’ ... that a theory is ‘something that someone has thought up’” (p. 215). Belenky et al. elaborate:

So long as teachers hide the imperfect processes of their thinking, allowing their students to glimpse only the polished products, students will remain convinced that only Einstein – or a professor – could think up a theory. (p. 215)

Women seem to prefer a pedagogy that focuses on “connection over separation, understanding and acceptance over assessment, and collaboration over debate” (p.229).

Some women faculty are working to change pedagogical techniques by cooperative learning as in class discussions, group work, field work, student presentations and so forth. Women may also feel a special responsibility toward their students thus placing a greater priority on counseling them. Insofar as there are small numbers of women faculty relative to numbers of students, this sense of responsibility may cause time and role conflicts which cannot be easily rationalized or resolved by prioritizing research and neglecting the needs of the students.

Women academics may feel that their students’ needs deserve priority and that the time they spend teaching is important. According to Carol Gilligan (1982, 1993), women more often reason in terms of an *ethics of care*, while men tend to follow an *ethics of justice*.⁵ Women are socialized to interpret morality in the sense of one’s responsibilities toward others, whereas men are taught to use a rational hierarchy when making moral decisions. Women academics may feel a sense of compassion and responsibility toward their female colleagues, students, and women outside academia (Bannerji 1992; Rich 1993). Mentoring untenured female faculty and advising female students are tasks of great value to women academics insofar as they help to bring more women into the academy and begin to challenge the dominant male perspective. Thus teaching and service constitute important activities for the personal, collective, and intellectual advancement of women in the profession.

The chilly climate, as noted earlier, provides a significant barrier to the success of female academics (Wunsch and Johnsrud 1992). They often report social and intellectual isolation

as sources of stress. The focus on publication productivity has been specifically associated with women's social and intellectual isolation, which seems to be experienced more profoundly by minority women in the academy and acts as a detriment to their career progression (Andrews 1993).

Teaching and service appear to be important activities for women's individual growth and collective advancement. Advising activities provide meaning to their work by giving them a sense of human connection and relationship. Committee and community work also help women establish contact with others, thus serving to ease feelings of social isolation. Thus, to assume that research is more important than teaching or service is problematic insofar as the survival of the academy depends on people teaching and advising students, as well as administering daily affairs and establishing connections with the community.

The Politics of Equity and Efficiency

The restructuring of higher education institutions is occurring in countries around the world. Universities are increasingly focusing on economic issues so that phrases such as universities with a business agenda, corporate universities, "academic capitalism" (Slaughter and Leslie 1997), and the privatization of education (Marginson 1997) have become common descriptors of these new universities.⁶ With all this talk of efficiency, does equity get lost in the shuffle or upheaval? How will the current emphasis on efficiency impact on equity issues and the work of women academics? We can only speculate as to the influence on Canadian universities by looking at events in other countries, since Canada is only now beginning to head in the direction of prioritizing efficiency and accountability in education. Changes are occurring in university structure, academic work, student profile, and most

importantly management practices. In these new-style universities certain types of masculine practices are valued: for instance, leaders are rewarded for tough approaches such as budget cuts and reducing staff, and issues of social justice become less important (Wyn, Acker, and Richards 1999).

Measures of control and accountability in academic work have led to the establishment of standards of performance. Peter Schmidt (1999) describes how universities in South Carolina are changing in that they are becoming efficiency oriented. In 1996 the state issued a policy known as “performance funding,” which links a portion of its financial support for universities to their success in meeting various criteria. Schmidt elaborates (p.3):

Among other things, the law sought to gauge instructional and faculty quality; graduation rates; post-graduation employment rates; administrative efficiency; accessibility; entrance standards; links to business. and , where applicable, outside support for teacher education or research. ... No longer would public colleges receive subsidies based on enrollment, as is the case in most states. Instead, they would have either to prove themselves or to risk being starved of state funds, the bill's sponsors declared.

Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie (1997) indicate that Canadian universities have not undergone significant changes which is partly explained by the fact the higher education is governed by the provinces with little federal government intervention. Nonetheless there is evidence that Canadian universities are beginning to accept the notion of “academic capitalism.” Indications of this phenomenon include: a large increase in student population, a reduction in funding, greater faculty workloads, and low salary increases. Johanna Wyn, Sandra Acker, and Elisabeth Richards (1999) note that:

In general, provincial governments have tolerated a high level of institutional autonomy and while programs are periodically reviewed by various regulatory bodies, there is nothing equivalent to the hard edged external reviews of academic performance found in Britain and Australia. (pp. 6-7)

The universities of the 1970s and 1980s advocated equal opportunity policies which sought to assimilate women and minorities into the university culture (Abella 1984). One example is Canada's employment equity policy of 1986 which was designed to abolish discriminatory employment policies and practices, and thereby increase the level of representation in the workplace of four traditionally disadvantaged groups: women, visible minorities, aboriginal peoples, and persons with disabilities. While these policies tended to point out deficiencies in the candidates rather than structural inequities (Blackmore 1997), at least there was some awareness of equity issues and a willingness to address inequities. In other words, rather than seeking to alter the structure of the university to accommodate faculty members of different sexes and various races and classes, potential candidates were expected to conform to pre-established formal and informal standards. Hence, over the years employment, tenure, and promotion requirements did not change in any significant sense and the informal networks known as the "old boys' club" continued to influence university procedures. Writing of recent times in Australian universities by Jill Blackmore (1997: 75) asserts that "the discourses of efficiency and effectiveness shaping the radical restructuring of higher education in Australia since 1987 have silenced earlier discourses of equity." She describes the notion of how gender equity is not affordable during hard economic times in the following way. "The gender-equity-is-a-luxury discourse maintains that, in a period of radical economic restructuring, issues of equity must be judged in terms of increased output rather than in terms of social justice" (p. 85). Women academics are beginning to find their place in the universities of the future. Johanna Wyn and Sandra Acker (1999: 13) examine the experiences of women in leadership positions in universities and argue that to meet the

demands of the “new” university “there is a need to develop a new understanding of the role of women in leadership” — one which recognizes the politics of difference.

Conclusion

In the groves of academe, despite the impact of the women’s movement and feminist scholars, most of the faculty members are still male, even though half or more of the students now are women. Notwithstanding the low representation of women faculty, some positive changes have occurred in their career paths. In recent years, women are climbing the academic ladder at a pace similar to that of their male colleagues. Women entering academia are finding more favorable hiring practices and pay structures, as well as a growing group of female colleagues.

Even with the increasing number of women academics, the structure of the university has not been altered to accommodate their life style; rather, women have been assimilated into a pre-existing university life. Many women no longer abandon their careers after childbirth, choosing instead to make speedy returns to their work and trying to give the impression that their life as a mother has not changed their work in any significant way. In a sense, women professors must behave like men by conforming to the expectations of the university which assume that family commitments and biological differences should remain separate from academic careers. Cooperation with established norms seems to be a prerequisite for obtaining equality in career opportunities.

In addition, women academics face marginalization on a daily basis. They encounter the forces of the old norms which act as constant reminders that women’s traditional work is relegated to the private sphere. Instead of accepting the old norms and staying home they

believe in the ideology of merit, only to find that in the university this ideology operates as a double standard in favor of men. As outsiders looking into the “old boys’ club,” they have limited access to the “rules of the game,” intensifying the difficulties of career advancement. As if these rules and games were not enough to complicate their lives, women often encounter a chilly climate in the halls of academe, which forces them to them to deal with gender stereotypes, devaluation of their work, exclusion from social networks in the department, and various forms of victimization if they choose to speak out against such inequities. Lesbian and minority women academics have indicated that they experience even greater oppression as a result of their sexuality and race or ethnicity, respectively. Further compounding the problems of rules, games, and the chilly climate is the larger workload that women academics often have (in the form of advising/supervising students, committee work, and so on) partly as a consequence of their relatively low numbers in the profession, and partly because of traditional expectations held by themselves and others.

To improve their situation, women academics act as “agents of change” by using a number of strategies. They continue to tackle issues of sexual harassment even though policies are in place. Those policies and practices are only somewhat successful and the matter requires constant attention to ensure that women are treated fairly. Feminist scholars use the power of publications to bring to life women’s oppression and gender inequality. Despite some resistance to women’s issues in some departments, feminist academics create their own form of resistance by continuing to maintain their beliefs and by conducting research to benefit women. Indeed by questioning issues of access, promotion, and knowledge women can become empowered in their own right — not just in terms of numbers and positions but also in the sense of constructing alternative frameworks of critical thinking

which do not rely on taken for granted assumptions of male domination. In the workplace, pioneer women faculty used various strategies for change such as superperformance, subordination, innovation, and separatism. More recently, women academics have employed countervalues against old norms and rules of the game. All of these developments create greater visibility for women academics and their issues. In short, women academics act as agents of change by using both individual and collective strategies to challenge the dominant construction of knowledge, norms, policies, and practices in the university.

One area which has received attention by feminist scholars in recent years is the faculty evaluation system, which is thought to undervalue teaching and service and overvalue publication productivity. These scholars argue that in effect women have been blamed for their uncomfortable place in the academy. They have been advised to focus on their research and reduce the time they spend on teaching and service. The assumption is that individual women who want to improve their situation can do so. This way of thinking obscures the structural inequities or more specifically the gendered division of labor which supports the current structure of universities. That perspective also assumes that the work that women do is not very important. "Women's work" includes childrearing (like teaching and advising), housekeeping (university service) and volunteer work (community service). Some women scholars suggest that teaching and service should be viewed as important activities for building the university's reputation for integrity and mutual caring among the students, members, and local community. I agree with Acker (1999) that caring is a noteworthy aspect of academic work and should be rewarded.

As actors in a changing academic labor market, women faculty are faced with the challenge of advocating equity over efficiency. There are many unknowns about what will

happen to women's issues in these universities of the new century, for the Australian experience shows us that equity and efficiency are not the most compatible terms.

There are several gaps in the literature which my study attempts to address. First, my work complements and expands the literature concerning childbearing and childrearing issues for women academics by examining such questions as: How do women academics plan and manage both childbearing and childrearing? How do the practices and the culture in the academy help or hinder the women's efforts to plan and manage childbearing and childrearing? Second, I explore the extent to which women understand their career experiences in terms of race and class privilege or disadvantage. Third, while much of the current literature focuses on the inequities that women face in academe, I include women's perceptions of the positive as well as the negative aspects of their careers and experiences. Fourth, I briefly address women's experiences according to academic field and rank. Finally, my research contributes to the notion that caring is important form of labor and should be recognized in academic reward systems.

Endnotes

- 1 In defining the contemporary family The Vanier Institute of the Family (1994:2) recognizes “diversity” such as married, common-law and same-sex couples. The children can be biological, adopted, or from a previous adult relationship. The definition also includes commuting couples and single-parent families. The literature on women academics, however, does not address same-sex couples or single-parent families and partner is often identified as the spouse.
- 2 The bulk of household labour is still performed by women. Statistics Canada (1994:66) divides household tasks into four categories, *meal preparation, meal clean-up, cleaning and laundry, maintenance and outside work*, and surveys women and men by their level of education to determine what percentage is shared equally. For the majority of couples household duties are not equally shared; women are responsible for the first three categories of tasks and men are responsible for the last task category. Findings show that in terms of meal preparation, for example, 10 percent of the women with a *university degree* report that they share this task equally with their partner, compared with 9 percent of the women with a *postsecondary diploma*, 8 percent of the women with *some postsecondary education*, 9 percent of the women with a *high school diploma* and 5 percent of the women with *less than high school* (p.76). The figures for the men are quite similar. Thus the level of education has a minor effect on the sharing of household tasks between the sexes.
- 3 According to Kanter (1977) tokens are individuals who comprise less than 15% of a group.
- 4 I use the term minority to refer to non-white, cultural and/or racial minority women academics.
- 5 See the critique of Gilligan in Chapter One.
- 6 It is important to note that in the US many states have passed anti-affirmative action referenda.

Chapter Three

Methodology:

Theorizing, Designing, and Conducting the Study

Introduction

Doing research *for* women and not only about women captures the intent of feminist research — one that is realized by a commitment to social justice for women. Many definitions of feminism exist, both broad and narrow, but a common motive guides this research which involves a critique of androcentric thinking and structures that continue to oppress women socially and psychologically. This is research, therefore, which ultimately aims for social change. bell hooks (1983) notes that feminism is not based on the notion that women share similar experiences of patriarchal oppression, for women's experiences differ according to race, culture, and class. Instead, feminism unites women under the umbrella of resistance to various forms of male domination.

I separate this chapter into four major sections and begin by exploring the initial research processes, including the pilot study, selection of participants, and the use of electronic mail for inviting participation. The second section presents the theoretical framework in feminist

methodology, stages in the interview procedure, and the rationale for using feminist interviewing as the main method of inquiry. Section three highlights my role as a researcher, as well as my learning experience while conversing with the women, interpreting their words, and telling their story. I conclude by discussing the controversial issue of whether a criterion of validity is applicable in feminist qualitative research.

Beginning the Journey

The initial stage in my research endeavor consisted of conducting a pilot study with three women academics. That work led to an invitation for other women academics to participate in a larger scale and more focused study about their career and family lives.

The Pilot Study

My pilot study consisted of two-hour interviews and two-hour observation sessions with each of three participants. Valerie Janesick (1994: 213) notes that “the pilot study allows the researcher to focus on particular areas that may have been unclear previously.” Additionally, this early study permitted me, the novice interviewer, to gain experience and confidence in an otherwise unfamiliar situation. The benefits of a pilot study cannot be overstated for it allowed me to test my questions, uncover new issues based on the interviewees’ comments, and judge the best use of time.

While my questions during these early interviews were broad and exploratory, covering aspects of the women’s public and private lives, the women provided interesting responses about the relationship between their work and personal lives. The major findings from this study were that the women chose not to have children, they had difficulty finding

relationships, and they encountered workload and time related problems when managing work and family responsibilities. Through that work I discovered areas that remained unexplored in the literature on career and family issues concerning women in academe. The literature suggested that for women academics, family commitments may have a detrimental effect on their ability to conduct research and produce publications (Simeone 1987; Backhouse et al. 1989; Caplan 1993). The women in my study limited their family commitments in order to achieve career success only to encounter another obstacle in their path, that of excessive workload relative to their male colleagues. The excessive workloads that these women reported appeared to be largely a product of a system which still treated the sexes on an unequal basis. At the time (1995) the literature only briefly addressed the subject of inequity in workload, although more recently a number of studies can be found that focus on this issue (Acker and Feuerverger 1996; 1997).

The women reported that the excessive workload affected the choices they made regarding family life. To be successful the women decided either to remain childless or to have only one child, and either to remain single or to pursue non-traditional relationships such as a commuting marriage. By making these choices they were able to manage both work and family. Clearly the women were enthusiastic in speaking about both their work and family lives which led me to focus more questions in the larger study on issues of family, tenure and promotion, and workload. These were areas that I wanted to explore because of the possibility that I might one day become an academic and have children early on in my career as well as because of their scholarly significance.

Additionally, to help formulate the interview questions for my larger scale study, I used a combination of revised pilot study questions and questions from the SSHRC research project

“Making a Difference” (Acker et al. 1996-98). That project has some similarities to this one in the sense of studying academics (albeit not all women) and the various inequities which they face. I also found the SSHRC project proposal useful in terms of writing my own research proposal, and I have cited a number of the subsequently published articles in this work. Finally, I adapted the “Making a Difference” letter of consent and brief questionnaire for use in this research.

Through the pilot study I learned to appreciate academic women’s extremely busy work schedules. My participant observations of these three women occurred during daytime hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.) at the university in question. During these sessions I observed the women at work in their offices as well as in their interactions with colleagues and students, and I attended committee meetings. The schedules of all three women academics revealed that work days are long (the women work both at the office and at home), and weekend work is inevitable.

From the very beginning of these observation sessions I came to realize that the women felt uncomfortable in their role as objects of my observations. While the women were enthusiastic about the interviews, they were reluctant to participate in observation sessions due to time constraints and the lack of privacy that these sessions entailed. As well, the observations did not produce the kind of useful information that was acquired during the interviews. Consequently, I decided not to use participant observation as a technique in my large scale study.

An Invitation to Participate

Women academics were asked to volunteer to participate in the main study. The criteria for selection were that the women be in the ranks of assistant, associate and full professor within a variety of faculties at one university, namely the Arts, Social Sciences, Sciences, and Professional Schools. The study was designed to include a roughly equal number of women in each rank and faculty, with the exception of the rank of full professor where very few women can be found and this fact was taken into consideration. My intent was to ensure that comparisons could be made among ranks and faculties.

I requested participation from women academics via electronic mail, in May, 1996. The invitations¹ to participate were forwarded using this medium because I anticipated that it would be the fastest and most efficient means of contacting busy women. I indicated in the invitation that I would be conducting the interviews in the month of June. Electronic mail addresses were located in the university directory and sometimes a telephone call to a department secretary was necessary in order to acquire these addresses. The rank of the faculty members was not listed in the university directory and determining rank also required a telephone inquiry. Since there were very few women in each faculty, all of the 67 women who matched my research criteria were contacted. From this group 48 responded of which 22 agreed and the rest declined to participate. Of those 22, two were in sessional positions and hence they were excluded, and another did not show up for the interview nor did she reschedule. Thus a total of 19 women academics participated in this study.

The responses to my invitation to participate reveal a number of characteristics about the participants. First, some women academics may have chosen not to have children but that was not the case for the women in this study. Since I indicated in my letter of invitation that

one of the issues that I was interested in exploring was the “connection between family and careers” many of the respondents either had children or were planning to have children. Of the eight assistant professors in the study, five had children — more specifically two older women had adult children and three younger women had infants and preschool children — and the three other women were young academics who were planning to have children in the future. The seven associate professors all had children. Only two of these women had adult children while the others had young children mostly of school age. Of the four full professors one had both adult and young children, another had only adult children, yet another had only a young child, and one had no children. Second, there was at least one representative from each rank in each of the four faculties of Arts, Social Sciences, Sciences, and Professional Schools. I have generalized the faculty names and grouped the women accordingly, rather than necessarily using the specific titles in the calendar of the university in question to help maintain confidentiality for the participants. Third, the women range in ages from 30 to 60, making it possible to draw comparisons across generations. Finally, all of the women with children were either married, divorced, or married a second time; one woman without children was also married; and three women were single (see the Profile of the Participants below).

Profile of the Participants

	rank	faculty	age range
Nancy	assistant	Arts	30s
Carol	assistant	Arts	30s
Patricia	assistant	Social Sciences	30s
Vanessa	assistant	Social Sciences	40s
Cynthia	assistant	Sciences	30s
Rachel	assistant	Sciences	30s
Martha	assistant	Professional	30s
Audrey	assistant	Professional	50s
Ellen	associate	Arts	50s
Natalie	associate	Arts	40s
Vivian	associate	Social Sciences	40s
Madeleine	associate	Sciences	50s
Janice	associate	Sciences	40s
Bridget	associate	Professional	30s
Pamela	associate	Professional	60s
Megan	full	Arts	40s
Paula	full	Social Sciences	40s
Lauren	full	Sciences	40s
Irene	full	Professional	50s

Moreover, the responses to my invitation to participate serve to illustrate that academe is organized in such a way that until recently the few women who entered the profession tended not to be of racial minorities. Only one young, assistant professor in this study can be described as a minority woman. In fact, the majority of academics can be depicted as white and middle-class. Three women in this study reported that they came from a working class background — two assistant professors and one associate professor.

Scheduling arrangements for the interviews were made mostly by telephone and some were done via electronic mail. I was concerned that the month of June might not be a very

promising one for interviews due to the possibility that many of the women would be away for the summer. However, the “yes” replies were extremely encouraging which led me to believe that it would be possible to conduct all of my interviews in the month of June. I was working under a time constraint because my spouse and I had decided in the month of April to move to the US on June 29th. In the month of May I sent out the letters of invitation to participate by electronic mail and conducted all of the interviews in the month of June. I believe that the quick responses to my invitations were made possible due to electronic mail. Initially I tried to contact some of the women by telephone, only to discover that they were not in the office nor were they returning my calls, because after all, I was a stranger, and it is difficult to leave a clear, in-depth message on voice mail. I also decided that using regular mail to send the letters of invitation would be too time consuming. The following are examples of replies via electronic mail from the women who acknowledged their willingness to participate.

I would be delighted to participate in the study! I await your return, and the steps we will take. The terms of the project sound just fine.

*I will be happy to participate in your study.
I think that your study sounds very interesting and will be of great value to women in academia. I will be happy to participate.*

I am happy to volunteer.

In their “yes” replies many of the women left specific instructions about where, how, and when to contact them.

I would be happy to participate. You can reach me at the phone numbers below or by e-mail to set up an interview.

Yes I am willing to participate in your study. The best way to get in touch is probably by e-mail.

I would be interested in participating in your study. I will be away May 25 until the 29th, and from June 20 to July 20.

Some of the women were willing to participate but were concerned about anonymity. In fact, almost all of the women in this study requested that I divulge only the name of their faculty and not that of their department. The woman in the excerpt below did participate in the study after we discussed my techniques for ensuring anonymity.

Your study sounds interesting. Anonymity concerns me and I would like to discuss that a bit. Ours is a small community (i.e. women academics) and I think this makes anonymity more important than usual. At the same time, the topic is an important one and you don't want fear of lack of anonymity to [be] a reason people don't feel free to express themselves openly. I am willing to consider participating (as a researcher I'd hate to say no) so please give me a call ... and we can talk about the details.

Other women had questions about how their name was chosen for the study.

I am willing to participate in your study. I am curious to know how you determined your sample, i.e. whether my name was drawn at random. You may call to set up an appointment at...

Still others were concerned about time limits and whether they could fit this extra responsibility into their hectic schedules.

I am willing to participate in your survey so long as the pre-interview questionnaire² and any post-interview follow-up³ are very, very brief. My office phone number is...; call any time.

Additionally, I anticipated that some of the women academics, being experienced researchers, would be hesitant to be interviewed by a Ph.D. student. I was pleasantly surprised when none of the women who declined participation in the study mentioned this concern. Nor do I believe that this was an unexpressed concern, given that these women provided other reasons for being unable to participate. In fact, many who declined participation expressed a willingness to participate at a later date. The most common reasons given for refusal to participate were lack of time due to workload, absence or unavailability

in the month of June, and being on sabbatical. Some of the women who were unable to participate kindly offered the names of other women to contact.

One of the difficulties which I encountered was finding a convenient time to interview which in some cases of potential participants was not possible, despite my flexibility in terms of conducting the interviews either during the day or evening. One woman was willing to go out of her way to take part in the study (that is, reschedule an airplane flight), but I respected her time constraints and did not include her in the study when a convenient interview time could not be found.

As a result of using the university directory and the assistance of department secretaries to locate the names of participants, in some cases the women contacted did not meet the criteria that I specified in the letter. Using electronic mail to invite participation helped me select out those women because many of them replied by expressing concern about their qualifications as potential participants. Nonetheless, I did arrive at two of the interviews only to discover that the women were part or full-time sessionals. In retrospect, one way of avoiding this misunderstanding would have been to insert a clarification sentence in the invitation to participate letter, such as: "If you would like to be a participant but are unsure about whether you meet the criteria for participation, please express your concerns so that I can elaborate on this point."

I believe that the use of electronic mail as a medium for inviting study participants is extremely helpful for the following reasons: (1) it resulted in a greater response rate when compared with the use of telephone and voice mail services; (2) it permitted rapid responses from women interested in the topic, which is not feasible with regular mail service; (3) it

allowed the women to express their concerns and receive an immediate reply, so that they could make an informed decision⁴ to participate.

Many of the women who were not available in the month of June were eager to take part in the study in the Fall. Thus, it was not the unwillingness on the part of the women to participate but rather my time constraints and desire to limit the women in the study to a manageable number that determined the number of participants.

The Feminist Tradition

I begin this section by highlighting the elements involved in feminist critical policy analysis, as well as my own approach to using this method. Later, I delve into the important features of feminist interviewing as depicted by current scholarship and the role of a feminist perspective in research. I complete the section by outlining the three main research phases that structure this study.

Feminist Critical Policy Analysis

Second wave feminist scholars have begun to illuminate the particular theories that are characteristic of feminist methodology. Leslie R. Bloom (1998) identifies four “concepts” that serve to distinguish the feminist tradition from other forms of inquiry. The first concept, *the social construction of gender*, positions gender as the fundamental category of analysis used to critique the binary gender/sex system which hierarchically subordinates women to men. To the category of gender, some feminists have added the multiple subjectivities that women possess, such as ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, religion, age, and dis/ability (Lorde 1984; hooks 1989). For the purposes of feminist analysis, gender is not the most important

category for all women. Audre Lorde suggests that a woman's race and sexuality may also affect her experience of oppression. Thus not all women are similarly oppressed, and privileged women (e.g., white, middle-class) must include in the analysis of gender how that privilege influences their lives (Spelman 1988). One of the tenets of feminist theory is that "individual multiple subject positions are central to human relationships and that these multiple subject positions take on different meanings and levels of importance depending on particular situations and interpersonal relations" (Bloom, p. 34).

The second concept posits that the primary source of data which feminists use constitutes *women's diverse lives and personal narratives*. While much of feminist research studies the lives of women, Bloom does not indicate that it is also possible to include male participants in feminist work if the ultimate goal is to enhance the lives of women. Men can also make contributions to feminist research (Harding 1987; Acker 1994). A third concept is that feminist inquiry must *answer the questions women have about their lives*. This assertion conceptualizes women as knowers and serves to redress inequities in traditional writings that use the male experience and/or men's questions about women to document women's lives. A fourth concept in feminist methodology is that the researcher may engage in *critical self-reflection* within her writings. "[B]y disclosing and analyzing her identity and values, the researcher asserts both that what she knows cannot be separated from who she is and that her warrants for making knowledge claims are subjectively situated and historically contextual" (Bloom, p. 148).

Estela Mara Bensimon and Catherine Marshall (1997) introduce feminist critical policy analysis as a method that includes five elements, of which the initial three resemble the four concepts described above (although in different categories) and the latter two are additional

components. Bensimon and Marshall note that the first step in feminist critical policy analysis poses gender as an essential category of inquiry with the intention that “the researcher is more alert to the various ways in which gender structures experiences, relationships, processes, practices and outcomes” (p.9). Bensimon and Marshall also assert that critical feminists conduct analyses of “differences, local context, and specificity” (p.9). They advocate that “gender equity and a nonsexist academic workplace cannot be attained unless conscious attention is given to women’s individuality as well as to relations between women and men” (p.10). The third element maintains that critical feminists use the lived experiences and perspectives of women as research data. Within this category, Bensimon and Marshall include the notions that feminist research should be designed to answer women’s questions, and that the researcher may engage in critical self-reflection. One additional component in the framework put forward by Bensimon and Marshall is that the goal of this type of research is to transform institutions. Critical feminists are likely to explore, question, and seek to transform the academy’s structures and practices that constitute inequities. For instance, critical feminists may problematize the tenure system as a taken-for-granted practice that serves to disadvantage women. A final component is that feminist critical policy analysis is “openly political and change-oriented” given that the aim is to dismantle power hierarchies (p.10).

On the basis of Bloom’s work and Bensimon and Marshall’s framework, I model my own approach to feminist critical analysis which includes the following components:

- Gender is the fundamental category of attention, which incorporates an analysis of race, class, and age.
- The data consists of the lived experiences and perceptions of women academics.

- The intent is to answer important questions about women's lives.
- As the researcher, I engage in critical self-reflection.
- The research is change-oriented.

Feminist Interviewing Techniques

When conducting interview research, another feature of feminist methodology, according to Bloom, is an ongoing concern to establish *research relationships* which are trusting and caring or at the very least non-hierarchical and non-exploitative. While it is not always possible to establish a long lasting friendship from a research relationship (see Oakley 1981, discussed below), it is possible to be a *friendly stranger* throughout the duration of that relationship. In feminist research the definition of rapport can be extended to include a special type of identification between the researcher and participants in instances where similar types of oppression are uncovered. As Bloom puts it (p.151): "in feminist methodology there is a belief that a researcher's identification with her respondents ... enhances the researcher's interpretive abilities rather than jeopardizes validity."

Ann Oakley (1981) was one of the first scholars to challenge objective research methodology and thereby provide a relational model for feminist interviewing. In her study of working class, pregnant women she finds that the traditional ways of conducting social science interviews which require the interviewer to remain impersonal and objective are impractical for the participants. The women, who are less educated than Oakley, ask for help in understanding childbirth on the basis of Oakley's own experience and she finds it difficult to deflect such questions. Oakley concludes that the traditional (or structured) interviewing

paradigm which stresses objectivity is a masculine one. Concerning Oakley's conception of feminist interviewing, Daphne Patai (1991: 143) states:

Accepting instead the notion that the personal is political feminist researchers such as Oakley have turned their attention above all to their interactions with the subjects (sic) of their research. The model of a distanced, controlled, and ostensibly neutral interviewer has, as a result, been replaced with that of sisterhood — an engaged and sympathetic interaction between two individuals united by the fact of gender oppression. Like other researchers making this argument Oakley believes that the outcome is not merely a better research process but also better research results.

Thus feminists tend to emphasize a model of non-hierarchical interaction in order to minimize role differentiation and develop closer relations between the interviewer and the interviewee. Feminist methodology encourages interview participants to engage in friendly conversations, and it encourages the interviewer to listen carefully and provide non-judgmental validation of the respondents' experiences. Andrea Fontana and James Frey (1994: 370) point out that, "Interviewers can show their human side and answer questions and express feelings."

Gesa E. Kirsh (1999: 2) indicates that Oakley's influential research led to the development of one of the principles of feminist research; that is, *research on women should also be for women*. Over the years feminists have expanded and clarified the meaning of this principle; so that at this point in time the phrase "research for women" implies that an attempt is made to empower the participants to challenge the oppressive conditions of their lives. Kirsh (p.4-5) identifies a number of other feminist principles which the researcher can use:

- *ask research questions which acknowledge and validate women's experiences;*
- *collaborate with participants as much as possible so that growth and learning can be mutually beneficial, interactive, and cooperative;*
- *analyze how social, historical, and cultural factors shape the research site as well as participants' goals, values and experiences;*
- *analyze how the researchers' identity, experience, training, and theoretical framework shape the research agenda, data analysis, and findings;*

- *correct andocentric norms by calling into question what has been considered “normal” and what has been regarded as “deviant”;*
- *take responsibility for the representation of others in research reports by assessing probable and actual effects on different audiences; and*
- *acknowledge the limitations of and contradictions inherent in research data, as well as alternative interpretations of that data. (pp. 4-5)*

A number of scholars have critiqued Oakley's call for the development of a research relationship resembling a long-lasting friendship or sisterhood. Pamela Cotterill states (1992: 599): “friends don't usually arrive with a taperecorder, listen carefully and sympathetically to what you have to say and then disappear.” Shulamit Reinharz (1992: 266) warns us of the dangers of over-romanticizing the establishment of rapport in feminist research.

Expecting to achieve ‘rapport,’ a concept that remains undefined, it is possible that the researcher may block out other emotions and reactions to the people she is studying. She might even romanticize the women or see them in stereotypic ways, because of her focus on ‘achieving rapport.’ And if she does not ‘achieve rapport,’ she may forego the study altogether. In my view it would be unfortunate if we were to introduce self-imposed limits to our research possibilities because of the notion of rapport.

Other scholars note that beliefs about sisterly rapport in interview situations do not take into consideration issues of differences in the women's subjectivities and power. For instance, it may be difficult for women of different social classes to identify with each other. Hence, Maria Mies (1991) advocates partial identification among research participants so that women can appreciate one another's differences (based on race, class, and so forth) and similarities (based on gender). Cotterill suggests that feminists can discard high expectations for sisterly rapport and still escape traditional notions of researcher objectivity by setting realistic expectations of fulfilling the role of a “friendly stranger,” instead of seeking to build long-lasting friendships. I believe that it is possible to establish a caring and trusting relationship on a temporary basis for the duration of the interview. We shall see later that the “friendly stranger” is how I would describe my role throughout the interview process. Like

Bloom (p. 41), "I have come to understand that interviewing women is not a contradiction in terms. Rather interviewing women in exploitative ways or in a dominating relationship is unethical and antithetical to feminist methodology."

A Feminist Perspective

Shulamit Reinharz (1992: 240) describes numerous characteristics of feminist work. She believes that "feminist research involves an ongoing criticism of nonfeminist scholarship," "is guided by feminist theory," attempts to "represent human diversity," and "aims to create social change." Additionally, she describes feminism as a perspective which can be used with any research method; thus feminists may use various research methods and a transdisciplinary approach. In short, according to Reinharz almost any kind of research can be feminist research so long as it includes a feminist perspective.

Thus, feminists do not claim any single research method or strategy as their own; rather, the theoretical and ethical framework upon which feminist research is based distinguishes this form of inquiry from others. Unlike other research traditions, feminist inquiry specifically focuses on gender (and women's multiple subjectivities) in the hope of creating social change. What further distinguishes feminist research from other forms is the practice of unveiling specific patriarchal and hierarchical qualities of mainstream research. Feminist scholars have revealed the exclusion, silencing, and misrepresentation of women within historical and current accounts. Feminist research, therefore, is guided by a feminist perspective which includes a commitment to enhance women's lives and eliminate inequities in the research process.

Does this argument mean that research which does not begin with a feminist intent cannot become feminist research? The short answer is no. In fact, Sandra Acker (1994) adds a new twist to the issue of using a feminist perspective in research by applying a feminist analysis to prior nonfeminist research. She argues that work context influences the kind of research that is performed in the academy. While employed at a university in Britain, she became aware that her research interests surrounding gender might actually reduce her chances for promotion. She writes:

Certainly, no-one ever discouraged me from doing research on gender. However, it became apparent to me that none of the decision-makers was going to be an expert in this area, and some of them would likely not consider it proper scholarship at all. So I had a strong motivation for developing new directions in my research. I needed to do the kind of work that would receive some recognition and comprehension, not just in my wider reference groups of sociologists of education and feminist scholars, but in my home institution. (p. 60)

Later, she is employed at a Canadian university and in a department which specifically values research on gender issues. As a consequence, she reexamines her prior research and conducts an analysis of the data using a feminist perspective. She concludes that “we might think of feminist work as that which is informed at any point by a feminist framework” (p. 55). Furthermore, she notes that feminist research should not adhere to rigid standards of eligibility for to do so may prevent “potential contributions to feminist scholarship ... if researchers are squeezed between feminist prescriptions on the one hand, and workplace or disciplinary conventions on the other” (p. 55). Through her work Acker demonstrates that feminists can do nonfeminist research, that nonfeminist research can be reanalyzed with a feminist perspective at a latter point in time, and that less rigid guidelines attached to feminist research may make feminist contributions more possible.

Synthesizing the above information encompassing both the use of a feminist perspective and feminist interviewing techniques, I conclude that my own specific methods for designing, interpreting, and reporting the data are influenced by feminist qualitative research, in five particular ways. First, based on the feminist principle that “research on women should also be for women,” I mobilized Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith Cook’s (1991) strategy of “making use of the situation at hand,” thereby paying particular attention to the ordinary, everyday lives of the women. Many of my research questions centered around their personal lives within the private sphere. This is an area which I consider to be worthy of study since many women spend a good part of their lives managing their homes and caring for their children. Again based on the above principle, I engaged in another of Fonow and Cook’s strategies typical of feminist research known as *reflectivity* or critical reflection on the research process. I analyzed my learning experience throughout my work and made adjustments to the research questions and goals as I learned more about the lives of the participants. Third, I sought to establish a trusting and caring relationship (non-exploitative, collaborative) with each participant (Bloom). Fourth, my intent was to provide a criticism of andocentric norms by uncovering inequities that women academics encounter (Kirsh; Reinharz). Moreover, I endeavored to collect information on differences between women — based on age and rank — and among women — with respect to the important issues of race and class privilege (Spelman 1988). Fifth, I had hoped that the research would have an action orientation through the process of demystification (Reinharz) whereby new information is uncovered which helps improve the lives of women or at the very least brings forth awareness.

Three Research Phases

Clearly we can say that feminist interviewing as a method of inquiry is distinctive, in that it imposes a feminist perspective on the qualitative interviewing/research process. Using the above feminist perspective I proceeded to conduct qualitative research which I describe as consisting of three overlapping phases; namely: *designing*, *interpreting*, and *reporting*. Decisions regarding design take place throughout much of the research process. Valerie Janesick (1994) uses a metaphor about dance and research to describe three stages of qualitative design decisions. The *warming-up* stage involves decisions made at the beginning of the research which include selection of research questions, participants, time frame, access, strategy, and theory; as well as consideration of the role of the researcher, and ethical issues. The *exercises* stage consists of conducting a pilot study and making “ongoing design decisions” (p. 213) throughout the actual study. These exercises include searching for the participants’ perspectives and conflicting points of view. Essentially these design decisions are made during and after the pilot and actual interviews, and at the time of data interpretation. The *cooling down* stage pertains to decisions regarding ending the interview research, and beginning the final interpretation of the data. Due to the social realities of doing research among people the qualitative design is modified or redesigned as the work proceeds. Janesick (1994:214) puts it this way:

Of course, the qualitative researcher has been developing categories from the data through constant comparative analysis over the entire time frame of the study. The process of reduction of the data into a manageable model constitutes an end goal of qualitative research design. There is a continual reassessment and refining of concepts as the fieldwork proceeds.

Ethical considerations are vital in interview research and consist of three forms (Fontana and Frey 1994): (1) *informed consent* refers to the consent which the participants choose to

provide once they are informed about the study; (2) *right to privacy* entails the researcher's responsibility to protect the participants' identities; and (3) *protection from harm* implies that participation in the study should not make an individual susceptible to emotional or physical harm. The interviewer obtains informed consent from the participants and strives to ensure confidentiality so that the lives of the informants are not disrupted.

Ethical considerations should also extend to respect for the participants. I use the term "participants" in the study to describe the women and myself in order to show that power is shared in the interview process. Margaret LeCompte (1993:14) writes: "If researchers truly wish to empower those whom they study, they must redefine informants to be those *with* whom they study." Yvonna Lincoln (1993: 38) elaborates:

'Research subjects' suggests disparities in power relationships surrounding the inquiry itself, with scientists possessing the power to make subjects (i.e., subordinates, victims, dependents) of other human beings. Rights to dignity, agency, and individual control are often displaced or suspended in favor of the scientist's right to know.

Additionally, in the design phase the researcher decides the structure of the interview (i.e., structured, semi-structured, or unstructured), creates the interview questions or knowledge sought, and proceeds to conduct the interview(s). Fontana and Frey (1994: 366) describe structured and unstructured interviewing as follows.

The former aims at capturing precise data of a codable nature in order to explain behavior within preestablished categories, whereas the latter is used in an attempt to understand complex behavior of members of society without imposing any a priori categorization that may limit the field of inquiry.

Feminists have used semi-structured interviews as the primary means by which to involve the participants in the creation of data describing their lives (Bologh 1984). I decided to conduct semi-structured interviews because this style of interview has the advantage of preset questions while still allowing the participant to introduce issues that I had not anticipated.

Whereas the structured interview provides the advantage of capturing precise information which is easily placed into categories, in this study it would have had the disadvantage of limiting the women's voices and therefore the field of study. Likewise the unstructured interview, while having the advantage of limiting the interviewer's preconceptions and giving priority to the voice of the participants, has the disadvantage of producing large quantities of unfocused information and therefore is best used when time is not a concern (Glesne and Peshkin 1992). The time constraints of the participants made the unstructured interview style inappropriate for this study. Therefore my intention during the interviews was to provide questions as starting points for the women to tell their stories but to encourage lengthy responses and deeper reflection with some guidance in a semi-structured interview format.

Kathryn Anderson and Dana Jack (1991: 12-13) suggest that women's ways of communication differ from those of men and therefore we must learn how to listen to women's verbal and nonverbal signals in order to understand their way of speaking. From women's stories we must gather not only their "activities and facts" but also their "feelings, attitudes, and values." Body language and vocal tone may be important indicators to the interviewer that it is time to request a clarification of, or elaboration on, the story. It is important to have an agenda that can be discarded or modified should the women's stories guide us in a new or unanticipated direction. They write:

A woman's discussion of her life may combine two separate, often conflicting perspectives: one framed in concepts and values that reflect men's dominant position in the culture, and one informed by the more immediate realities of woman's personal experience. Where experience does not fit dominant meanings alternative concepts may not readily be available. Hence inadvertently, women often mute their own thoughts and feelings when they try to describe their lives in the familiar and publicly acceptable terms of prevailing concepts and conventions. To hear women's perspectives accurately, we have to learn to listen in stereo, receiving both the

dominant and muted channels clearly and tuning into them carefully to understand the relationship between them. (p.11)

In the second research phase, which can be called *interpreting*, the tape recorded interview information is transcribed into written text and the interviewer interprets the transcribed information by establishing a coding system and developing themes. Feminist interpretation is particularly concerned with analyzing women's experiences and presenting their voices. The interviewer finds within the transcripts words, phrases, sentences and even paragraphs that reveal the personal experiences of the participants with respect to a given phenomenon. The meanings of these experiences are interpreted based on recurring patterns that relate directly to the theme in question (Janesick 1994:216). The intent is to find meaning in the individual's lived experience. During this phase the researcher may also choose to verify the findings. I address the application of verification, credibility, or validity in qualitative research in great detail at the end of this chapter. Here, it suffices to say that validity is a controversial issue when applied to qualitative research. While postpositive theorists view validity as a way of authenticating the study, some feminist and poststructural theorists readily dismiss any notion of validity in qualitative research.

Feminist interpretation is complicated by the acknowledgment that "when women create narratives, they often unconsciously reproduce patriarchal ideologies because these ideologies work like master scripts on the individual subject regardless of sex" (Bloom, p. 62). The fear is that women's narratives may reproduce structures of domination rather than liberate them from their silences. Phase three of qualitative interviewing consists of integrating the themes into a story or narrative description. Feminist researchers seek to construct a woman-centered discourse by "writing beyond the ending" (DuPlessis 1985) or "writing against the grain" (Gilbert and Taylor 1991). A woman-defined discourse provides

women with alternative languages or different ways of telling a particular story. For instance, Rachel Blau DuPlessis suggests that in novels “writing beyond the ending” means rejecting the “happily-ever-after” beliefs imposed by fairy tales. Instead the author’s experiences and emotions are represented which may be in conflict with the “master script” (male models or norms), such as alternative notions to marriage, family, heterosexuality, and so forth.

Thus feminists use narratives to further the feminist project of writing for the female gaze or rewriting the culturally mandated elements of the master script. This woman-centered approach stems from the feminist tenet that women are able to resist and change prohibitions placed against them. If feminists do not reveal the realities of women’s experiences and feelings and if women’s narrative endings continue to be ideologically based on male perspectives, then patriarchal norms remain undisturbed (DuPlessis).

A description of qualitative research would not be complete without indicating that interpretive work is open to different and multiple interpretations. These reinterpretations raise the question of whether the “truth” can ever be found in qualitative work. Below Norman K. Denzin (1994: 505-6) indicates his preference for a thick description of the story so that the writer can make her case for the truth and the reader can better understand the basis for a given interpretation.

A thin description simply reports facts, independent of intentions or circumstances. A thick description, in contrast, gives the context of an experience, states the intentions and meanings that organized the experience, and reveals the experience as a process. Out of this process arises a text’s claim for the truth.... The intent is to create the conditions that allow the reader, through the writer, to converse with ... those who have been studied. Building on what has been described or inscribed, interpretation creates the conditions for authentic, or deep, emotional understanding.

In my view a thick description can at times be problematic for it may lead to the identification of the participants in the study. Thus the researcher must balance with care ethical and verification issues. While it is insightful and helpful to explore the various interpretations of a given narrative, often only one interpretation is reported. I believe that the feminist account which I offer the reader strives to accomplish the goals of feminist methodology by: 1) furthering our knowledge about women's experiences; 2) opposing dominant participatory research processes; and 3) striving toward social change. To enhance our understanding of the women's lives, I include a description of their differences both in terms of diversity among women and their "power differences" — a concept considered fundamental to feminist critical research.

The Research Process as a Learning Experience

In many ways the research process presents a unique learning experience for the researcher. This section consists of two subsections. The first subsection focuses on my own experiences during the interviews as well as my perception of the experiences of the respondents and the second outlines the ways in which I interpreted the women's words in order to tell their stories which featured both commonalities and differences. In short, these two subsections describe my personal experiences with feminist qualitative research by revealing the interviewing, interpreting, and writing processes.

Listening to Women's Words

I believe that one of the most important aspects of feminist interviewing is being *sensitive* to the women's concerns, not only in terms of listening carefully during the interview and expressing interest in their story but also in the sense of accommodating their work schedule and family obligations because too often in the past some of the tasks that are important to women have not been acknowledged. By extending this form of respect one is more likely to receive the same in return and thereby become a *privileged interviewer*, that is, an interviewer who acquires in-depth information from the participants. Moreover, the particular research role that I assumed was that of a *learner* which contributed to a comfortable atmosphere and allowed us — the participants — to engage in what I refer to as a *discussion*. Turning the interview into a *discussion* requires preparation on the part of the interviewer. Prior to the interviews I decided that I would act as a *participant* as well as use such techniques as self-disclosure and ice-breakers. I entered each interview as a virtual *stranger* to the interviewee which made it necessary to use techniques to help everyone feel at ease. On the other hand, the fact that I was a stranger may have increased the women's willingness to reveal confidential information in exchange for anonymity. As a feminist researcher I also introduced questions of *diversity* and *power differences* during the discussion. Thus, as an interviewer I had many roles, that of sensitive interviewer, privileged interviewer, learner, participant, feminist researcher, and stranger. The role of stranger was the most uncomfortable and possibly was discarded at some point during the interview. Below I discuss each of these issues in turn.

Let the Conversations Begin

I conducted in-depth, semi-structured, taped interviews running from 90 to 120 minutes and one lasting as long as 3 hours. While most of the interviews lasted 90 minutes some of the women were willing to contribute an extra 30 minutes of their time to complete their stories or to complete my questions because we had spent too much time on other questions. One woman, who gave lengthy responses to all of my questions as well as introducing some of her own concerns, allocated three hours of her time to this endeavor.

A possible explanation for the women's willingness to devote more of their time to the interview than the pre-established 90-minutes was that I was *sensitive* to their concerns both before and during the interviews. One of the ways in which I was sensitive to the women's concerns, before the interviews, was by being flexible in terms of location and timing of the interviews. The women had the option of having the interview take place either at their office or home, in the morning, afternoon, or evening. This choice often depended on place and time of convenience as well as level of comfort in the environment. Some women chose to be interviewed at home because they had young children or because they were not teaching in the month of June and therefore they did most of their work at home. For instance, I interviewed one assistant professor between eight and ten o'clock at night because she indicated that this would be the most convenient time since her young child would be asleep. Another assistant professor had her baby present at the interview. I found this interviewee's story particularly interesting because, like her, I am from a working class background. In my memo that evening I wrote:

Today I had the most interesting interview with an assistant professor and her baby boy, in her office. Apparently she takes her baby to work quite often and her colleagues don't mind. She even strolls him down the corridor when he's crying as she soothes him with such words as 'let's go and disturb the colleagues now.' The

baby slept for about the first thirty minutes of the interview; afterwards he cried quite a bit which can be heard throughout the tape. To stop his cries sometimes I held him and other times she strolled him down the corridor, hence I paused the tape several times. But the disruptions didn't bother me, rather it was fun and interesting especially since her story really appealed to me because she was from a working class background.

Another way in which I was sensitive to the women's concerns during the interviews was by using an interviewee-guided approach; that is, some of my questions were preset, yet like the approach Nadya Aisenberg and Mona Harrington (1988: x) used in interviewing women academics, I "let the interviewees' responses determine the order of subjects, the time spent on each, and the introduction of additional issues." Additionally, as suggested by Kathryn Anderson and Dana Jack (1991), I listened to the women's words, observed their expressions, and noted their hesitations in my field notes so that I could understand the importance that each woman placed on the various issues. For example, some women had tears in their eyes and others laughed as they related their stories. The emotions that the women expressed highlighted certain points that I might otherwise overlook or find trivial. Furthermore, because of my semi-structured interview format, I was able to pursue particular areas that were important to each woman. For example, one woman cried as she spoke of her unpleasant tenure experience. Her story was a complicated one and I was able to understand it fully only by spending more time on this particular topic. This resulted in an interview where some of my other questions remained unanswered. Nonetheless, the interview seemed to be more than complete, not because it turned out to be a 120- rather than the usual 90-minute interview and not because I omitted some questions, but because she revealed so much of her person by disclosing her emotions, her deepest fears, and her desire for an academy where women are treated with the same respect as her male colleagues. Many times during my work I felt like a privileged interviewer because of the depth of information

that the women were willing to reveal. On the other hand, this access to privileged information sometimes led me to feel guilty, for what I was acquiring in a sense can be called *guilty knowledge* whereby I knew too much about the participants because sensitive interviewing encourages them to let down their defenses. Although this form of knowledge can lead to an in-depth analysis of the women's circumstances, it becomes problematic when writing their story for it requires determining whether the sensitive information will reveal the person's identity and therefore must be omitted.

Rapport, Reciprocity and the Privileged Interviewer

I am not sure when *rapport* was established between the participants and myself but it probably occurred at some point during the interview because the women were so candid about their personal experiences. I wrote in my memos: "I am surprised at how open the women are with me in expressing their feelings and their secrets. I feel like a *privileged interviewer*." Steinmetz (1991) discusses privileged, limited, and active researchers in participant observation. The privileged researcher is the one that acquires the most in-depth information as the participants reveal their uttermost feelings and secrets. The women in my study spoke freely and deeply about their lives and work. They had a tendency to provide long, useful answers to my interview questions. Their responses were filled with emotions and to a certain extent excitement in the fact that someone was interested in their story. I later realized that the interviewees spoke openly about their experiences in part because they shared not only my gender identity but in most cases my racial identity and class position; since I would describe myself as a white and currently middle class woman (due to my level of education and spouse's income). It is also possible that *reciprocity* was established which

would explain why the women were forthcoming with confidential information. Perhaps they believed that the completion of a thesis on the careers of women academics is a worthwhile goal — an important and necessary step toward greater awareness and appreciation of the work that they perform. For example, many of the women were willing to continue the interview beyond the 90-minute mark to provide sufficient information for a proper insight into their lives. Even though confidentiality was a major concern, the women were determined to open their lives to a stranger. In fact, many of them at some point during the interview prefaced their responses by stating, “I am assuming this is all confidential.” I believe that this study assumes commonality between my participants’ goals/hopes and my own. I think that in return for their information I provide them with the opportunity to “break the silence,” tell their stories and hope for positive change.

Learner, Participant, and the Discussion

The particular role that I assumed as a researcher may have also enabled the women to feel comfortable with our *discussions*. I refer to the interviews as discussions or conversations because I see my researcher role as being that of a *learner*. I believe that Corrine Glesne and Alan Peshkin (1992: 36) appropriately portray my role as a researcher in the following.

It is important to have this sense of self [as learner-researcher] from the beginning. The learner’s perspective will lead you to reflect on all aspects of research procedures and findings. It also will set you up for a particular type of interaction with your others. As a researcher, you are a curious student who comes to learn from and with research participants. You do not come as an expert or authority. If you are so perceived, then your respondents will not feel encouraged to be as forthcoming as they can be. As a learner you are expected to listen; as an expert or authority, you are expected to talk. The differences between these two roles are enormous.

Additionally, I was a participant during the interview; that is, the women asked me questions and I responded. If I felt that my response might in any way sway their answers, I would simply say, "I will make a note of that question and respond at the end of the interview." On the other hand, if the question was a factual question such as, "are you married," then I would respond during the interview. This form of conversing also made the interview feel more like a discussion. Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (1994: 370) state that:

...the emphasis is shifting to allow the development of a closer relation between interviewer and respondent, attempting to minimize status differences and doing away with the traditional hierarchical situation in interviewing. Interviewers can show their human side and answer questions and express feelings.

According to Reinharz (p. 258) feminist research allows the "involvement of the researcher as a person." A topic that I struggled with was self-disclosure, for initially I could not decide whether I should tell the participants about myself at the beginning or end of the interview. The advantage of self-disclosing at the beginning of the interview would be the possibility of quickly establishing rapport and gaining access to confidential information. In other words, it can act as an ice-breaker. The disadvantage of using this technique upon meeting the participant is twofold: (1) the information provided might influence their responses, and (2) that information might diminish my power as an interviewer since I was already in a situation where I was interviewing women who had greater social power than my own by virtue of their positions. Thus, as noted earlier, I decided to spend a few minutes at the end of the interview telling my own story (information about my background and interest in the project) which the women seemed to appreciate. This solution left me with the dilemma of searching for an ice-breaker.

I believe that the first interview question is crucial for it determines the way the remainder of the interview will proceed. In other words, will it feel like a conversation or an interview. I began each interview with the same question: "Tell me about your graduate education and how that led to your first academic job."⁵ At times this question served as an ice-breaker for it helped some of the women to feel comfortable immediately. The first question was simple, one that women could readily answer about their own lives. It did not require the revelation of confidential information. Instead it required a lengthy answer which showed the women that I was prepared to sit back and listen to their stories, that in fact they had the green light to talk for as long as they wished, and some did just that. If this approach was not effective in the sense that the participant provided only a short response, I initiated "plan b," whereby I would ask questions about her experience with teaching and research. Again this would be information that was not confidential. All of these questions were designed to help the women feel at ease with the discussion. On the other hand, if the woman revealed personal and confidential information in response to my first question, then this was a cue that she was ready for the discussion to begin and in such instances, of which there were a few, I omitted the questions about teaching and research so that there would be plenty of time for a lengthy discussion on issues that particularly mattered to the woman.

Throughout the interviews, I used a number of other techniques to ensure that the atmosphere of a discussion was maintained. For instance, I encouraged long answers simply by nodding or smiling and not interrupting until the woman had stopped speaking (Ely et al., 1991). I asked supplementary questions to probe for the women's meanings and interpretations of particular events and to clarify statements (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992).

These techniques also served to enhance the data analysis and reduce the possibility that the interviewee would be misunderstood.

The Friendly Stranger

Despite my belief that rapport was established during the interviews, another scenario could be that rapport was not established with some or all of the participants. In other words, given the fact that there was only one interview with each participant in my study, rapport may or may not have been established. This being the case, what explains the women's willingness to disclose highly personal information? I believe that in the type of study I conducted, the fact that I was a *friendly stranger* served as an asset. The participants were expecting absolute confidentiality. I do not believe that the women would have revealed such confidential information to a colleague for fear that it might be relayed to another colleague. Ensuring the confidentiality of the interviewees was very important in this study so that the women's reputations and careers were not jeopardized. Accordingly, the participants' names remain anonymous to avoid harm to their personal and professional lives, and instead I use pseudonyms throughout the text. In addition, to satisfy the women's requests for confidentiality I have revealed only the names of the faculties and not those of the departments or universities in which they have been employed. Even the names of the faculties are in a sense disguised for they are not cited exactly as they appear in the University directory.

Addressing Issues of Diversity

Reinharz (p.252) states that “feminist research strives to recognize diversity,” that is, “feminism acknowledges the paradox that women are alike in some ways and dissimilar in others.” Given the low level of representation of minority and working class women in academe, I was able to find only a few of these women to participate in my study. Nonetheless, I addressed diversity through questions of race and class privilege (Spelman 1988), in that most of the participants in my study are white, middle-class, heterosexual women; and I recognized not only that their issues and problems are not generic to all women in academe, but also that white, middle class women enjoy privileges of racial identity and class position. For example, the women were encouraged to tell stories about their privileged background and how that influenced their choice of career. There was also diversity among individual women; that is, each woman revealed a unique perspective on her career and life. This is not to say that patterns or themes did not emerge, but merely to clarify that there are both differences and commonalities in women’s experiences. Race, class, age, sexuality, individuality, and so on all play a role in making women different from each other and some feminist research tackles these issues. While I was unable to find a highly diversified group of women — with respect to race, class, and sexuality — the stories of the white, middle-class women academics in this study are not intended to be representative of all women’s experiences in academe. Ruth Roach Pierson (1995) points out that many white, middle-class women have not regarded themselves as privileged; rather they have denied their implication in the oppression of other women, assuming that as “victims” of gender oppression they are “innocent.” Some poststructural theories about multiple identities show that women can be simultaneously oppressors and oppressed, privileged and discriminated

against — their identities are continuously shifting depending on the social relations in which they are involved.

Interpreting Women's Words

I began the interpretation process by writing *memos* after each interview to enhance my recall of the women and their stories. I have used some of those memos throughout this work in two distinct ways: (1) by developing my understanding of the women's lives; and (2) by quoting directly from my fieldnotes. To interpret the women's words I transcribed the interviews noting almost every word, hesitancy in speech, and emotion that was decipherable through the taped medium. Later I read the transcripts a number of times to fully understand the perspective of each woman before completing the *coding* process. In *writing* the text I used quotations from the transcripts to substantiate the women's interpretations, striving to reveal the women's perspectives in a truthful way. Below I elaborate on each of these points in turn.

Memos

I wrote analytical memos after each interview in order to document my learning experience (Ely et al. 1991; Steinmetz 1991; Bogdan and Biklen 1992). In doing so I acknowledged that my memos were in fact useful data for they recorded my thoughts, interpretations, method used, and even the emerging patterns and themes. Below I provide examples of my fieldnotes, which consist of descriptive and analytical memos; ethical memos; and methodological memos.

Interview 16 24/6/96 Descriptive and Analytical Memo

This afternoon I conversed with a full professor who is 43 years of age and has achieved her rank and status through hard work and sacrifices. She indicates that she has sacrificed having a relationship and children for the sake of her career. Now she is ready for a relationship and she may marry soon but she believes that it is too late to have children. ... I see a pattern emerging because other women have mentioned some sacrifices that they have made either for their children or for their career.

Interview 12 20/6/96 Descriptive and Analytical Memo

Today I had an interesting discussion with a young associate professor who has had a difference of opinion with her male Chair. Essentially she questioned his judgment during a committee meeting and he called her into his office afterwards and expressed his anger. She states that 'the men do this sort of thing all the time and get away with it.' Later her Chair did not recommend that she receive tenure but she appealed that decision and won. I believe that this is a good example of the way women are silenced in academe, especially untenured women.

Interview 4 11/6/96 Ethical Memo

During my interview with a young assistant professor this evening ... she asked that I rewind the tape and erase a few sentences because she was concerned about confidentiality related to the sensitive matter which she was discussing. I abided by her wishes both to meet my ethical code of confidentiality and because her level of comfort with the interview and interviewer was important to both of us.

Interview 1 3/6/96 Methodological Memo

Prior to the interviews I struggled with the issue of self-disclosure. In fact, I arrived at the first interview not having made a decision on that issue. At the end of the interview I resolved that dilemma by simply saying, 'Since you've shared your experiences with me, I would like to tell you a little about myself.' I think that the woman was happy to withdraw from the spotlight and listen to some of my secrets after she had revealed so much of her own personal life. ... In the short time that the women and I share together it is difficult to build a relationship but at least I feel like a certain amount of trust has been established in those few moments that I tell my story and doing so after the interview means that there is no bias.

Interview 5 12/6/96 Methodological Memo

I was almost finished with my interview with a full professor when the tape recorder malfunctioned. The battery life ran out. She was very accommodating and even searched for batteries to no avail. I had another interview scheduled soon thereafter so I explained my situation and I asked her if I could return once I completed that interview. She replied, "yes but call first to see that I'm still in the office once you're done" Fortunately, she was still there and I completed the interview. ... I am amazed at the kindness and understanding shown by the women in my study.

Coding

As I transcribed and edited the interviews, I allowed for wide margins which are useful in data analysis because codes and subcodes can be placed in the margins; and I set up the text according to interview responses and in the form of paragraphs. Subsequently, I read over the data in its entirety a couple of times while simultaneously writing down preliminary codes and subcodes on a notepad. Robert Bogdan and Sari Knopp Biklen (1992: 177) describe codes and subcodes as follows:

Codes categorize information at different levels. Major codes are more general and sweeping, incorporating a wide range of activities, attitudes, and behaviors. Subcodes break these major codes into smaller categories.

On my third round of reading, I completed the data analysis by placing codes and subcodes in the margins according to themes drawn from the interview transcripts, as well as questionnaires, memos, and documentation (Glesne and Peshkin 1992). This led to the discovery of underlying patterns which determined the major themes for each chapter reporting findings. For instance, when searching the interview transcripts often my interview topics, such as *career and family*, identified the codes and the subject of my interview questions, such as *role of children and partner*, identified the subcodes, but sometimes a new code or subcode materialized on the basis of information or unfamiliar words and phrases, such as *May baby phenomenon*, reported by a number of women. According to Glesne and Peshkin (1992: 133):

Coding is a progressive process of sorting and defining and defining and sorting those scraps of collected data (i.e., ... interview transcripts, memos, documents, and notes from relevant literature) that are applicable to our research purpose. By putting like-minded pieces together into data clumps, we create an organizational framework. It is progressive in that we first develop, out of the data, major code clumps by which to sort the data. Then we code the contents of each major code clump, thereby breaking down the major code into numerous subcodes. Eventually,

we place the various data clumps in a meaningful sequence that contributes to the chapters or sections of our manuscript.

Sometimes, after identifying the subcodes, I renamed the major code and/or broke down a particular code into numerous codes. For example, I began gathering subcodes under the category of *family* but found that I had too many subcodes for just one chapter. I divided the code *family* into three codes based on the subcodes (or women's words) namely, *tenure and children, non-traditional relationships, and time management*. The first code became a distinct chapter. I also divided each code according to professorial rank to make comparisons among assistant, associate and full professors. The following is an example of my codes and subcodes. One of the major codes was *tenure and children* which consisted of six subcodes, *time-off, May baby phenomenon, no kids before tenure, sacrifices, policies, female/male life course*. Another major code was *non-traditional relationships* which originally included six but later was reduced to four subcodes, *child care, household labor, spouse/partner, mobility* (children and friends were not included in the chapter due to too much information). The code, *time management*, initially included the subcodes, *prioritizing, time stacking, leisure time is child play, feelings of guilt, conflict, coping strategies, integrating personal and professional life*. However, the subcode, *coping strategies*, was reorganized under the code, *non-traditional relationships*. I used the same codes and subcodes for assistant, associate, and full professors; however, I distinguished the coded information according to rank in order to make comparisons among these groups. The analysis can be viewed as a process of interpretation by the researcher. Despite this presumed subjectivity, the research is a collaborative process among the participants (i.e., the interviewees and interviewer) which assumes its validity based on the proof provided by

the quotations from the women in the final written text. Bogdan and Biklen (p. 176) describe the changing properties of codes and subcodes as follows:

... Your first attempt to assign the coding categories to the data is really a test to discover the workability of the categories you have created. The coding categories can be modified, new categories can be developed, and old ones discarded during the test. It is important to realize that you are not attempting to come up with the right coding system, or even the best. What is right or best differs according to your aims. You might look at the data again after you complete more research projects and code them differently.

On file, I reserved an original copy of the transcripts complete with coding categories. To sort the data I used the computer. Through the use of a *Word for Windows* program I collected (copied and pasted) segments from the interview transcripts for each code and subcode and then I also separated that data by rank. Each segment was labeled with the corresponding pseudonym. Then I read the segments consecutively to confirm old subcodes or identify new ones. The rearrangement of the segments according to codes and ranks helped me further to understand the relationship between individual and group perspective, and to find patterns within and among groups. While this approach is time consuming at the beginning, it saves time eventually when writing-up the research because the selected quotes are organized in a chapter-by-chapter format.

Telling Women's Stories

Writing is easy; all you do is sit staring at the blank sheet of paper until drops of blood form on your forehead. Writing and using quotations is hard work. Presenting raw fieldnotes is usually a cop-out from taking that next step of refining your thinking and sharing with the reader the intricacies of what you have learned (Bogdan and Biklen, pp. 185, 192).

I, on the other hand, stared at a blank computer screen quite often when starting a new chapter. The advantage of using software is that there is no waste of precious paper, and when your writing seems worthless, you simply press the delete key.

I wrote up the research according to the themes that arose from my data analysis and shaped each chapter around a particular code and several subcodes. The codes often served as titles for particular chapters and the subcodes sometimes became section headings.

As a feminist researcher I endeavored to establish a relationship of collaboration with the participants (Reinharz 1992). Thus throughout the written text, I use the first person singular voice and such unconventional terms as “participants” rather than “subjects” in order to show that power is shared between the interviewees and the interviewer. Recognizing that as the researcher and writer I hold the ultimate power to tell the women’s stories, I strive to truthfully represent their experiences by using the women’s own words to substantiate my interpretations.

Moreover, as a feminist researcher, I attempted to involve the reader by establishing a connection between the reader and the women studied. “Transcripts of the interviews, for example, familiarize readers with the people who were studied and enable the reader to hear what the researcher heard” (Reinharz 1992: 39). Through my writing I seek to engage the reader by including the words of the participants, thereby providing an insight into the women’s lives. This style of writing may also serve to raise the reader’s awareness of stories that have previously been suppressed, especially if she shares similar experiences with the women in the study, which in turn may lead to an understanding of her own situation.

The women’s interview responses are displayed in block quotations and in their original form and content with the exception of the following minor modifications. First, an omission

of words in a sentence or paragraph appears as three dots (i.e., ...) and a move to the next paragraph within the same quotation appears as four dots (i.e., ...). The formulations of paragraphs are by and large based on responses to new questions but sometimes new paragraphs are actually subjective breaks made while transcribing. Second, I deleted the women's sighs such as hum, uh, um. At first I wrote a draft including these hesitations but I found that they did not add to, but rather interfered with, the understanding of the women's meanings.

While ethical issues can arise throughout the study, I consider these issues to be of utmost importance during the interpretation and writing stages. At the interpretation phase, as a researcher, I am bound by the words of the participants to tell their true story. To be sure, there can be several interpretations of a single event; however, I must choose the one which most closely reveals the meaning of the women's words. Moreover, confidentiality becomes most crucial when writing the account for it can be read by a number of people who are familiar with the participants. The concept of confidentiality has its limitations. For information to be really confidential, it should not be reported at all. When the participant's comments are used in the text, it is conceivable that she can be identified by someone in the workplace. Identification becomes especially possible when the participant is described with details such as being an academic and mother of two small children. Indeed, as a researcher I can limit identification by changing or omitting small details. For example, in this study I have not revealed the name of the university nor those of the departments and I have strived (sometimes unsuccessfully) to use shorter extracts from narratives to illustrate themes. Despite my attempt to use short narratives from the interview transcripts, I discovered that at

times longer extracts were necessary, powerful tools that clearly and truthfully portrayed the individual's perspective.

Do Feminists Address Issues of Credibility, Verification, or Validity?

The short answer is that *some do and others do not*. Let us begin with the techniques used by those that do address these issues. Like some qualitative researchers, some feminists try to verify their work using established postpositivist criteria. Janesick (1994:216) states, "Validity in qualitative research has to do with description and explanation, and whether or not a given explanation fits a given description. In other words, is the explanation credible?" Burke Johnson (1998) elaborates on this perspective by identifying three forms of validity in qualitative research. (1) *Descriptive validity* implies that the facts of the story are accurate. (2) *Interpretative validity* means that the participants' experiences, opinions, and thoughts are accurately represented by the researcher. (3) *Theoretical validity* is achieved when the theory used to explain a particular phenomenon fits the data. Furthermore, he suggests twelve strategies that can be used to promote validity such as data triangulation, reflexivity, peer review, and so forth.

John Creswell (1998:201) indicates that qualitative researchers tend to "use the term verification instead of validity because verification underscores qualitative research as a distinct approach, a legitimate mode of inquiry in its own right." He identifies "eight verification procedures" and recommends that the researcher uses at least two of these procedures to verify her study (pp. 201-3). If I adopt this line of logic the verification procedures which I used in this study are as follows. First, I employed *methods triangulation* which involves the use of multiple research methods in a single study so that one type of data

serves to verify or supplement the other and provides for a more accurate interpretation (Bogden and Biklen, 1992). I began with feminist interview research which was the primary method. At the end of each interview I proceeded to collect background information by asking the woman to complete a brief questionnaire on age, academic degree, marital status, number of children (if any), field, position, tenure status, and number of years employed as an academic. At the final stage, I gathered documentation for content analysis which included organizational records (directories, calendars, handbooks, policies, and procedures) and university literature (newspapers, newsletters, pamphlets and flyers). I searched these documents for organizational policies and practices that perpetuate gender inequalities. For verification purposes, I compared interview findings with those from the questionnaires and printed documentation to confirm factual data such as the ratio of women to men in each department.

Second, I used *negative case analysis* which consists of revising initial assumptions or themes in light of the statements of some participants that do not conform to my expectations. Glesne and Peshkin (1992: 147) point out that: "Continual alertness to your own biases, your own subjectivity, also assists in producing more trustworthy interpretations." To identify my own biases I constantly searched for other interpretations that were useful, and to attempt to eliminate such biases I ensured that my interpretations were supported by the women's words. Third, my supervisor acts as my *peer reviewer or debriefer* for she asks complex questions about my research design, methods, and interpretations; she listens to my explanations and tries to understand my meanings; and she provides advice. All three members of my thesis committee assess whether or not my

interpretations and conclusions fit the information provided by the participants in the study as quoted in the text.

Using another line of logic to determine the credibility of this study I can use the criteria identified by Joan Acker et al. (1991). As they put it (p.145):

The first question about the development of worthwhile knowledge has to be answered in terms of an emancipatory goal. We might ask whether our findings contribute to the women's movement in some way or whether they make the struggles of individual women more effective or easier by helping to reveal to them the conditions of their lives.

I believe that this study addresses the concerns of women in the academic realm and highlights important issues surrounding their work and family lives. Through the process of demystification, my work contributes to knowledge in the sense of broadening the understanding of women's experiences in academe. This understanding is beneficial both to women already in the profession and those seeking to follow in such footsteps.

The second question, how to decide what is true or valid, is one we have in common with all social scientists.... If validity is to be judged by the adequacy of interpretation, we must return to our theoretical orientation to determine the criteria of adequacy... The first criterion of adequacy in this approach is that the active voice of the subject (sic) should be heard in the account (p. 145).

This work satisfies the "criterion of adequacy" by using the women's own stories to support the interpretations. While there are several interpretations that can flow from any given story, the ones I have used make sense based on the women's words and my aims for the study.

A second criterion of adequacy is that the theoretical reconstruction must be able to account for the investigator as well as those who are investigated. The interpretation must locate the researcher in the social structure and also provide a reconstruction of the social relations that produce the research itself (p. 145).

My multiple subjectivities as a woman who is a feminist and a Ph.D. student may increase the validity of this study in the sense that "accuracy of listening and hearing may be as

important as the openness of the telling” (J. Acker et al., 1991: 146). As a woman and a feminist I feel a certain sensitivity toward the women’s stories and a motivation to reveal a faithful account. As a Ph.D. student I am grateful for their accomplishments and sympathetic to their struggles. This response creates a closeness and an interactive process in the interview rather than a distant one. On the other hand this closeness can be viewed as a form of researcher subjectivity. The fact that I am aware of this closeness leads to the realization that the process of analysis is an ongoing one even as I write the text so that I can state the truth as perceived by the participants. After all I maintain a certain degree of distance, in that, I am a stranger with an interest in telling the women’s stories. Furthermore, moving away to the US after conducting the interviews, made it more difficult for me to remain connected with the women in this study. One motivating factor to complete the project is the memory of the women’s generosity with their time, and my desire to reciprocate by helping them learn about themselves through the creation of new knowledge.

A third argument concerning the verification of qualitative studies is presented by Lincoln and Denzin (1994) under the auspices of “the crisis of legitimation.” They write (pp. 578-9):

It is clear that postmodern and poststructural arguments are moving further and further away from postpositivist models of validity and textual authority. Poststructuralism reads the discussions of logical, construct, internal, ethnographic, and external validity, text-based data, triangulation, trustworthiness, credibility, ... [and so forth] as attempts to reauthorize a text’s authority in the postpositivist moment. A poststructural social science project seeks its external grounding not in science, in any of its revisionist forms, but rather in a commitment to a post-Marxism and a feminism with hope, but no guarantees...

Poststructural feminists believe that a text should seek to empower and emancipate the participants or the readers (Lather 1986). According to Lincoln and Denzin, poststructuralists are committed to exploring the ways in which ideology and power, in our current society, work to influence people’s lives when gender, race, and class constitute major

considerations. Using this rationale, I might say that my study seeks to explain issues of ideology and power that influence the lives of the participants, namely women academics. Kirsh (1999) points out that feminist scholars judge feminist research principles on the basis of ethical rather than epistemological considerations for they seek to empower study participants. "In that sense, many feminists define 'better' in ethical terms — as research that is meaningful, empowering and beneficial to participants, research that has the potential to improve the participants' lives" (p. 11).

Clearly, answers to issues of verification, credibility, or validity of the written text are in the process of change and flux. More theoretical frameworks and research efforts are called for in this important area. On a final, positive note, at this point in time the researcher is able to make a choice of her own concerning the use of verification, credibility, and validity in her work. As for my own research, I believe that it incorporates Kirsch's ethical principles of work which is *meaningful* in that it addresses some of the concerns that women academics have about career and family life; creates greater awareness surrounding these issues which can be *empowering* for the women; and leads to the possibility of *benefiting* the women's lives.

Endnotes

- 1 The invitation to participate which I posted on electronic mail is in the form of a letter which is displayed in Appendix A.
- 2 This was changed to a post-interview questionnaire which is presented in Appendix C.
- 3 There was no post-interview follow-up mentioned, nor was there one conducted.
- 4 I received informed consent from each woman in this study. An example of the consent form is displayed in Appendix A.
- 5 The interview questions are displayed in Appendix B.

Chapter Four

Embarking On An Academic Career:

Mixed Messages and New Norms

Introduction

White women are entering the academic profession in growing numbers but there is little literature which explains the intricacies of their career choices. Much of the literature which examines women's entry into academe focuses on the inequalities that they face in their attempts to secure a tenure track position. But what are the stories of those women who are successful in obtaining such positions? What are the ingredients that enabled them to embark on an academic career? The purpose of this chapter is to describe the way in which women (mostly white and middle class) overcome gender stereotypes and find their way into academic life. Through their words, the women interpret the ways in which gender roles influence their lives. These interpretations reveal a new set of social norms regarding women in academe and mixed messages which they receive from important people in their lives.

Pathways to Academic Life

For the women in this study, embarking on an academic career involved a number of influential childhood and adulthood experiences. There are at least two main ingredients that early on in their lives contributed to the women's career decisions: (1) all of the women come from *relatively privileged* backgrounds; and (2) all of the women received *uncommon support* from their parents, during their youth, to pursue an education and some were fortunate to receive that same support from their fathers to choose a career. As the women became young adults, we see that several other factors come into play in influencing their decisions to *become academics*.

Relative Privilege

Privilege took a number of different forms since the fathers of these women held various occupations which included professor (7), business owner/person (3), teacher/principal (2), manager (2), lawyer, architect, baker, foreman, and construction worker. Most of the mothers worked at home to care for their families without a labor force involvement, with the exception of one who was a university professor later in life, another who worked as a substitute teacher once her children were teenagers, one who held various occupations after her spouse died, and one who was a baker. In describing her own mother Vivian appears to describe the typical mother of these women.

Mom was a 'Leave it to Beaver' Mom, Mrs. Cleaver, a stay at home Mom. In fact, when my Mom started working, she started working part time at a store, we weren't allowed to tell anyone that she was working, and if they found out, we had to make sure that they knew that she didn't have to work.

Most of the participants (fifteen) in this study are white, middle class¹ women who grew up in Canada and have a British or Northern European background. The other four women

identify themselves either as growing up in a working class family (three) or as a member of a visible minority² (one) but part of the middle class.

The white, middle class women in this study are aware of their privileged background. Many of these women indicate that their race and class background has provided them with specific advantages, such as the chance to obtain the education required to enter an academic career, because their parents valued the notion of higher education. Paula points out that her family “had a very heavy emphasis placed on education.” Similarly, Irene states, “I think in my family we used as our indicators of hierarchy, education rather than wealth.” She makes an interesting point about how children learn what is valued in the family through stories. Her family often told tales about educated female relatives. Those stories must have held great meaning for Irene because she followed in their footsteps. She illustrates the way in which family stories can place emphasis on education by linking it with her own children and reinforcing her notion of how children learn and copy their parents.

I have a friend who married somebody who came from the MBA program, together they bought a business ... All their children are interested in going into business on their own, whereas my children [are not] ... If what's valued in your family is intellectual life, reading, education, children will know that.

Some of these women note that in addition to education their parents also valued hard work. Audrey states, “There was always a very high emphasis on education in my family ... and on doing well and on working hard and that one should be responsible for oneself. ... My parents were both well educated.” Similarly, Paula’s mother had seven children and returned to university after her fifth child was born to pursue a Ph.D. degree. Through her behavior she taught her daughter both the importance of education and hard work.

According to these women another advantage of their family background is their ability to understand the English language. For instance, Vanessa reports, “I think the advantage the

middle class status gave me was ... language ... the ability to articulate ... and that makes a big difference.” Ellen points out that working class people have a more difficult time obtaining an education because “the language and the expectations are not groomed in that lifestyle...”

Moreover many of the women mention that a major advantage for the middle class is the higher income level which makes financing their education more feasible. As Pamela puts it, “People in the lower class may not be able to afford university and my parents paid for my university.” This does not necessarily imply that all of the women in this study grew up in wealthy families; rather, some of the women base their claim to middle class family origin on the fact that their parents were educated rather than high income earners. Thus, while many of the women believe that they come from middle class backgrounds, I detect a division between those who are clearly privileged in class terms, namely, the upper middle class who have not had to worry about funding their education, and those in the lower middle class who have struggled to finance their higher education. In fact, some of the lower middle class women paid for their own undergraduate and graduate education because their parents could not afford the cost of tuition. Natalie comments, “As an undergraduate I had a very good scholarship. But I also worked seven nights a week in the cafeteria in one of the residences. ... As a graduate student, I mostly lived on the TA and especially university scholarships.” Other women indicate that their parents were only able to provide for their living arrangements if they lived at home (e.g., Martha) or pay for books and clothing (e.g., Audrey). Nonetheless, the parents of these women were dedicated to their daughters’ education and provided as much financial support as possible. Paula points out, “For the first two years my parents paid for it. I worked summer jobs but it wasn't enough to pay for it.

After that I always worked part time and had summer jobs ... at the graduate level I always had scholarships.”

There are three women in this study with a working-class background. Two of them mention the importance of their family’s strong work ethic in their career choice. Patricia and Carol, both assistant professors, indicate that their working class background has influenced their personal career experiences by allowing them to accept a work ethic which values hard work and long hours as a way of life. They imply that the particular segment of the working class that values the work ethic also values education. For instance, Patricia’s parents insisted that she obtain a university education and they financed her undergraduate degree. Carol’s parents taught her the importance of receiving an education at a young age. She notes, “My parents read to me a lot. They wanted [me] to have an education. My parents loved reading and they’d read to me every night and we’d go to the library.” With respect to the work ethic these two women state:

I grew up in a working class family with a real strong work ethic... [I] don't ...[work] because it's an objective but because I get a lot of ... self validation from it, and it's important to me that my girls do the same thing. (Patricia)

... of course it's hard work, and I don't mind the work, it doesn't seem to bother me that there are very long hours involved ... and I think I sort of grew up with that. People in my family got up at five thirty in the morning, [and] worked ten hour days. (Carol)

Similarly Rachel, who is a member of a visible minority group, mentions the importance of a work ethic. “I don't come from a very rich [or poor] family ... I don't think it has had any effect except in the sense that you know you have to work very hard... My parents are immigrants so they worked very hard for what they wanted to have.”

The women’s stories illustrate several important issues. First, class privilege is relative and therefore problematic. It is important to deconstruct privilege for a clearer understanding

of the women's experiences. For example, the bright, lower middle class women who worked their way through university while securing scholarships and whose parents made countless sacrifices could not possibly share the same kind of privilege as the children of wealthy parents or even academic parents. The first group appears to reveal an element of upward mobility and one of a certain amount of struggle. Their sense of privilege should be viewed in conjunction with my hypothetical questions: "If you were from a working class background, do you think that you would still be an academic today? If you were from a minority background, say a person of color, would you still be an academic today?" Second, a hidden privilege which all of the women refer to is the possibility of flourishing in an era of low tuition and available scholarship. In response to my question, "How did you finance your education," all of the women in this study indicate that they received scholarships at the graduate level. Third, the women's stories show that despite some variation in class and race background, their family values influenced their career decisions in similar ways. All of the women mention the *emphasis on education* and the importance placed on the *work ethic* as elements in their family background which influenced their career choices. Fourth, it is significant to note that it is the more recent recruits (i.e., 3 out of 6 junior women academics report a less privileged family background) who are more diverse. Carol and Patricia, both assistant professors, are from a working class background. Rachel, also an assistant professor, is part of a visible minority group within the middle class. This is an indication that university recruitment practices may be broadening slightly if the assistant professors are less likely to be from white, middle class backgrounds.

Thus the women acknowledge the privileges and influences that come from being white, speaking English and basically sharing the cultural assumptions of the dominant class. The

white, middle class women believe that they are privileged in many ways due to their class and race background. The working class women recognize their somewhat privileged status because they are white and currently middle class. Even the minority woman indicates that she is privileged to some extent simply by being part of the middle class. Because of these class and race advantages many of the women believe that their gender played a more significant role in their lives as they sought to develop a professional persona and renounce conventional limitations. Natalie sums up this section by emphasizing the notion that her privilege rests in her class and race background but not in her gender. "If you are talking about people with backgrounds like mine, not poor by any means but you had to work, there were lots of people like me who made it into the professorate ... but gender was probably the bigger issue." The gender discrimination described by the women in this study can be placed into Elizabeth V. Spelman's (1988) analytical framework of gender, race, class, religion, and sexuality. She identifies sexism as the primary source of oppression for white, middle class women--precisely because one is white, and therefore not exposed to (anti-black) racist prejudice, and middle class, and therefore not exposed to discrimination against working class norms.

In general we have no trouble asking and answering the question of why some women are subject to many forms of oppression--because of their race, we say, because of their class, as well as their gender. The same answer applies to the question of why some women are subject to just one form of oppression--because of their class, because of their race. That is, no woman is subject to any form of oppression simply because she is a woman; which forms of oppression she is subject to depend on what 'kind' of woman she is. In a world in which a woman might be subject to racism, classism, homophobia, and anti-Semitism, if she is not so subject it is because of her race, class, religion, and sexual orientation. So it can never be the case that the treatment of a woman has only to do with her gender and nothing to do with her class or race. That she is subject only to sexism tells us a lot about her race and class identity... For her, being subject only [or principally] to sexism is made possible by these other factors about her identity. So rather than saying she is oppressed 'as a woman,' we might more accurately say she is oppressed as a [white, middle-class] woman is oppressed. (pp. 52-53)

Uncommon Support

The fact that seven women in this study have academic fathers is a significant point for it represents a kind of cultural or academic capital that most families could not provide their children. These women were steered into the academic profession by their fathers. Additionally, the women with non-academic parents also cite their fathers as influential and supportive of their career choices. The mother's role in the women's lives was more traditional. Most of the mothers worked at home and expected their daughters to do the same. While they wanted their daughters to be educated, they expected that once their daughters were married they would remain at home and care for their children. The daughters, on the other hand, seemed to rebel against this model of womanhood and in turn undergo an identity transformation. For instance, Vanessa explains:

In some ways I wanted a life different from my mother's but I went about it in a really bizarre way. I was raised with very traditional expectations of women and bought into them absolutely. But very quickly ... began to experience real dissonance between what I thought I was supposed to do and what satisfied me. If there's a story of my life it's been trying to adjust those two to get rid of the dissonance. My father was in middle management ... and my mother was a homemaker and a very unhappy one ... and my mother said to me, 'you can be a teacher or a nurse or work in an office until you get married.'

For many of these women their mother's lack of career combined with a respect for education in the family actually led them to search for a career of their own. Madeleine searched for a very different life from that of her mother. As she puts it, "I wanted to have a life and not be a wife." According to Audrey: "My mother ... came from a very upper class background and women in her family didn't work ... Certainly [it] took me a long time to get over that kind of upbringing." Audrey believes that there was a part of her that accepted the notion that she would stay home and care for the children until she tried it and discovered "boredom."

Some women highlight the importance of having their academic father as a role model while they were children. These women were advantaged in receiving insider knowledge through their fathers. Martha notes, "I think one of the things I liked about academics was the life style that my father had, the flexibility that he had." Megan states, "my father was a ... professor [in this field] ... I grew up ... surrounded by people in the field and so that's why [I became an academic], but it was unusual certainly in my family for a female to do it." Simultaneously, Megan's mother strived to be her daughter's role model. I asked Megan, "Did your mother have any objections to your career?" She replied, "She didn't object but as I discovered over the years at various points what she really had in mind was that I would find a good ... professor to marry and have children the way she did." I probed further, "And how does she feel about your career now?" "Oh she feels fine about it now but probably she wouldn't feel as good about it if I weren't married with a child." Cynthia's father is a professor in the same field as her own. She reveals the extent of her father's influence on her career choice by stating "that has had a major impact in my decision because I've always felt that ... [this field] is important. I've grown up watching him ... wondering ... why is he so interested in it?" To this day her father acts as a mentor. She describes a situation in which one of her male colleagues was "sabotaging" her laboratory work and her father provided useful advice. Cynthia notes, "I don't know if I would have survived as a woman without the support of my father."

On the other hand, Bridget's father was not a professor but he nonetheless encouraged her to pursue a professional career. "My father was a teacher and my mother was a homemaker My father had a great mind, a wonderful individual. So I think ... what interested him and his quick mind kind of propelled me in this direction." Similarly, Patricia, who is from a

working class background, notes: “Oh, I know exactly how I got here. It was my Dad.” As a child she would take walks with her father and later recalls the memory of her father’s words.

‘Patricia, ... no matter what it costs, somehow we will find the money ... to send you to school for as long as you want to go, for whatever you want to do, and that's really important to me, you can be whatever you want, ... why don't you be a lawyer, Patricia, why don't you be a doctor.’

Both of Natalie’s parents were university educated but her mother had very traditional opinions with respect to a woman’s role and adhered to such stereotypes as women are subordinate to men. Natalie attributes the choice of an academic career both to her father’s career and to the fact that education was considered important in her family.

My parents were both very smart and well educated. My mother held very firmly to the view that women were created to serve men and that women should get a university education in order that they be better wives and mothers. My father ... was a very good mathematician and that probably influenced me... I suppose it's just more that the life of the intellect was respected...

Sometimes not only the mother but also the father supported the stereotype of the traditional woman’s role, that is, that of wife and mother. Bridget reports, “Even with a middle class background my mother and her parents could not understand, you know, why I wouldn’t stay home with the kids.” Cynthia, whose father is a professor, was raised by both her parents with the notion that she should get her Ph.D. but remain home to care for her children, which in fact is the direction that her sisters have followed. She states:

It took me years to realize the dichotomy of the message that I was getting from them. ... It wasn't until my second post doc ... I started reading about feminism and ... becoming more aware of ... the things that I was looking at and I realized that I was actually raised with the idea that I should get a degree and stay home with my children which is what my sisters have both done. They both have Ph.D.s, they both are at home with their children.

Cynthia and her spouse live in different cities in order to accommodate their respective careers. While Cynthia’s mother believes that her daughter will abandon her career for the

sake of having and raising children, Cynthia is not planning to leave her job nor take time off to care for an infant. I asked Cynthia: "How do you think your parents will react when you act so different from your sisters?" She replied: "They just have to get used to it. ... It's been really good for me to move here, to get away from my family's influence, and ... be on my own. ... When you move back, they somehow manage to impose their ideas on you." Similarly, Ellen points out that her parents had no expectation for her to find a career; instead, they wanted her to be more like her mother whom she describes as "a bright woman who had a career but gave it up for the family." Ellen, whose father was an academic, points out, "Just the model of my father gave me an impression of what to do, living, growing up on a university campus, having him near."

Only one woman, Paula, believes that her mother steered her into an academic career. At the same time her father was also very supportive of non-traditional roles for women. I asked Paula: "How has your background influenced your career choice?" She replied: "I think the university was not a mystery to me and that was because my mother was going to school for years while I was still at home. She is a really incredible person. I think she's very bright." Her mother had seven children and returned to university to pursue a Ph.D. when Paula was about ten years old. Hence her mother became her "mentor" by making university life "familiar" and "memorable." In terms of her parents' influence on her career decision she states: "I think they were both important but I think as they say through example my mother was more important."

Even with an academic mother as a role model, Paula, as a little girl, was influenced by gender stereotypes in the sense that certain occupations were either predominantly female or

male. The teaching occupation was definitely considered a female one, albeit not necessarily at the university level.

I would say that when I started university ... I didn't perceive all the professions as equally open to me. ... And I think it was some kind of subconscious notion of gender. That women didn't go to school to become doctors and lawyers. But in a sense academia was the extension of teaching. I think as far back as I can remember I wanted to be a teacher and as I got older the level I wanted to teach went up... So I think probably what happened when I got to university was that there was a sort of resurgence of the notion of teaching, just at a higher level.

While all of the women were encouraged by both their parents to obtain an education, it was the fathers who provided uncommon support for their daughters to pursue a career of their own. In some cases the women who received encouragement from their fathers were expected by their mothers to be traditional. In other cases both parents expected their daughters to receive an education but be traditional in their work. Although only one woman indicates that her mother acted as a role model for her career choice, seven women describe their academic fathers as role models and several others note the same about their non-academic fathers.

It appears that the stories of these women reveal no generational differences. The junior professors tell traditional stories as do the senior ones. However, I searched further through the transcripts and discovered one distinguishing feature between these two groups of women; that is, the senior women were more likely than the junior women to choose alternative career paths prior to entering academe. A total of eight senior women (full, associate, and senior assistant professors) began their careers in feminized professions such as teaching, nursing, or even motherhood, but only one junior assistant professor reports choosing a different occupation (one not gender specific in retail) prior to becoming an academic. The explanations that the senior women offer for initially entering feminized

professions include their mothers' influence telling them to pursue predominantly female occupations, social pressures dictating a woman's place in society, and financial constraints due to family obligations such as the support of young children. For example, Audrey tried to emulate her upper middle class mother by staying home with her young children until she discovered that something was missing in her life. Vanessa initially became a nurse believing that that was a proper occupation for a woman based on her mother's words, "you can be a teacher or a nurse or work in an office until you get married." While she wanted to pursue her university education especially after she was married, she felt obliged to continue in her current position because, as she puts it, "I was supporting my husband and two kids." Pamela had an aunt who was a nurse and role model which initially led her to follow that same career path. Irene became a teacher partly based on family stories about her aunt's teaching occupation.

Vanessa and Audrey are not the only ones whose family obligations determined their early alternative career paths. Other senior women tell similar stories. For example, Ellen had not yet entered graduate school when her children from her first marriage were young. Instead she states, "I did volunteer work and taught music for ten years." Madeleine notes, "At that point in my life my husband was still finishing his Ph.D.; ... we had a preschool child and in that three years our second child was born; and I took a teaching position."

Nadya Aisenberg and Mona Harrington (1988: 11), in their US study, find that the parents of women academics "verbally" and "actively discouraged" their daughters from an "excessive emphasis on intellect." In contrast, this study shows that the women's parents favored education for their daughters. Similarly, Mary Kinnear (1995) studies the lives of the first generation (1870-1970) of women in four different professions, including university

teaching, in the province of Manitoba and finds that the parents of women academics provided both emotional and material support for their daughters to pursue higher education. However, she does not mention whether or not the parents also provided support for the pursuit of an academic career. Nonetheless, these findings leave us wondering whether there is some distinction between Canada and the United States regarding parental attitude to women's education.

Furthermore, Aisenberg and Harrington suggest that women academics are limited in their career endeavors by the "old norms" which place women in the "marriage plot" or private sphere and men in the "quest plot" or public sphere. They find that both parents believe that professional life was unsuitable for women; instead the parents have implicit assumptions that their daughters should marry and lead domestic lives. On the other hand, in this study the fathers tend to encourage *new norms* which establish the social acceptance of women in academe. It is mostly the mothers that believe in the notion of marriage and domesticity for their daughters, while the fathers encourage and support their daughter's choice of an academic life. Consequently the women receive *mixed messages* from their parents and make their career decisions on the basis of the combination of ingredients which I identify in the next section.

Becoming Academics

Thus far we have a situation of relative privilege and uncommon support for daughters as ingredients in the choice of an academic career. At this point the women have reached the level of a university education and then find themselves becoming academics when a number of other factors come into play. Love of subject matter and the presence of faculty

encouragement seem particularly important. When I asked each of the women, “What steered you in the direction of an academic career,” Lauren replied, “I like the teaching aspect of things and ... working with students, ... so that's probably why I chose academe instead of [working for] industry or government.” Martha stated, “I actually went back to school when I was 26 to get my undergraduate degree and while I was doing that I started teaching ... and really enjoyed it, so then I looked into becoming an academic...” Vivian uttered similar comments, “Ever since I can remember ... I've always wanted to learn, and I wanted to know more and more.” Vanessa describes her love of the field as follows, “I really thought ... I'd go to Law School ... but I took some more courses and I just knew it wasn't for me and I'd always loved ... [this field] in high school and ... I kind of just drifted towards this.”

Some women were guided into the academy through the encouragement of their undergraduate professors. During her undergraduate program Paula had some exposure to both writing and a research assistant position. “The program here was good; at the time the Master's level was the highest degree you could get so I think there were ways in which we were treated as more senior than we would have been otherwise.” Similarly, Carol describes her undergraduate faculty in the following way, “They basically have way too much time and energy to devote to you when they don't have graduate students. So I was a TA as an undergrad ... and they started talking about graduate school fairly early on.”

Madeleine points out that she was encouraged by a role model, “I had a superb ... [science] prof, interestingly a woman who was the first woman to get her Ph.D. from ... [that] University.” Similarly, Carol indicates that she pursued this career “with the help of some pretty significant role models along the way.” Although Carol received a great deal of

support from her undergraduate faculty members, being from a working class background she was concerned about financing her graduate education and recounts how that problem was resolved.

At first I thought ... 'I can't afford five more years of student loans and debts.' ... So I asked some of the graduate students how they could afford to do all this and some said T.A.ships, 'what, you mean they pay you to do this?' And I realized I could afford it, so that was a big barrier removed which was financial.³

Academic success and opportunities for employment in their field of choice are also ingredients which fostered the women's drive for academic careers. Lauren states, "I got a research scholarship which then allowed me to have a faculty level position here." Bridget comments, "It was not at all difficult to find a job. I had three job offers before I was finished with my Ph.D." Similarly, Martha indicates, "I had eight interviews and found out eventually that this was the place I wanted to come and then they made me an offer..."

Natalie elaborates:

As graduation grew near, one of my professors asked me where I was going to graduate school and I said that I didn't have enough money to do my applications this year. I was planning to waitress and save up enough money to apply the following year. And he came back a little later and said, 'I've got a position for you at [University X].'

Furthermore, the women in this study can be divided into two groups: those who planned to become academics and those who happened upon this career virtually by accident. Most of the women whose parents were also academics planned to follow in those footsteps. Paula, whose mother was an academic, states, "There was never a point where I thought there was something else I really wanted to do and I really liked university life so I just kept doing it and eventually became an academic." Cynthia, whose father is a professor, notes that she had "no doubts" about becoming an academic.

For many of the others, the women whose parents were not academics, this was not a planned career choice but rather an accidental path that they encountered and decided to pursue. Vanessa notes, "Once I graduated, I came here to do an MA and again it was something that could be fitted in with childrearing and make some money. But I never imagined I would end up here." Similarly Vivian states:

When I got to university I didn't intend to get a Ph.D., it didn't even occur to me that I could get a Ph.D. I mean I saw people working on it and they just seemed like they were geniuses. But ... I liked to learn and I liked the environment... I took a year off between my undergrad and my grad, and when I got in then I just kept going.

Kinnear (1995) discovers that, unlike the women in this study, the first generation of women academics encountered severe difficulties once they entered university life. There was no support to be found from their professors because the climate was chilly for women students. Aisenberg and Harrington (1988) also find that professors literally discouraged women from obtaining a university education by implying that their true destiny should be marriage. In contrast, the experiences of the women in this study reveal a possible change in social norms as they were likely to receive support from their undergraduate professors to pursue a graduate education.

Conclusion

In describing their decisions to become academics the women have revealed several ingredients which influence their career paths sometimes from a young age: including academic interests, parental support, chance to go to university and graduate school. For some the decision was crystallized by love of subject matter or faculty encouragement and role models, while for others an accidental path led them to academe. Academic success and opportunities also served to foster the women's career choices.

The fathers' and mothers' roles in influencing their daughters' career decisions seem to take opposite sides on the career versus family pendulum. While most of the fathers played significant roles in encouraging the women's professional career decisions, most of the mothers tended to be more traditional in their outlook and advice. The mothers were inclined to believe in the stereotypes of a woman's role and project those stereotypes onto their daughters: for example, by telling them that the so called "women's professions" are teaching and nursing and that they should choose from those until they marry and stay home to care for children. Only one woman was steered by her mother into the academic profession.

Thus these women received *mixed messages* from their parents since the fathers tended to support *new norms* by establishing their acceptance of women in academe and the mothers tended to encourage *old norms* with their traditional attitudes of women's roles. Additionally, the mothers provided *mixed messages* to their daughters by believing in higher education but not necessarily careers. Even the women's former university professors seemed to be encouraging new social norms by the support they lend their female students to pursue graduate education.

The senior women were more likely than the junior women to follow alternative, non-academic paths at the start of their careers. Some of the senior women began working in feminized professions due to stereotypes about 'women's work,' the role of mother's influence, and/or obligations toward young children and partners. We can assume that the senior women's career aspirations fluctuated due to family obligations and gender stereotypes making their career routes less predictable.

Other elements that influence the women's career decisions at a less conscious level are *issues of class and race privilege*. The women in this study recognize that they are

privileged in many ways due to their class and/or race background. It is because of this race and class privilege in general that these women experience “their gender” as the one major obstacle when entering and working in a predominantly male occupation. The issue of gender inequality in the academic profession forms the basis of the next chapter.

Endnotes

1 Miliband (1991: 19) describes class as a pyramid with the power elite on top including corporate and state power; followed by the upper middle class consisting of medium sized companies and the credentialized part of the population; next is the lower middle class made up of the small business owner and semi-professionals; close to the bottom is the working class or wage earners; at the very bottom is the under class or the permanently unemployed. I use this description of class because there is a clear distinction in this study between upper and lower middle class women.

The women in this study define people of the middle class status as those who are educated but not necessarily wealthy. In other words, the women believe that income is not as important as education for one to be a part of the middle class.

2 Her parents are immigrants.

3 Most of the women financed their own graduate education through scholarships. In fact, many indicate that without such financial aid they would not have continued their education.

Chapter Five

Gender as a Barrier to Full Membership in Academe

Introduction

Women academics in Canadian universities constitute a small percentage of faculty members and their numbers drop significantly as their rank increases. Only the rare woman is promoted to full professor. Numerous studies show that women academics feel excluded, isolated, and marginalized in this profession (Aisenberg and Harrington 1988; Dagg and Thompson 1988; Caplan 1993; Chilly Collective 1995). As well, the academic environment has been referred to as a male-identified culture (Tierney and Bensimon 1996). The profession continues to revolve around the male life course; there is little acknowledgment that the woman's life course is different, with a few exceptions in the form of policies designed to permit women to have both children and a career. If academe is unconditionally and effectively to accommodate women of all races and classes, then our current view surrounding issues of both career and family planning as well as gender differences in the workplace must be reconstructed. Accordingly in this chapter I shall consider the barriers to the full membership of women in the academy.

Obstacles to Full Membership in Academic Life

The women in this study are a privileged group by and large who have found their way into academic life. But what happens when they become academics? After all their efforts to obtain a graduate education, their winning of scholarships and production of publications, gender still operates as a barrier to full membership in the academy. They are happy in many ways but they still have a number of obstacles in their path, details of which differ in different ranks and fields.

The women as a group appear to identify much that is positive in their academic careers, irrespective of their rank and field, with one exception that will be noted below. These responses were drawn from two of my questions: "What are the positive aspects of your academic career;" and "Are you satisfied with your job?" Women academics indicate that their careers are challenging in the sense of teaching and research. They welcome the flexibility of their hours, control over their own time, and independence of their job. They express excitement about their ability to be creative and their opportunity to continue learning. They enjoy the travel and variety in their work. They perceive themselves as good role models for their children. Some are aware that their efforts are recognized, their opinions are taken seriously, and their activities can instill progress or change. Some enjoy working with their colleagues but mostly in fields where women are over-represented.¹

From the same two questions the women report the following items as negative aspects of their academic careers, regardless of their rank and field, again with a couple of exceptions. Women academics indicate that their careers consume most of their time, a difficulty that is further exacerbated by the tenure clock ticking and the fact that their careers may be in jeopardy even with tenure. They report a certain amount of conflict and guilt associated with

their preoccupation with work while they are spending time with their family. At home their work is constantly on their mind and they have guilty feelings when they are not working. They perceive a lack of appreciation of their work by the general public combined with insufficient funding or financial constraints. Some depict the academic environment as a threat to their self-esteem given that few women proceed beyond the associate professorship level. Some find that their colleagues are overly competitive and hold elitist attitudes towards students. This phenomenon tends to occur in fields where women academics are under-represented. Some describe the academic environment as isolating in part because there is little chance of making good women friends since women academics are a marginal group. Again this is a phenomenon in fields where women are under-represented, keeping in mind that women are under-represented in most fields in academe with some exceptions such as Nursing and Library Science.

Although my summary may imply a consensus response, individual responses to the questions about positive and negative aspects of academic life reveal a number of contradictions in the women's experiences, which is the focus of the remainder of this chapter. I believe that these contradictions act as obstacles which when combined together can be viewed as a gender barrier to full membership in the academy.

The Tenure-Child Obstacle

Women academics with young children usually have a smaller proportion of time to devote to research, the production of which is ultimately necessary for achieving tenure. In this sense the profession's long-standing unwritten policy of determining a person's career security on the basis of quantity of publications is geared toward the male life course. Janice

states: "I'm a mother with a family, I mean I didn't have the children to ignore them, and I feel that I've had less time to devote to my research."

In academia productivity is measured on the basis of research publications. According to Paula Caplan (1993:65): "publications count far more for tenure and promotion than do teaching and service to the institution, the profession, and the community." The ideal academic career that once demanded high productivity from the start for both women and men now extends that demand to graduate (and even undergraduate) students aiming at an academic career (Cassuto 1998). Attitudes towards gender roles, however, have not progressed as rapidly as productivity goals for it is still true to say that unlike most female academics, male academics usually have the luxury of putting their careers ahead of household responsibilities and child care, since quite often their female partner will assume responsibility for the domestic realm (Smart and Smart 1990; Duxbury et al. 1993). This increased demand for productivity by graduate students neglects to take into account the female life course and serves to compound the problem for women who want to experience combining career and children in their lives. Publishing necessarily requires more time in graduate school and financial hardships can make it difficult for women graduate students to support children; instead, those who want children may wait until they obtain an academic position. Even then for productivity and tenure reasons junior women academics may postpone the timing of childbirth further into the future.

In terms of the planning and timing of maternity the women in this study attempt to fit this particular experience in their lives into their career schedules. The senior women tell stories about hiding their pregnancies or having their children in the month of May so as not to disrupt the teaching sessions in their departments, an act that they believed would jeopardize

their careers. The junior women still experience personal anxiety surrounding the potential risk to their careers by having pre-tenure children; they believe that the solution is to plan to experience post-tenure maternity. This issue is discussed in detail in chapter six. Here it is sufficient to say that the women find the very act of having pre-tenure children becomes an obstacle to their career progression.

The Career-Child Obstacle

The women's words reveal a number of contradictions in their perspectives on combining family and career. On the one hand, an academic career facilitates the raising of children, due to the flexible hours involved. On the other hand, combining the two leads to fatigue, conflict, and stress. Much of this situation is due to the time consuming nature of both forms of labor and the profession's reluctance to accommodate the female life course.

The women with children tackle two very demanding jobs and they highlight the difficulties inherent in performing double duty.² Natalie notes that a negative aspect of her career is "the fatigue, if you're trying to do two jobs basically... I think for most people with small children it's finding enough connected time, not just scraps and patches of time — to do serious research is a big problem." On the positive side, Natalie emphasizes that the control that she maintains over much of her work hours is useful for performing family obligations.

... it's a hard job being a ... Professor and a lot of hours in a week but the fact that you are largely autonomous is a boon if you have very small children. There are certain things that, of course, you can't reschedule your teaching, committee work or meetings and so on. But there's a big portion of our work that's in our control. And a big portion of our work that we can do between 2 and 5 in the morning if we want to and if we can force ourselves to stay awake. And certainly that flexibility, the fact that we don't push a time clock, the fact that every time that we have to run to school or to daycare to get our kids, we don't have to get permission, that's a big advantage.

Moreover, budget restraints limit the salary ranges for junior assistant professors, which in turn impacts on their financial ability to support children. Carol, an assistant professor, notes: "The financial constraints of the University make it difficult for me to be the sole earner ... I don't think it was quite so tricky back when my male colleagues were the sole earners in their families but right now it's very tricky." In response to my question, "What are the positive aspects of your academic career?" Carol replies, "Flexibility to combine it with the family." Vivian elaborates on this point, as follows:

Another thing that's really important to me is the fact that I can control my hours, so that I can work my kids around it... The same amount of work has to get done but I can choose when it gets done. That [flexibility provides] the only way ... [of combining] kids and a career and making it work positively.

Some of the women believe that as academics they are good role models for their children. Patricia is one of those women. "I have two girls, and ... I want them to grow up, and ... see what women can do. And so sometimes when I'm really down, I think the only reason I'm doing this is so that they have this great role model." However, she also experiences a conflict between her career and children, which may cause her to leave the academy in search of a career that is more compatible with raising children. "I think maybe it would be great to work at a women's shelter or something that wouldn't be so much pressure."

The women with children express an internal conflict, which on the one hand pulls them to spend time with their partner and children and on the other hand pulls them in the opposite direction, back to work. Patricia explains that the conflict between work and family is an internal one that is difficult to resolve, virtually requiring a woman to be in two places at one time. She expresses a great deal of anxiety over working and leaving her children in the hands of a caregiver.

I remember going to my sister's house and just bawling, and saying 'I have the cutest little two year old in the whole world, I have a very nice woman who I like minding her [and] she can't stand her. But, I'm getting up every morning and I'm going into work, when all I want to do is stay at home and take care of her because she's so miserable.' ... My sister was wonderful, she said, ... 'I'll take her more and she'll be fine and you'll be fine...' So I have moments like that.

At a certain stage in their lives some of these women realize that they have given too much to their career and they begin to want more of a personal life. For instance, some may want to have children. Martha reports, "I've given up a lot to get here. And I think I'm trying to work on that. I hope the decision that I've made to have my own little family won't hurt me career-wise." Martha also identifies the flexibility of her hours as a positive aspect of her career. She states, "I have a lot of flexibility in when I choose to work or not work, comings and goings most of the time."

Other women reach a point in their lives at which they would prefer to spend more time with their children. In particular, Paula, who is a full professor, describes one form in which guilt is manifested in her life, that of feeling guilty about being preoccupied with her work while spending time with their children.

At this stage I'd like to do a bit less. I think it's partly that in the beginning as a goal people are hungrier, it's new, it's more exciting. I'm still hungry in the sense of really enjoying most of the job but I think I've realized that I've got much more time left when I'll be working my career than I will with children at home... So I'd like to feel not necessarily that I was spending more time with them but ... that the time I spent with them was a little less stressful from their point of view. I think I seem a lot of the time when I'm with them to be occupied and I am.

The literature suggests that women academics who choose to have children must also choose whether they will disrupt their career during childrearing years or support a triple workload of child care, household duties and career-related activities. A possible negative consequence of the triple workload is excess stress and exhaustion. While the typical academic works 55 hours per week, those with chief responsibility for child care and home

duties may work over 70 hours per week (Hensel 1991). Additionally, women academics are less likely to be married or have children when compared to their male colleagues or women of similar training in other professions (Simeone 1987). US studies also show that women are more likely than men to leave the academy to care for children (Chused 1985; Hensel 1991), or to interrupt their career for child care reasons which reduces their probability of obtaining tenure (McElrath 1992).

The Time Consuming Career Obstacle

The women indicate that they value at least three aspects of their occupation: (1) the control that they have over their working hours; (2) the lack of supervision; and (3) the right to determine their own course of research. As Janice puts it, "I earn quite a bit of money doing what I like or what I feel like doing. ... The alternative would be working in an industry. I mean here at least ... I get to do research on what I decide to do and not what someone else decides to do." Similarly, Martha notes, "I get to do the things that I want to do ... I get to teach ... it's challenging ... I also get to do research on issues that interest me." Additionally, Audrey states, "I enjoy the independence of my job. I would hate having a job where I had to go and punch a time clock every day. ... I have to work hard but nobody says where I have to do it or when I have to do it." Rachel comments: "The positive aspects [are] I'm not being bossed around too much. ... I really enjoy being able to explore things and think about things when I want to. I also like the flexible hours."

The control that the women exercise over their work time has its limitations, for almost all of the women have mentioned that one of the negative aspects of the academic career is that it is enormously time consuming; that is, there is so much to do with so little time. One facet

of time is that the lack of it causes stress in the women's lives. Patricia points out that a negative aspect of her job is that there is "so much pressure, there's always pressure, there's always more work than you can possibly do, and nothing is ever completely done... But it's the researching that really causes me a lot of stress." Other women mention that their research time is limited due to other work related responsibilities. In particular, Audrey states:

I find, I don't have as much time to devote to it [research], as I need. I mean, if I didn't have to sleep, it would be fine, if I didn't have a personal life it would be fine and I refuse to give up those things... I think because they've cut faculty and staff, faculty ends up doing more and more committee work.

Another facet of time is that the lack of it can interfere with the women's abilities to conduct research and/or receive research grants. In turn, low research output and lack of funding has an impact on job security by undermining their tenure and promotion endeavors. The assistant professors worry about obtaining tenure; this event is constantly on their mind and causes stress. Vanessa points out that "... the worry about tenure, it never goes away. I mean sometimes it gets pushed to the back of your mind and the answer to that is to do it and get it and then I think it will be less stressful." Similarly Martha is concerned about the impact of insufficient time for research on her tenure possibilities. There is an interesting contradiction in her words for she believes that the tenure stress that she is experiencing is a personal flaw rather than a systemic problem.

I think the other negative is there's so many pulls on my time right now, I have to be very structured and I find that very difficult like what should I do first, where should I focus my time with the tasks that I have. ... It's self-imposed stress because this tenure clock is ticking as they say. I want to make tenure here. ... It's a little scary to think that I might not be able to do that.

The associate professors worry about the limited possibilities for career advancement. Janice is concerned about the impact on promotion of the lack of time for research. When I

asked her, “What are the negative aspects of your career,” she replied, “The long hours that you have to put in if you want to really excel.” Even the full professors are concerned about the impact of lack of time on their ability to obtain funding and in turn maintain job security.

According to Lauren:

The negative aspects are the large amount of time that it takes; it is without question a lot of work. You can't leave it, if you leave it then your research will just grind to a halt, you'll lose your grants. ... and that is a problem because it's not a system which allows you to take a breather if you say, 'Gosh I just really need to opt out of this for a year or two.' That's not a possibility or you lose your research grants and you'd lose your career at least from that point of view so it's not the sort of system that is friendly... It's also extremely competitive ... having to keep at that level all the time is stressful and there's a huge stress component to it ... especially right now with University cutbacks I mean even with tenure your job's in jeopardy.

The women describe the lack of funding for their research as an absolute negative.

Without funding they do not have access to research assistants and adequate resources to conduct research. The impact of insufficient funding was especially pronounced for women in the Faculty of Science³ where a great deal of financial assistance is required to establish and run laboratory research. According to Madeleine one of the negative aspects is “the fact that there isn't the support to do things that we need to do, that we want to do, the fact that you have to keep justifying your existence, to outside agencies, even to your Dean.”

Similarly Cynthia states, “If I don't renew my grants, I have to fire people... the financial difficulties are real and you're trying to balance the budget... [I] realize that what I do affects whether or not these people have jobs. It's very stressful.”

Moreover, the financial constraints in the universities require the faculty members to accept extra duties, which further limits their time for research. According to Audrey, “the changing economic climate has restricted the funding to universities so that we've got fewer

and fewer faculty ... [doing] the same job... I can't do the job and the research that I would like to do because funding isn't available."

For most of these women their work becomes their life. Consequently, the women experience worries about job security and guilty feelings related to the time that they devote to their children. They feel that they should spend most of their time working and if they are not working they are thinking about work because as Vivian puts it, "It haunts you, it consumes you." Similarly, Megan notes, "I suppose the down side is that with this kind of job it's never done so you don't feel at home. ... You can't leave your job at five o'clock and go on with your life." While the women enjoy the variety of work in academe, there is not enough time to do it all. In contrast to the pleasure that they receive from their work is the guilt that they experience when they are not working. Audrey explains this guilt phenomenon as follows:

I suppose one of the negative aspects of the career, which is also one of the positives, is the fact that there is so much to it. ... Sometimes it gets difficult to stretch yourself thin enough. ... I do get variety in my work but the hours can be very, very long. I get tired of feeling guilty because I'm not working.

The Excessive Workload Obstacle

A common theme throughout this study is the inequity in workload between female and male academics. Most of the women academics volunteer this information about workload inequity at various points during the interview. There seems to be a preoccupation with workload that stems from the way the system is designed because normally there are so few woman academics in the faculty relative to men; hence what they have to offer in terms of research interest and quality of help is in great demand especially if the student population is predominately female. These women are required to be on numerous committees and they

tend to teach more courses than their male colleagues. The emphasis on overworked women academics has become more common in current literature (Caplan 1993; Park 1996; Acker and Feuerverger 1996 and 1997; Acker 1999).

Some women point out that they and their female colleagues in the department perform the bulk of the service work. Ellen notes that her schedule for committee work is enormous; it encompasses about 40 percent of the time that she dedicates to work. Because she is the only woman in the department she indicates that she does “much more” committee work than her colleagues. By the same token she also takes on more of the student advising responsibilities. Madeleine not only does most of the student counseling in her department but she also teaches more courses than her male colleagues. As a result, she has had less time to devote to research and has lost most of her research grants. She blames herself for not realizing that the extra work means less research. “I was asked to do them, I was eager to prove myself, I assumed that the research would come along okay. I didn’t assume correctly ... nobody told me ... I should have figured it out myself.”

Vanessa also sits on many committees. Furthermore, she notes that organizing social events is another responsibility that is delegated to the women in the department. She tells a story about the aftermath of a committee meeting which she did not attend. One of the topics at the meeting was to choose a replacement host for a retiring female professor who held an annual seminar and reception. Only one woman faculty member attended the meeting — a part-time instructor who had not yet completed her Ph.D. — and she was assigned that duty. Vanessa states, “I guess the script was that I was supposed to be there and I was supposed to step into this role.” She was “furious” that her colleagues did not find it a serious issue to

relegate such a responsibility to a junior woman who needs as much time as possible to establish her career.

Rachel provides another example of junior women who believe that they must do extra work in order to be appreciated. "I have good office hours which is where I think my strength is that I'm available out of the classroom ... I try very hard to make sure that I'm accessible because in our department that's what the students want."

There is little or no recognition in the processes of tenure and promotion of this extra work that women academics perform. The women provide numerous examples of the excessive workload obstacle; that is, they are on more committees, supervise more graduate students, have more office hours, and spend more time at the university. In contrast, they explain that the men in the faculty are rarely in their offices, they "disappear," they publish. In the end, the men are rewarded and glorified for their publications, but not the women for their work and dedication.

One reason for the inequitable workload between women and men is that in some disciplines many graduate students now focus on gender issues and there are only a few women conducting research in this area. Women students prefer to work with women professors because they believe that they will receive "good supervision" and "more time." Another reason female students prefer to work with female faculty is because they enjoy their courses and via those courses they establish rapport with their professors. Moreover, the women believe that some male faculty members teach fewer courses which grants them the freedom to be away from the office more frequently or to allocate a greater proportion of their time to research. The above rationalizations of the inequitable workload appear to portray a large and growing frustration on the part of the women toward a system that still

treats the sexes on an unequal basis. In a sense these women can be described as “doing good and feeling bad,” a concept which Sandra Acker and Grace Feuerverger (1997: 124) use to show that the women academics in their study are “working hard” to fulfill the expectations of a gendered script, yet they feel that their efforts remain largely unappreciated. Acker and Feuerverger suggest that the “various policy developments in the universities have not gone far enough to tackle the question of what counts in academic work.”

Jennifer Mather (1998) points out that the reason the academic system acts unfavorably to women who have gained entry is because of “two social pressures”: 1) the assumption that women should sacrifice a part of their lives to provide family care because this realm is their responsibility; and 2) the pressure for women to assume the greater responsibility of teaching and caring for students because of the stereotype that their gender is more suited to this type of labor than to research work. The women in this study would agree that these two pressures act as important obstacles in their career path. Moreover, they would add that another reason for which they encounter the pressure of excessive workload on their path to full membership is because of the extremely low proportion of women academics in the profession.

The Social and Intellectual Isolation Obstacle

Most of the women indicate that they enjoy the challenge of doing both teaching and research. They are pleased that their teaching makes a difference in the lives of some of the students. They are excited about teaching, and learning from, graduate students. They feel intellectually stimulated by their research and some by their colleagues. As Lauren puts it: “Another positive feature is interacting with students ... I like helping in the academic

progression of students and watching them develop ... And I like the research too, I was going to say, but that goes without saying.” Similarly, Ellen reports, “I love the interactions with students. I like the research, ... I love exploring and growing, [and] developing skills constantly ... Well, I love my job.” Audrey collaborates these sentiments by stating, “The students are a great joy... I enjoy the challenge, I enjoy seeing them grow ... you know some of them are going to go way beyond you... I enjoy the research... I enjoy having a problem and finding a piece of the answer.”

Some women not only report that they “love” their work but that this is the best job in the “country” or “world.” Madeleine notes, “I wouldn’t trade it for any job.” Natalie states, “... I have a job that's interesting, challenging, highly rewarded monetarily, provides an unusual amount of autonomy and flexibility. So I guess in the overall sense I would have to say that I know that I'm lucky...” Some even have trouble believing that they are paid for doing what they like best.

On good days I'm still skipping around this place thinking wow people are actually paying me to do this, I can't believe it, it just seems amazing that our society has this priority, you know, paying people like me to read and think and write and talk to people about what I'm reading and thinking about... (Carol)

I have quite a few days when I [find] it just amazing that somebody would pay me to do this... I love what I do. I like the writing ... there's no better job in the world... I like dealing with the students, by March I think they're really terrific people... (Vanessa)

Some women value the learning experience, in that they are constantly learning from their research, colleagues, students, and environment. Cynthia describes the thrill of discovery in the following way, “Well I like the work, I like running my own lab.... I like being creative... When you get an exciting result and you think you've made a new discovery, there's really nothing else like it.” According to Irene, one of the positive aspects of her career is “the opportunity to be continually expanding in areas that are interesting to you ... you have a lot

of control over what you do with your time, you get a lot back from the people that you interact with ... what could be better.”

Other women enjoy the traveling aspect of the academic career, which includes traveling for the purpose of conferences and use of sabbaticals to conduct research in other countries. Lauren describes the positive points of her career as follows: “The opportunity to be able to go and live someplace else and you know meet other people ... you develop a whole set of contacts and friends and people that you can interact with throughout life.” Still others enjoy the variety in their work in terms of being able to choose different research topics as well as having the opportunity to travel and meet interesting people. As Paula puts it:

I find it intellectually fulfilling... I like the opportunity of doing more than one thing. An academic career really lets you do that in terms of research you can switch topics and ... you're doing a different job in that sense. I've met people nationally, I never would have met otherwise. I think given that I am a professional woman... [and that] there aren't all that many of us, it's been nice to meet women from other cities ... who are in similar circumstances.

In contrast to the pleasures that the women receive from their work, they tell stories about experiencing social and intellectual isolation. The women's experiences with contradictions between feelings of pleasure and those of isolation towards work varied among faculties. For instance, only a few women mention working with their colleagues as a positive aspect of the academic milieu and most of these women are found in faculties where women are over-represented, with the exception of one assistant professor, Martha, who works in a faculty where women are under-represented and has been employed there for almost one year. She states, “I'm working with some great people... There are also quite a few new faculty here who I get along with and we do a little bit of socializing ... I'm really enjoying the job.” The women in faculties where women are over-represented indicate that they receive not only intellectual interaction but also a great deal of support from their colleagues. Audrey

comments, "I do enjoy my colleagues, they keep me intellectually stimulated... It's a nice faculty to work in because people are supportive of each other."

Those women in departments in which women are under-represented describe themselves as socially isolated from their colleagues. According to Bridget: "I don't find that the men in the department, even though I'm quite a capable golfer, would think of asking me to play nine holes after work." Those same women mention the competitive and elitist attitudes of some of their colleagues as a negative aspect of their careers. Bridget states, "if the environment at work was a bit more friendly, more of a team spirit that would make me happier I would [want] a trusting, caring, and supportive attitude and environment amongst faculty which I don't feel exists at the present time." Similarly Janice notes, "I have several colleagues who ... if we're teaching a course together and we disagree on how the term work should be evaluated ... they just talk for hours and hours ... I find that frustrating that they're not willing to compromise." Vanessa depicts her colleagues as "elitists" who underestimate the qualities of the current generation of students. She indicates that her male colleagues attended university when only the top 2 or 3 percent were fortunate to receive a university education; now the percentage is higher and her colleagues fail to see the advantage of that increase in student population. "I really get impatient with that ... cynicism of some of my colleagues, you know, 'the barbarians are at the gates, what can we do, oh well, retirement's just around the corner.' So that is a negative aspect but by and large it's a good job."

Moreover, the women in disciplines where they are under-represented point out that a negative aspect of their career is the isolation due to the lack of women colleagues and friends. As Ellen puts it: "I'm not getting a lot of support from other women." According to

Cynthia a negative aspect of her career is “feeling isolated; not having women colleagues; having to try to understand the male culture and fit in or deal with it. That’s been tough.”

Paula elaborates on this point as follows:

I've been a woman working in an environment where there are very few other women and so I really do feel the cost has been that difficulty meeting ... and forming friendships with other women. I think most of my best friends are out-of-town ... people I've met through work initially and then we had so much in common between being academic women, having families ... [and] shared interest in similar pursuits.

The women express a sense of regret that their careers have cost them the opportunity to form friendships with other women such as mothers of their children’s friends. Some of those mothers view women academics as different partly because they work in a male environment. Paula states:

I think as women with a high level of education in any professional job, we are still a marginal group among women. While I would say I like a pretty broad range of women in terms of whatever their backgrounds might be, I think I'm perceived as a bit odd... and incomprehensible by a lot of women. Probably there are assumptions made about me being, you know, really intellectual all the time. So it's a bit difficult to make friends with a lot of the women I might meet in terms of mothers of kids at school.

Nancy describes the way in which she experiences intellectual isolation because much of her scholarship is feminist work: “It’s made me more anxious about the reception of my work in general and it’s made me feel more isolated within the department in particular, isolated because I have more reservations about showing people my work and about sharing my views.” Paula points out that her male colleagues know her as a feminist, which serves to reinforce her isolation. “I was always recognized as someone who ... thought that men should be treating women in a certain way and I think that’s been the basis in part ... for exclusion.” These women academics are excluded from the male network on the basis of their beliefs and opinions.

Some women have the perception that their gender interferes with their academic success. Lauren comments: "I have this sense that if I wasn't a woman, I would be more successful ... it arises from the feeling of being different than my colleagues ... from being the only woman in a department of 18 men." Other women point out that their careers represent a threat to their self-esteem because of the heavy focus on having others evaluating their work by reviewing a paper for potential publication or judging their competence for tenure and promotion. Vivian states "with the research being the primary focus of a lot of what goes on here there's always sort of a threat to your self-esteem that somehow you are just not quite smart enough, or you are not quite cut out to do it..." Vivian has had a negative tenure experience. She was initially denied tenure but she appealed that decision and won. As a result, in describing herself as an academic she has accepted the notion that she is mediocre. She is convinced that she will never achieve the level of full professor because she is unwilling to put herself once again through the ordeal of a promotion process and its potential negative effect on her self-esteem. She notes that many women seem to end their career at the associate level. Although she wonders why that is the case, she speculates that other women may tell stories that resemble her own experience. "If you look at my life as an academic, I'm okay, I'm not great, I will probably never be a full professor.... I'd never go through that process again." Janice, Madeleine, and Bridget also believe that they are unlikely to reach the level of full professor either due to discouraging tenure experiences or lower number of publications compared to male colleagues.

Constance Backhouse, Roma Harris, Gillian Mitchell, and Alison Wylie (1995) also find that women academics experience exclusion from the social networks of their departments. They note that through informal networks such as the "the old boys' club" academics learn

the unwritten rules of career advancement. Thus, women who are excluded from such networks have less opportunity to find a mentor, which in turn increases the difficulty of career progression.

Conclusion

The women in this study truly enjoy and appreciate their careers. Most of them appear to view the academic career path as a lifelong challenge, one which they would not willingly choose to leave. They find this position to be fulfilling and prestigious, and some even describe it as the “best job in the world.”

Despite the women’s depictions of positive career-related aspects, entry into the academic profession for women does not imply that their future paths will be smooth; rather, they encounter a set of obstacles, which prevent them from gaining full membership in the academy. Many of these obstacles are derived from the prevailing social ideology that a woman’s primary responsibility is to her children and family. Another obstacle is based on the gender stereotype that women are different and somewhat inferior to men. As a result of these gendered assumptions, women face excessive daily workloads and isolation in the academic environment.

An academic career requires continuous day-to-day work, and there is no clear delineation between work and personal life. The women indicate that the flexibility of their hours permits them to combine both children and a career. This is not easy, as in a sense some of them (especially the women with young children) are maneuvering three full-time jobs, but the control that they have over their hours makes it somewhat feasible. Nevertheless, the women feel guilty when they are not working both because there is so much work left

undone, and because they are preoccupied with their work while spending time with their children. They experience the conflict of wanting to perform all of their duties at a reasonable pace; yet they feel stressed because there is so much work left undone. Many of the women point out that the portion of time that they can devote to research is insufficient and a major source of stress. In the end, for women juggling career and children, so much to do with so little time creates fatigue and/or sleep deprivation.

The women who are in disciplines where they are under-represented have little opportunity to perceive themselves as part of the academic culture. They receive overt and subtle messages from their colleagues indicating that they are different and not quite fit to be a member of this elite group of men. They are given this impression in overt ways because few women are promoted to the level of full professor and others must undergo an appeal procedure to receive their tenure status. In more subtle ways they are excluded from the “old boy’s network” which results in the manifestation of social and intellectual isolation. While these under-represented women mention the isolation that they experience due to the marginal nature of women in academe, the women in faculties where they are over-represented note the pleasure that they receive from working with their colleagues. Yet even the women who are in “friendlier” disciplines where they are equally or over-represented encounter overt messages of “not fitting in” because they are promoted to the top academic rank at a lower rate than their male colleagues. In this profession the women are led to believe that they are different and somewhat inferior to the men. One interpretation of these findings is that women are tolerated rather than accepted in the academy.

In contrast, the women use a largely individualistic framework to describe their situations. Even when there is some acknowledgment of a systemic problem such as gender bias, it

often reverts to a comment about themselves; for example, “It’s self imposed stress,” “It’s made me more anxious,” “I’m okay, I’m not great,” and so forth. The women make some references to social constraints but nonetheless depict a strong theme of blaming themselves or at least seeing themselves carrying the responsibility for their own fate. I am suggesting that obstacles to employment fulfillment for women academics should be easy to see and understand so that women can witness other women living similar experiences and likewise experiencing social constraints.

Endnotes

1 For the purpose of this study, I define faculties or departments in which women are under-represented as those in which women constitute less than 33% of the faculty members. The majority of the departments fall into this category and in some disciplines there are as few as one or two women. In faculties or departments in which women are over-represented they make up more than 80% of the professorate. In those faculties or departments in which women are equally represented with men they constitute about 50% of the members on faculty.

2 Although the women in this study identify women with children as performing double duty, in actual fact some of these women perform triple duty when household labor is taken into consideration.

3 The science system is different from other subject areas because the women need large grants to run a laboratory and conduct research. Without this funding they are unable to continue publishing effectively.

Chapter Six

Tenure and Children:

The Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon

Introduction

In this chapter I examine the dilemma of combining the roles of professor and mother through the stories that the women tell about their experiences with tenure, pregnancy, and childrearing. The stories of older and younger women academics reveal both differences and similarities, which I address through such questions as: Do women academics have children before or after tenure? What messages do senior women academics pass on to their junior female colleagues regarding the relationship between children and tenure? In what ways do the stories of these women link the past to the present? The reader may recall that most of the women in this study have children (fifteen out of nineteen) and three are planning to have children.

There are two sections in this chapter, each of which addresses one or more of the above questions. The first section presents the stories of older and younger women academics regarding their experiences with combining childbirth and seeking tenure. Their stories

reveal that where children are involved, the female life course requires an uncertain (because every woman has different needs) amount of time off from work to care for children, given that in our society women are still the primary caregivers. However, taking any time away from work can be detrimental to career prospects. The women also speak of policies and benefits that do not cover every woman's needs. The general consensus seems to be that having children before tenure reduces the possibility of obtaining a tenured position.

Drawing on this consensus, the second section shows that some women believe in the necessity of carefully planning their pregnancies around their demanding career schedules. Older women introduce what they call the *May Baby Phenomenon* whereby junior faculty women, in the past, were trying to have babies in the month of May. Younger women express a certain amount of anxiety associated with the prospect of pregnancy in the pre-tenure stage of their careers.¹ In general, these women have experienced or are currently experiencing what I call the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon* whereby they either attempted to hide their pre-tenure pregnancies or to have post-tenure babies. Hence, the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon* links the past and present experiences of women academics who combine the pursuit of scholarship with having and raising children.

Learning From the Past

Women look to other women as role models, especially when it comes to combining children and a career. As the women in this study tell their stories and compare their own situations to those of other women who are either their seniors or their juniors, their words reveal several messages² about the difficulties of having children prior to securing their careers. To demonstrate the impact of these messages as they are passed on from generation

to generation, I begin with the stories of the older women academics and proceed to those of the younger ones.

Women Academics' Stories

Paula and Megan are both full professors who had children after they obtained tenured positions. Paula made a deliberate choice to secure her career before having children. In fact, she worked ten years as a full professor before her first child was born. Her story shows that although she was able to plan the timing of the birth of her child, there is much related to childbirth that cannot be planned. However, the advantage of being an established full professor was that she could take maternity leave, work part-time, and even be on a sabbatical when her children were born.

I stabilized my career before I had children. And that was pretty deliberate. I didn't want to have the concurrent stress of trying to stabilize my career and having children. ... I don't remember really thinking all that much about children initially. I was pretty focused on finishing my Ph.D. and then carrying on with work... When I did start thinking about having children I really did want to have my career secured.... In the case of the first child that [maternity leave] was only ten weeks. In her case she had Down's Syndrome so the second term I arranged to teach a half course less ... to be around for the intrastimulation program when the child worker would come to the house to show you things to do with your child. The second child, my son, was born while I was on my first sabbatical so I had much more flexibility in my time. I am surprised retrospectively at how much work I did. And probably I should have been a little bit lighter. I did a lot of writing and research that year. But I had flexibility in terms of not having to teach.

When she began her career Megan was told by another woman academic in her department that she should not have children before tenure, for doing so might very well put an end to her career. She describes her colleagues' perspectives, at the time, regarding a pre-tenure pregnancy in this way: "Certainly after the first year, several months of leave, they [her colleagues] expected that you [the mother] wouldn't be seen again in a major way." She

believes that things have changed significantly, in that women are now having pre-tenure children in her department but they may not necessarily be successful in their careers. While the mere fact of being pregnant is no longer a deterrent to career success, the consequences of being pregnant and having children (i.e., fewer publications) may very well be because, as Megan puts it, women are not allowed “a different career path.” Megan begins by talking about the early days in the department:

See, when I came to this department ... there were over forty full-time [faculty]; among those there were two women close to retirement. One of them quite a queen bee and ... another one who had had quite a struggle. She had come after her children had grown and she gave me the best advice she knew how to give at the time which was, try to be more charming at parties to win their hearts and don't have a child. Given her own experience that was the only advice that she could give. So in a sense she was giving me good advice ... she had done her degree after her children were older. She just knew them well enough to know ... if I walked around pregnant that would be my doom and I'm sure, at that point, she was right.

Later Megan describes the way in which certain perspectives in her department have changed and others have remained the same.

I think it has changed considerably. The first person in our department to get pregnant ... before her tenure ... came in a different climate, she came with different kinds of credentials. ... It was also several years later when it became apparent to many people, like [the Chair] who were very ambitious, that they better foster the feminists for their own sakes. So she came in a different atmosphere. Still, I think it wasn't easy for her but she was the first one to do it and after that a number of people did have children. ... I think, there's someone coming up who has had two children untenured and she hasn't gotten the research done the way she needed to. I think she's going to need it. In other words, ... I don't think that any significant allowance has yet been made for a different career path just as far as that [combining research and children] is concerned. The simple fact of being pregnant now would not be a hindrance.

Over ten years ago few benefits existed for women with pre-tenure children. One full professor, Irene, had her children before tenure. She began her academic career immediately after her first child was born. She states that due to the competitive nature of getting the job,

she did not take maternity leave, delay her career or work part-time. Nonetheless, her department Chair made an accommodation for her and her infant.

My first full time ... job started a month after [Karen] was born, I wasn't going to start working part time. By that point we were already into a competitive situation, there were seven or eight people that wrote the comps ... in my Department at that time ... and the Chair offered this job to me. There were lots of men he could have offered the job to and he didn't, so I didn't think it was ... a good idea for me to say 'yes, but I've got all these demands and, you know, requirements and I can only do part time and I can't do this and that.' One accommodation, though, that was made was that in the Fall term, because at this time they really realized that this baby's being born, the Chair said 'well, what about this, we have a Faculty member that's going to be retiring soon, and how would it be if he took ... an additional load in the Fall term, when you're baby's going to be just a few months old and you're going to be exhausted. Then he retires at Christmas and you take his extra course.' So I had two courses in the Fall term and then four in the Winter term, but two of them were repeats. So it was like one preparation and two versions of it. So that was quite helpful.

Audrey and Vanessa are two older³ assistant professors who have delayed their education or careers for the care of young children and have not achieved a tenured status. Audrey lost her tenure track position by changing her employment status from full-time to part-time work when her youngest child was a baby.

At that time I had been on tenure track and our Dean said, 'I understand why you are going back to part-time; when you are ready to come back to full-time, I'll put you back on tenure track...' In the interim there was a changing of Deans. The new Dean [had] an entirely new philosophy that only Ph.D.s were going to get tenured ... So when I came back to full time I was in a situation where the Dean said, 'it doesn't matter whether you were on tenure track before ... you're not on it now.'

Below, Vanessa describes how she combined being a university student and having children, which in turn delayed the start of her academic career.

I started taking courses when my youngest one was six months old and I graduated with my BA on his ninth birthday and I finished my Ph.D. when he finished his first year of University [laughing] and so he's kind of my benchmark. ... I felt that the two were quite compatible, you know, that I could take one or two courses a year ... that that was compatible with my responsibilities. I could still ... be a volunteer at the kid's school.

Even the older women associate professors who had their children prior to tenure did not take maternity leave because at the time it either did not exist or it was too “risky” to take time off for child care. It was commonly thought that women with children were not serious about their careers. Natalie was not in a tenured position when she had her children and she believed that it was “too risky to take maternity leave.” Her rationale for this belief was related to an incident which occurred while she was still at graduate school. At the particular university which she attended, she was the first woman in her field to graduate with a Ph.D. However, she was married a day or two before she returned to a Fall academic term to complete another year of her doctoral program. Natalie points out that, at the time, the end of the year evaluations were conducted orally and she describes her experience as follows.

The question they asked me at my evaluation in spring ... was whether I was no longer serious about ... [this] Field. See if they had asked me whether I was not serious about my marriage I could have understood it, given the evidence. You get married, you leave, you only see him at conferences. I would have said, 'it's none of your business.' But at least I might have understood where the question was coming from. How they could ask me whether I was still serious about [the] Field or not was beyond any sort of rational explanation. So maybe I was overly cautious, maybe I could have taken maternity leave and not run into any difficulty. But it didn't seem like it was a risk worth taking. And so [Vicki] was born the evening I turned in my grades for regular term teaching and [Ken] was born the morning of the final exam for my summer school teaching.

Two positive changes have occurred at this institution due to the efforts of senior women academics who have raised the awareness surrounding women’s struggles with children and career; that is, women are now able to take maternity leave and women assistant professors who become pregnant prior to tenure can choose to delay the tenure clock by one year for each pregnancy. Both of these changes constitute major accomplishments for they acknowledge that women striving to combine child care and tenure efforts are at a

disadvantage relative to their colleagues. Natalie describes the difference that maternity leave has made for younger women academics on campus as follows.

For the women my age almost all the babies were born in May and June because that seemed like the only safe time to have a child: [Vicki] was born in May, [Ken] was born in June. We worked very hard to improve the maternity leave plan and it actually kicked in just about the time when [Ken], my second one, was born. It wasn't very well established or tried yet. For other women, you know, who are say ten years younger than I am, the babies are scattered much more evenly around the academic calendar ... at least that's my anecdotal impression. They do seem to feel much more free to take maternity leave. They don't assume that it's going to be the end of their career. The package that is now available is much better than the one that existed before 1985.

For example, Carol, a younger assistant professor, has taken maternity leave without being concerned that it might present a risk to her career prospects. She describes her level of comfort with tenure and the possibility of deferring that process for one year in the following way: "There's a lot of work involved, but I'm not that stressed out about it... I could take some deferment as well because I've had [the right to] maternity leave since I've been here."

Although these changes are helpful there are many unresolved problems for women academics with children. One problem which Janice, Bridget, and Vivian identify deals with the policy of adding one extra year to the tenure clock for the birth of a child. For instance, Janice (associate) notes that the tenure clock extension does not resolve the negative impact of having children on research grant possibilities due to fewer publications, which in turn affects promotion possibilities.

You can ask for an extra year if you've been having children. ... I think it hurts more in research grant considerations possibly than it does for tenure decisions because tenure decisions can be, 'well we'd like one or two more papers but obviously she's been having children.' But the research grant people have told me they can only look at performance, they can't look at potential.

Bridget is a young associate professor who had children prior to tenure and was initially denied tenure. The situation called for her to defend her performance to win her tenure

status. She notes that she did not take the extra year that the tenure clock would allow her for having children because the nature of her research would have required more than just one additional year to generate more publications. Consequently, she feels that when it comes time for tenure, quality of publications, rather than quantity, should equate with excellence for women with young children.

I do know that the two men who went up for tenure had no trouble and the two women did. But there's several possible explanations for that and some of them are just lifestyle and productivity issues. I've been told many times by men that ... it is fine to have women academics ... as long as they're as good as the men which anyone would agree with, you want quality individuals working in a university. But it's how you define good ... or how you define productive and if it's a number counting game then women do not play on the same field. It is more difficult for women to have the same number of publications... We don't have the time to spend at work.

Additionally, Vivian, who is now an associate professor, began her career as an assistant professor with an eleven-month-old baby and a three-year-old toddler but she received no recognition for her family responsibilities; that is, the extra year was not added to her tenure clock nor were any other accommodations made to help her balance what she calls two careers, family and work. In the end she went through an appeal process to win her tenure status.

If you have your children when you are in a tenure track job they add a year to your tenure [process], but because my children were eleven months and three I got nothing, so I was competing on the same playing field as anybody else with no recognition. I think that's wrong. On the other hand, I don't want to say that I need handicapping, and I think one of the problems with changing it to a way that I think would be fair, is that it does lead to that 'Oh well, they're just getting a handicap and that's not fair.' I wouldn't want that either.

Another problem, which some women point out, is that neither university daycares nor other daycare centers meet their needs. Janice states that daycare centers are not ideal establishments for working mothers because children in daycare become ill quite often. As the primary caregiver for her children, Janice remains at home when they are ill since it is

difficult to hire a baby-sitter without prior notice. She notes, "Of course they're sick all the time so it's really a nuisance. My husband's gone to work at 5 or 6 in the morning so I'm the one that's there when we realize they're sick so I usually end up staying home."

Bridget identifies the difficulty inherent in the operating hours that the daycare centers maintain. Such centers are open a restricted number of hours; therefore they do not accommodate professional women who work more than 45 hours per week. In turn, these hour restrictions serve to limit time allotted to research and other work related responsibilities for women academics.

[I]f you look through the university you'll find that ... [the women] are older, divorced, lesbian ... or they wait until they're tenured to have their children... You'll be surprised ... when you discover ... how few women have children. I'd be lucky to put in a forty-five hour work week. [D]aycares only run from eight in the morning until six at night and most daycares have a nine-hour rule so you couldn't put your children in from eight to six. That's ten hours. So you either work eight to five or nine to six but these are the rules. And that's a progressive daycare. Many other daycares aren't even open until six. But that's also the time that the child is in the center, which means you've got transportation time. It really works out to maybe an eight and half-hour work day. And, if you aren't too exhausted by nine, and your children are in bed, you might be able to work in the evening but most of the time you're too exhausted by that point to do any thoughtful work.

The daycare center at this University is not geared toward the needs of faculty women; rather, it is student oriented. The children of faculty members are allowed entry into the daycare center only after the children of the students and staff have been accommodated. Below Audrey, an older assistant professor, describes the way in which the daycare center functioned when her children were young, and Carol, a young assistant professor, describes the current daycare center. In essence, over the years the daycare center has not changed its policy toward the children of faculty members.

I was going to put him in the daycare center up here but faculty were last on the list. ... Full-time students, part-time students, something with the graduate and undergraduate students, there's a priority, and then staff and then faculty. ... By the

time they said we have a spot for him he'd been quite comfortable with somebody ... I hired. (Audrey)

It [daycare] could be better for faculty. We do really well because my husband is an undergraduate student, so we get none of these things because I'm a faculty member. The faculty benefits are ... mostly geared towards older men. For example, they [benefits] pay for tuition but not child care. The University daycare gives priority to undergraduates; faculty can be on the waiting list for years. (Carol)

Lessons Learned

From the stories recounted above we can identify three messages or lessons that young women professors can learn by observing or talking to older women academics. The first message that young women assistant professors receive from the past is *that taking time off from work for child care can be harmful to their career progression*. They learn this from the experiences of women full professors who first secured their careers and later had post-tenure children; from the experiences of women full or associate professors who had pre-tenure children but did not delay their careers or take any time off even in the form of maternity leave; and from the experiences of older women assistant professors who delayed their education or careers for their children and remain in untenured positions.

Martha is a young assistant professor who would like to have children. She states, "I'm 35 and ... I put it off for a long time because of my career ... I love kids." She notes that she is prepared to take maternity leave but only if the child is born during the semester. On the other hand, if the child were born during the summer she would not take time off from work.

It would depend on the time of the [child's birth whether] ... I would take a semester off. ... If I had a baby over the summer say, I might not even take time out from teaching. ... But if the baby were due let's say in like mid-September or whatever then I'd probably take that semester off from teaching and take the maternity that's available.

The literature supports this first message in several ways. Susan Kolker Finkel and Steven Olswang (1996) find that time required for childrearing is a major impediment for women assistant professors in their striving for tenure. Karen McElrath (1992: 277-8) shows that the effects on tenure are negative for a woman who interrupts her career: "the probability of obtaining tenure decreases and the length of time to tenure increases." McElrath speculates that the reason for this is that tenure committee members may perceive work disruptions as an indication that the woman academic is not taking her work seriously and assume that she may further interrupt her career in the future. Furthermore, she notes that a woman who leaves the academy for long periods of time to care for children may suffer cumulative disadvantages across her career. Diane Davis and Helen Austin (1990), through their survey, discover that women (but not men) identify "family responsibility" as an inhibitor to research productivity during the critical stages of a woman's life course.

The second message that young women assistant professors receive from their senior female colleagues is that *benefits such as maternity leave, child care, and the extension of the tenure clock by one year for the birth of a child do not cover every woman's needs*. They learn this from the experiences of associate professors who find that one additional year added to the tenure clock is insufficient to compensate for the enormous amount of time they withdraw from research activities to devote to child care duties. They also learn this from the experiences of associate professors who find that daycare facilities do not meet their child care needs. Additionally, they receive this message from associate professors who began their careers with young children, rather than having children during their career, and therefore found that many of the benefits, such as maternity leave and extension of the tenure

clock, did not apply to them. In fact, Nancy, a young assistant professor, learns through her own experience about the insufficiency of benefits to address her needs.

I should have negotiated for some kind of maternity leave given that my daughter was born three weeks before my contract started which means that legally they're not required to provide me with any maternity leave. ... They didn't offer me any kind of leave or teaching leave for that first year and my husband who has just been offered a job has already had his teaching load reduced for the first two years and I never had a smaller reduction offered to me. The fact that that ... offer was not made to me in good faith and more explicitly that it was not made to me when I told them that I was having a child three weeks before my contract started suggests to me that there's no support mechanism in place for women around issues of maternity or, you know, childrearing in general.

Clearly, a group of women for whom child-related benefits do not apply are those who are beginning their academic careers with newborn or young children. These women should be considered as likely candidates for a reduction in their workload and an extension of the tenure clock.

While women professors currently have the right to take maternity leave, the academic clock does not stop so that during this time they are expected to conduct research and produce publications. Otherwise, the presumption is that they are not taking her scholarly work seriously. Needless to say, it is difficult for women to maintain high levels of research productivity if they feel tired or ill during pregnancy and when they assume primary responsibility for a newborn baby. Many years ago the Committee on the Status of Women (1988:105) recognized this dilemma facing women academics with young children and recommended that:

Where the tenuring process is limited to a specific number of years, allowances must be built into the procedure. For example, the probationary period should be extended one year for each pregnancy. Parenting care policies need to be developed for men and women alike.

The Committee's first recommendation (extending the tenure clock one year for pregnancy) has been institutionalized at the particular university in this study. However, the different eligibility requirements for this benefit need improvement so that women who enter the profession with young children may also qualify. And there should be a mechanism built in to prevent these women from facing a situation in which the policy works to their disadvantage by preventing them from obtaining employment. On the other hand, the Committee's second recommendation for parenting policies has not been established. While the university has a maternity leave policy, it has no paternity leave policy, an omission that serves to reinforce the belief that childrearing is a woman's responsibility.

More generally, universities should provide adequate child care facilities to help academic mothers reduce family and work conflicts. Many universities in Canada sponsor on-site child care centers. But those facilities do not adequately meet the needs of academic women and their children. Paula Caplan (1993) points out that Canadian university child care centers have few spaces, long waiting lists, inflexible hours, and may not care for infants or toddlers.

A third message passed on to young assistant professors is that *having children before tenure can reduce the likelihood of achieving tenure*. They are taught this from the experiences of young associate professors who have children before tenure, produce fewer publications and must fight for their tenure status. Rachel is a young assistant professor, in the Faculty of Science, who would like to have children. However, she feels obliged to pursue research endeavors even during a maternity leave to maintain grants and not jeopardize her chances of achieving tenure.

I will probably take some time off. ... Probably what I would do with that maternity leave is use it to not teach. I would still maintain some sort of research program. I don't want to ever cut that off because it's very difficult to start building up again. Teaching is a lot easier to cut and come back to it.

Nancy is a young assistant professor in the Faculty of Arts who believes that it is a good idea to postpone having children in order to secure one's career. But she has a child and hopes that that does not undermine her career prospects because she cannot allocate all of her time to her work. Her view concerning sharing time between work and family appears to provide her with a balanced life.

I think it's a really good idea if you want to secure your career and I think it's a terrible truth that that [not having children] can be the best way to secure your career. But I decided that the risk was worth taking ... and that academia was not worth foregoing what I anticipated to be the pleasures of having a child and which have proven to be very true and no amount of conferences can make up for her. I hope in the end it doesn't cost me my job having taken that chance. ... I think that she prevents me from spending 100 percent of my time on my work and I don't mind that, I'm glad of it but if 100 percent were required it couldn't be done. It's impossible and I refuse to do it at her cost.

Although Nancy would like to have another child soon, some of her female colleagues have discouraged this course of action. A major factor preventing Nancy from having another child prior to tenure is that such an act may give her colleagues a reason to question her career commitment.

Various faculty members in so far as they are trying to be supportive say that it would be a bad idea, [to have another child] before tenure. ... But I would ideally like to, because I feel like you know I would like to have another child before the gap is huge between them but I feel like it would be putting myself at such great risk that I may not do it [because] it will just give the enemy ammunition and allow them to take the publishing career that is there ... and make it seem less significant than it is ... and also to simply cast aspersions on my commitment to the career ...

Brian Wilson and Eileen Byrne (1987:163) acknowledge that women with young children require some form of compensation for time spent caring for the family, which potentially places them at a disadvantage in terms of research productivity. They recommend that universities entitle women academics to take "special short leaves" for research and publishing to prepare for promotion. As Sandra Acker (1994:126) states, "productivity is

most enhanced when someone else does all the support work,” that is, housework and child care.

There is little doubt that assistant professors who are in their childbearing years feel that publishing is made more difficult and less feasible when combined with the care of young children. While some changes have occurred to help women combine child care and work, perhaps we must all learn from the past and start to make accommodations on the basis of an individual's needs. Patricia, a young assistant professor, describes the process of writing with young children as an “agonizing” procedure. Below, Patricia depicts her experiences with juggling research and child care and in doing so she unveils one of the subtle consequences of combining these two forms of labor, namely, changing the way one writes.

Up until I had kids, when I would write, everything was early, like term papers... you'd get up in the morning, and you'd write and take breaks, and write and take breaks ... till night time and you'd go to bed and you'd just do that for like a week or so and then it was done. But now, you know, I can't do that, so I find I'm trying to write in smaller blocks of time, and then, if you're not really disciplined, those smaller blocks of time ... they're just sucked up. ... I've finally got into ... a routine that works best for me and I didn't get into it until, I guess when ... my oldest ... was about twenty months old. ... I had been taking her to child care, [and] then I had someone come in for a year. ... I'm an early morning person. So I would be getting up early, trying to do work and then she would get up, take care of her, then take her to child care, then get into work. And when this person came into my house I would get up and be at work, like around quarter to seven, and that's when I hit my stride, once I could do that and go in really early and have ... from seven until ten pretty much until the Department got bustling, then that really... helped, things started feeling like, 'hey I might actually be able to do this' ... that's sort of like my [way of] coping. That was when she was two. Then the following April I got pregnant. Between the time that she turned two and the time that I got pregnant ... [was] really my best period, where I really felt like I was finally on top of my work. ... And then I went and got pregnant, which, you know, I thought 'why did you do that', but ... I was going to have a little girl who was going to be three, and if I was going to have another child, then that was when I wanted to have it ...

Linking The Past and the Present

The impact of pregnancy on the careers of women academics is an area that exemplifies a gap in the literature. While some of the literature deals with the influence of childrearing on women's academic careers, I have found no research which addresses questions such as: how do women academics make decisions regarding when to get pregnant, before or after tenure? To what extent are those decisions based on such factors as fear of not obtaining an academic position, fear of not receiving tenure or promotion, and/or fear of being terminated from their employment? I examine these questions in this section.

May Babies

The dilemma of combining children and a career for women academics begins during pregnancy and is anticipated before then. Some of the older associate and full professors, having had their children prior to tenure, speak of the *May Baby Phenomenon*, whereby junior⁴ faculty, at least ten years ago, were trying to have babies in the month of May. Having babies in May, or for that matter at any time during the spring and summer months, was a window of opportunity that permitted women to have children and yet not take time off from work or jeopardize their goals for achieving tenure. Of course the month of May was considered the optimal month for the birth of a child since this would allow the woman a few months to adjust to motherhood prior to the commencement of the new teaching session.⁵ For these women having children was a process that required careful planning. Their colleagues and superiors would regard being open about their pregnancies as a lack of commitment towards their careers because at the time the predominant ideology was that

women could not handle both a career and a family. Irene, a full professor, describes how she used a clothing strategy to conceal her pregnancy during the winter term.

I had it all very, very planned out, because in those days there wasn't any such thing as maternity leave. ... In fact, I was walking across the campus and the Chair of the Department said 'what are you doing next year,' and I said 'I'm writing my thesis,' and he said 'well how would you like a job?' So I thought this is not the moment to tell him that I'm expecting a baby, so then I said 'yes, that would be nice.' The baby was due in July, so ... there were whole numbers in my Department that didn't seem to know, even by April, that I was pregnant because of the strategy that I had at the beginning, of wearing tight things one day and then voluminous things the next day. ... By the time I was wearing lots of voluminous things nobody noticed that they were any different from what they had seen. Now of course women don't do that ... they're up front in planning. But I felt, I think, at the time that if I said to the Chair, 'oh yes, I'm having a baby in July, but yes I would like a full time job.' I think he would have thought, 'oh well, this is going to be too much for her, you know, this is probably not going to work out.'

During the interview Janice, an associate professor, described her rationale for having a pre-tenure baby in the month of May and a post-tenure baby in the month of December. The latter appeared to cause a bit of a problem for the Chair who seemed surprised to have had to deal with the birth of a child and the inconveniences it imposed on the department.

Well the first one [pre-tenure baby] was, you know, you don't want your colleagues to resent you when you come up for tenure, you're afraid to interfere with [the procedure] ... and so I had this May baby and came back to work in August because we had 10 weeks maternity leave then. And then when the second one came along I had her in December and that really threw the Chair for a loop, he was kind of, 'well what are we going to do about this baby due on the 13th of December?' [That was] about ten months after I got tenure. [laughing] My post tenure baby. ... And I intentionally didn't have a May baby that time either, I had a December baby.

Additionally, Janice speaks of how she discovered that other junior women, like her, were trying to have babies in May.

There was a time when I used to go to women's caucus meetings and they would talk about [May babies], so that was where I discovered that all the junior faculty were trying to have their babies in May so it wouldn't interfere with their teaching and upset their colleagues. [laughing] The May Baby Phenomenon...

The difficulty with this strategy is that not all women can necessarily get pregnant when they want to; nonetheless, the key point is that some of the women in this study attempted to control the timing of their childbirth for the sake of their career. Another factor in pregnancy is the uncertainty involved in the sense that one cannot be sure of having a healthy baby. As we saw at the beginning of this chapter, Paula planned to have her children after she became a full professor; however, she did not plan on having a child with Down's Syndrome.

Natalie, an associate professor in the Faculty of Arts, believes that she was fortunate to have delivered her babies in May and June but she notes that the timing of childbirth should not have been accepted as a standard because some women have difficult pregnancy experiences.

I was lucky that everything worked out fine, that they were healthy, that the deliveries were uneventful and it's ridiculous to think that ... that young women should be expected to count on that kind of thing. The fact that it sometimes works out right is nice but it shouldn't be taken as ... something that you expect everybody to adhere to.

Post-Tenure Babies

As noted in the previous section the women who over ten years ago formed part of the Women's Caucus at the University worked hard to improve the maternity leave plan. As a result, Natalie, an associate professor in the Faculty of Arts, believes that now younger women (about ten years younger than herself) are having babies at various times throughout the year. While this change may have occurred in some faculties, nevertheless most of the younger women in this study argue that *not* having children prior to tenure is best. This is where the past and the present collide. While in the past women hid their desires to have children by having May babies, the current trend is toward post-tenure babies. In both situations women are hiding their maternal desires in order to meet an unwritten professional standard that is geared toward the male life course. I refer to this situation as the *Hidden*

Pregnancy Phenomenon. Both of the young assistant professors in the sciences, Cynthia and Rachel, note that they will either wait for a grant renewal or for tenure before having children. They believe that pregnancy before tenure harms their career prospects. However, Cynthia mentions wanting children before the age of thirty-five. Beyond the age of thirty-five fertility decreases and the risk of having an unhealthy child increases. Having a disabled child, for instance, would certainly make an academic career more difficult.

A trend that I see in all [of my] male colleagues who've been hired in the last five years [is that] their wives have quit their jobs and moved. It does leave me sort of [alone], I'm not going to get my husband to quit his job and move... They all have houses [and] children. I can't have children at this point in time because it would really mess up my career. I plan to wait at least until I have my grant renewal. ... Even if my husband doesn't move here, I think I'm going to have kids because I don't want to wait. I'm thirty-two now so I still have time. I definitely want to start trying to have kids before I'm thirty-five. If I have kids in the next year, how would I ever write that grant? I mean, there is a reality ... [in terms of] the number of hours you have to put in, because I'm writing three grants, trying to get my papers out, trying to keep the lab going, doing my teaching, doing the service, you know, there's no way I could have kids in the next year. I think if I already had them, it wouldn't be that bad. To actually give birth ... and to lose the three months, I just don't have that time now. (Cynthia)

Tenure. Tenure, tenure first. I think, like ultimately it's very difficult to do it [have a baby] unless you know you are well established and when you're trying to establish yourself and establish family at the same time, I'm not convinced it's something I could have done. (Rachel)

Young women academics in other faculties are also likely to postpone having their children until after they have obtained tenured positions. As we saw in the previous section, Martha is a young assistant professor in a professional school who loves children but has put off having them for a long time due to her career.

Another form of the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon* which links the past to the present is that young women academics continue to hide their pregnancies during job interviews.

Nancy is a young assistant professor in the Faculty of Arts who intentionally hid her

pregnancy during her job interview for fear of not being hired. When I asked if she feared not getting the position due to her pregnancy, she replied:

... it was just at that five month stage where I could still get away with not ... revealing that I was pregnant, but it took a lot of work. ... I think it [getting the job] would have been more difficult. I mean ... I think they would not have believed that I was going to finish my dissertation; they would never have believed that.

There are some exceptions to the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon*. Carol and Patricia are young assistant professors in the arts and social sciences, respectively. Both of them have had children before tenure and both attribute this decision to their non-traditional marriages. Carol indicates that if she did not have a spouse at home she would not have had children before tenure because striving for tenure constitutes a stressful time in her life.

Well, when I was an undergraduate and then when I was in graduate school, I knew lots of women professors, I knew none with kids. Zero, so of the seven women I knew in my graduate program, none had kids. Lots were married, and the same in my undergraduate. ... I had people say 'well how do you manage to do it?' And the answer is that I've got a husband who does an awful lot, and before we decided to have children I said I was only going to do it if it could be that way. And, that's worked very well with our daughter, he takes care of her half the time and she's in daycare or preschool half the time. And we'll do the same thing with this guy [baby in her arms during the interview] so he's got sort of half time involvement in his career or university, so we talked about that in advance. So that's how I do it, that's how I was able to do it.

Patricia also has a spouse at home who assumes child care responsibilities. However, she enlists the help of her sister and can afford to hire a woman full time to care for her two children.

I think my husband is very proud of me. He has two Masters ... but he hasn't been able to find a teaching job here. ... That was hard at first ... it was a source of conflict in terms of who was going to take care of the baby. He thought he would do it for a year, but he found he didn't enjoy it at all. And it turned out to be an awful lot more work than he thought it was, which isn't a surprise. So we made other arrangements. ... Actually as they [the children] get older, he gets better; he has a harder time with the babies.

To recap, there are exceptions to this phenomenon, since some untenured women academics do have children even at the present time. These women cite their non-traditional marriages as the main reason for having children prior to tenure. Other factors may also have influenced Patricia's and Carol's decisions to have children before tenure. For instance, both of them are in faculties where feminism has taken root; therefore, they indicate the existence of support from other female colleagues. Both women have also taken maternity leave and they are considering extending the tenure clock by one year. These are benefits to which many senior women had no access. I asked Carol: "If you didn't have a husband who could [care for the children], would you still have had kids?" She replied: "Not now, later, after I had tenure because this period is pretty stressful." Furthermore, it is interesting to note that none of the young assistant professors in this study had children earlier in life as they underwent university studies.

Acknowledging the Female Life Course

I believe that the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon* is a direct result of the fact that the career path for senior and junior women academics has not undergone any significant change. Over the years women academics have been tailoring their personal lives to fit their professional lives. For example, of the eleven older women in this study (these women fall into the category of being in the childbearing years of twenty-five or older before 1985) six speak of having had May babies, one had no children, two had children as students and delayed their careers, and two waited to have children after they became full professors. These numbers should be considered in light of the fact that those women who had May babies also tell stories of attending Women's Caucus meetings before 1985 and discovering

much to their surprise that “all” (word used by the women) of the junior women at the time were trying to have babies in the month of May. In their perspective this phenomenon seemed to be widespread at the university.

Of the six young assistant professors, three speak of hoping to have post-tenure babies (two of these women are in the science field), two have children but also have stay-at-home spouses, and one has one child and would like to have another but has been advised by the women in her department to wait until she receives tenure. Of the young associate professors both had children and both were denied tenure until their appeal. The women’s stories reveal that while in the past untenured women academics avoided having babies during the academic year, at present women academics, especially in the sciences but also to a lesser extent in the other faculties, avoid having babies prior to tenure. This difference in the timing of pregnancy between older and younger women occurs for much the same reason: they are attempting to adapt to the male life course which sets the taken for granted parameters of the academic career. Some might call this form of adaptation merely a way of “balancing family and work.” Yet, how can they realistically balance the intricacies of life within a “life course” that does not belong to them?

In different ways both senior and junior women attempt to accomplish this difficult feat of balancing their lives. In the past women who were intentionally pushing their biological clocks (delaying pregnancy) into their late twenties and thirties were virtually unheard of; instead, delaying their careers for their children and thereby deferring tenure was a more common practice. Below, Irene’s words illustrate this point.

In my case when I had my first child I was twenty-seven which now seems relatively young, but at the time when I was in the hospital, we had this, you know, bunch of people in the ward, and they said ‘how old are you Ingrid?’, ‘seventeen’, ‘how old are you Jane?’, ‘twenty’, ‘how old are you Mary?’, ‘nineteen’, ‘how old are you

Irene?’, ‘twenty-seven’, ‘oh, come on, how old are you really.’ [Laughter] Because I was, you know, presumably well past the point at twenty-seven they would have thought... [I]n that era, there were a lot of women that would have been having their first child at seventeen. ... [I]f that was the choice you made, to have your first child at seventeen, you obviously weren't going to get into graduate school, so there were people who eventually deferred that and they came back and did stuff later when they were fifty. But the people that I knew they would probably defer having their children until, you know, late twenties.

On the other hand, at present, with the advent of new medical technology in the area of fertility, women are more likely to push the biological clock and have children in their thirties or even forties. During my interview with Vivian I asked her: “Relative to your female colleagues what do you think about the amount of time it took you to progress from Assistant to Associate Professor?” She replied that she is at the “tail end” of rank progression because most of her women colleagues have had post-tenure children. Despite this slower pace she feels secure with the choices she made regarding the timing of her children’s births because she does not have to worry about being too old to have children. Nor does she have to worry about whether or not she is able to have a second child due to a decline in fertility, which corresponds with an increase in age.

Most of my colleagues had children after they got tenure. They didn't do it the same way I did, but I wouldn't change what I did, I mean I see all sorts of people not being able to have children, you know ... they've left it so their biological clocks have just about ticked right out. I wouldn't change what I did.

In other words, given the choice of extending the tenure clock by one year for the birth of a child or trying to stretch the biological clock by a number of years to secure tenure prior to having children, women are more likely to choose the latter. This choice is based on at least two factors. Some women feel that the extra year added to the tenure clock for the birth of a baby is insufficient time to permit the attainment of tenure. Others believe that there is no real choice; rather, the choice is predetermined since the academic profession through tenure

limits the number of years that one can prove herself fit to be an academic and adds only one extra year for the birth of a child during that time. In contrast, the medical profession through advanced technology now provides a woman with the possibility of a longer time span in which to become a mother thereby allowing her to pursue her career goals first. Unfortunately, that longer time span often involves a large consumption of time and money on infertility treatments because of the higher risk of infertility over the age of thirty-five.⁶ Other risks of increased maternal age are chromosomal abnormality in the newborn baby (Creasy and Resnick 1994) and miscarriage (Gindoff and Jewelewicz 1986). Bridget, a young associate professor, and Cynthia, a young assistant professor, speak to each of the above two beliefs, respectively.

I think, I went up [for tenure] after six years and then ... because of a maternity leave, I was potentially eligible for an additional year's extension, which I did not want to take. I was exhausted. ... I didn't have journal articles like in the process that, if I waited a year and they got published, it would make or break my CV. (Bridget)

I mean if you really think about child raising, the hard part is the pregnancy and giving birth, which is really one year and that shouldn't make or break a person's career. ... [I]f you want to get into societal infertility, I mean look at the society as a whole, look at what we've done. We've made it very difficult for women to have children, ... so women delay having children so that they can have their career and then they are infertile because they've waited so long. So then you come up with all these infertility clinics, all those infertility drugs, billions of dollars spent to try to get women to have babies. Why not take all that money, put it into daycare early on so that women in graduate school could have children? (Cynthia)

In other words, according to Cynthia a woman's need for infertility treatments due to age would be virtually unnecessary if the professions were more accepting of, and accommodating to, women with young children. Below, she continues with her story:

When you look ... in the forties during the war they were trying to get women to work in factories so they had daycare paid for by the factory. Women had the option of buying a cheap dinner to take home when they picked up their child. I mean that was fifty years ago and we are nowhere near doing that. It's not set up for us to be successful on many levels.

Conclusion

The experiences of senior women academics serve to identify the difficulties of having children before securing their careers. In turn, these stories are passed on to junior women academics from their predecessors in the form of what I call messages. Some of the young women professors take these messages to heart for they are wanting to have children but they are unwilling to take time away from work by interrupting their careers for child care or using benefits such as extending the tenure clock. They view other women having pre-tenure children who end up filing appeals to obtain tenure and they conclude that having post-tenure children is safer.

In spite of some of the exceptions to the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon*, the fact remains that in the past many senior women academics hid their pre-tenure pregnancies and more recently many junior women academics hide their desire to have children until after they are tenured. Hence, the *May Baby Phenomenon* has become the *Post-Tenure Baby Phenomenon*. In addition, as in the past, women academics today continue to hide their pregnancy during job interviews. I refer to all of the above situations as the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon*. At least part of the reason for this hidden pregnancy phenomenon is the way in which benefits for pregnant women academics are viewed. In the past those benefits did not exist and women feared requesting time off for their special circumstances. At present, benefits such as maternity leave and adding a year to the tenure clock still exclude some women and some women fear taking advantage of those benefits. One of the reasons women may not want an extra year before tenure is that colleagues' expectations concerning their productivity may increase. This perception extends from the ambiguity that surrounds tenure; that is, "how much is enough" in terms of publications is mystified. Moreover, that

fear of taking advantage of those benefits remains grounded in the same rationale as in the past, that the women will be perceived as having a lesser commitment to their careers and a greater commitment to their children. In turn, this perception is based on the underlying view that unequally distributed benefits provide a form of privileged opportunity for some groups of people who would otherwise be unqualified to perform a certain occupation. In other words, opponents believe that extending benefits to a select group, such as women academics with children, is not based on the meritocratic system; whereas proponents view the two (benefits and merit) as separate entities. It is this negative perception of benefits combined with the unclear criteria surrounding tenure and volume of publications that I believe underlies the *Hidden Pregnancy Phenomenon* and impedes change in this area. Put simply, this phenomenon persists because the academic profession does not allow women a significantly different career path than the standard one developed around the male life course.

Endnotes

- 1 Some women academics may choose not to have children in order to focus on their career or for other reasons, but that was not the case for the women in this study.
- 2 As the women told their stories, it became apparent that the younger women professors received messages about the lives of their female colleagues either through the grapevine or by observing and communicating with older women academics.
- 3 I use the term “older” to refer to those women academics in this study who are above the age of 42 (i.e., ages 43 to 60); and the term “younger” includes those women below the age of 42 (i.e., ages 30 to 41). I make this distinction not to imply that some women are old and others are young but rather because the women above the age of 42 have been academics for a longer period of time than those below that age. The so-called “younger” women are mostly assistant professors and a couple have just become associate professors. These women either have young children or speak of the possibility of having pre-tenure or post-tenure children. The “older” women are mostly associate and full professors, however, there are a few that are assistant professors and have been in that position for a long period of time or have entered the profession later in life. Many of these women have teenage or adult children. Only one full professor in this study indicates that she is not married and has no children (instead she is currently in a long term relationship); however, she notes that this was not an actual choice that she made but simply a result of the way her life proceeded.

4 I use the term “junior” to refer to assistant professors and the term “senior” to refer to both associate and full professors.

5 The *May-baby phenomenon* is related to the typical academic year in this and many other Canadian universities. Professors begin their normal teaching schedule in September, have a three-week teaching break in December and resume teaching in early January until April. Only a few select courses are taught during the spring and summer months and not all professors teach such courses. Usually spring and summer months are reserved for research purposes. Those months provided some of the women in this study with a “window of opportunity” to have children without taking time away from their normal teaching schedule.

6 Senrono Laboratories (1997) has compiled a booklet of information about the increased risk of infertility above the age of 35 and the treatment options available to women.

Chapter Seven

Career and Children:

Finding Inequities Thought to be Extinct

Introduction

In just a few simple words Vivian captures part of the essence of this chapter: “being a woman is like having a career.” The women academics with children consistently point out that caring for children means being responsible twenty-four hours a day. That responsibility does not diminish when the mother changes roles and becomes the professor. By the same token women academics do not forget about their job when they arrive home. Having two demanding careers, that is, professorship and motherhood, makes it problematic for women with children in the academic profession. In this chapter I address two fundamental questions: What are the inequities that women perceive to be related to combining childrearing and an academic career? How do they resist those inequities?

Inequities associated with having both children and an academic career are subtle. While they can be defined as part of what we know as the “chilly climate” for women in universities, relevant details are not found in that literature. Rather the chilly climate

literature focuses on issues of “stereotyping, devaluation, exclusion, and victimization” (Wylie, 1995). The category of “stereotyping” is probably the closest match to the inequities described by the women in this study. However, that category is broad in the literature for it includes all forms of gender stereotyping without specifically identifying career-child inequities. The “chilly climate” category of “devaluation” also has some relevance to the inequities I discuss, but that category focuses primarily on issues of harassment and competence, and neglects the notion of devaluation of other forms of work that women academics perform. Hence, the purpose of this chapter is to identify career-child¹ related inequities and place them in specific categories. While career-child inequities can be included under the chilly climate categories of stereotyping and devaluation, I have assigned them categories of their own in order to encourage a broader recognition of such issues.

In the first section I present three categories of career-child related inequities that women perceive, namely: *sacrifices*, *risks*, and *differences*. *Sacrifices* refer to the perceived sacrifices that these women academics make either for their careers or for their children. *Risks* imply the perceived riskiness of having children before attaining a tenured position. *Differences* constitute the perceived differences between the work that women and men do, which is exemplified in the discrepancies in their work record, time, and ethics. Section two shows the ways in which women academics tend to resist some of the above inequities. The need for eliminating career-child inequities in order to facilitate the daily lives of women academics is stated clearly in Natalie’s comment, “It’s no great surprise to say that the main thing that’s a big factor in the lives of female academics who also have young children is just to take that as the overwhelming issue.”

Perceiving Career-Child Related Inequities

A number of authors find that women academics encounter inequities related to issues of family commitment and career development (Cooney and Uhlenberg 1989; Davis and Astin 1990; Caplan 1993; Johnsrud and Des Jarlais 1994; Finkel and Olswong 1996). These inequities focus primarily on child care responsibilities and their negative impact on career progression. For example, some studies show that women academics receive little help from their partners in handling family responsibilities (Hensel 1991; Smart and Smart 1990), that women academics with young children produce fewer publications than their male colleagues (Cole and Zukerman 1984; Kyvick 1990), and that women academics are more likely than men to reject a job offer to accommodate family needs (Teevan et al 1992). Family commitments also tend to reduce the options which these women have for taking study leave and attending conferences (Romanin and Over 1993). Women are more likely than men to abandon the academy to care for children (Chused 1985; Hensel 1991). The women academics in this study perceive numerous inequities related to having children and working to build an academic career. I have grouped these inequities into three categories: *sacrifices, risks, and differences.*

Women's Sacrifices

One *sacrifice* which the women in this study identify is that the profession, which still operates along the mandates of a male perspective, requires women to make several difficult choices about combining the prospects of having children with the pursuit of a career. Women must decide whether they are willing to work inordinately long hours to satisfy the demands of career and family or whether they will prioritize in favor of one or the other. The

issue of prioritization involves choices such as delaying, interrupting, or abandoning one's career versus delaying childbirth (see Chapter Six) or remaining childless. For example, Bridget notes that men are not required to entertain the possibility of being childless or of having post-tenure children in order to succeed in a career.²

Men don't realize the sacrifices that women are inadvertently asked to make when they embark on careers in academics particularly. Because if men were asked to be childless, would they accept that? In effect, I didn't take this road, I chose to have my children, but I know several personal friends, one of whom had an abortion when she was pre-tenure because she felt she couldn't cope. Another two individuals who delayed having their children until they were post-tenure. ... I don't feel that the men would opt either not to have families or to postpone their wives having babies. I just feel that often the sacrifices that women have to make are fairly high; sacrifices that men don't make. You look at even the number of children that the men would have versus women ... I wouldn't be surprised if there's at least a one child differential.

Studies show that women academics are more likely to remain single and childless compared to their male counterparts and other women (of the same age) in the general population (Simeone 1987; Committee on the Status of Women 1988; Caplan 1993; Duxbury et al. 1993). Nancy Hensel (1991) finds that in the US almost half the women staying in academe remain single and childless and other women leave the academy due to family-related commitments. Similarly, Teresa Cooney and Peter Uhlenberg (1989) show that 31 percent of white women faculty between the ages of 35 and 39 are childless and 44 percent between the ages of 30 and 34 are childless. The women in this study can be differentiated from the general population of women academics on the grounds that most of them either already have children or are planning to have children. Of the nineteen women in this study, only four are childless and three of these women are young, assistant professors who report that they would like to have children at some point in the not so distant future.

The women also speak of inequities in the form of the *sacrifices* that they make either for their children or career. Pamela and Madeleine, both associate professors, mention that when

their children were young they prioritized in favor of their children rather than their careers. For Pamela, her “children came first” because in those days she envisioned her work as “a job or a position instead of a career,” and therefore she began working full-time when her youngest child was in kindergarten. Similarly, Madeleine indicates that she prioritized in favor of her young children in her early career years. She states, “... that was not right. If I had it to do over again, it would be different.” I asked, “How have your family responsibilities impacted on your career?” She replied, “I would have to say negatively ... they are always on your mind.” Audrey, a senior assistant professor who interrupted her career for childrearing purposes, states that unlike men, women tend to make sacrifices in their careers for their children.³

Men tend to have wives who look after the family even if they're working. ... Whereas the women, in order to move ahead, usually there has to be some sacrifices that have to be made within family or home. I've had to make sacrifices in my career ... and I'm not sure that I'm unhappy about them although at this stage in my career given the economic climate I realize I'm very vulnerable [in an untenured position]. I think that if you want a really high powered career you have to be willing to give up a lot of your personal life. And if you want a really wonderful personal life, you have to be willing to give up something in your career. And it's hard to find a happy medium level that will allow you to be successful in both. I think the super Mom kind of thing has been a myth and I think it's done a terrible disservice to women. Because they think that they can have it all without giving up anything. I think that while there are some men who have become very supportive and excellent partners who really do share, I think that there's still very strong evidence that males do not carry their full share of the personal burden. So I think that women pay with their time.

Some US studies find that women are more likely than men to abandon the academy to care for children (Chused 1985; Hensel 1991; McElrath 1992). Karen McElrath notes that women academics may subordinate their professional careers to those of their partner by accepting part-time research or teaching positions, and/or interrupting their careers, which

reduces their probability of obtaining tenure. The primary reason women academics “subordinate” their careers is to assume childrearing responsibilities.

Even those women who do not interrupt their careers speak of the sacrifices that they make by combining an academic career with motherhood. Vivian, a young associate professor, notes that the notion of spending quality time with your children is a myth because children want as much of your time as possible. She too has prioritized in favor of her children.

... my first priority has always been and always will be my kids and so ... when I first started working, I didn't do as much research as people who don't have kids. ... There's been certainly an increase over time but ... I didn't go up for tenure until the end because I knew that I would be stronger at the end. ... Although within our Department there is sympathy for having kids, within the faculty, especially with people who have been here a long time, there isn't ... [According to those colleagues] you get there on the basis of your record and that's it and it doesn't matter ... how you have to divide your time up, ... you make a choice, that's the attitude that they have here, and I mean I can buy that, but my choice was that my kids come first because I didn't have them not to have them. You see I don't believe in quality time, I think that's the biggest myth that's been put on people. Kids don't give a damn about quality time, they want quantity time.

Natalie, an associate professor, points out that for about ten years, while her children were young, she was “seriously sleep deprived.” Her spouse, also a professor, was working at a university out-of-town. Therefore, she functioned as a single parent while simultaneously attempting to establish her career.

When the children were little, it was very hard for me because he [spouse] would be gone for three or four days in the middle of the week and so in terms of getting the kids to daycare, covering when they were sick, everything, you know, it was mine to do... I could only get about 5 hours of sleep [each night]. At the same time [as] you're trying to get tenure, at the same time [as] you're trying to get yourself established; ... you have small children at home and nobody to help out, neither of us has family anywhere near. ... [The children] are now just finishing grade 5 and grade 8. It makes a big difference that they're old enough to be home by themselves for a little while. If I don't make it home you know exactly at four o'clock, the world doesn't fall apart. I think that was the hard thing when they were younger was that your schedule is a house of cards. You have everything very carefully planned and

everything depends upon the thing before having gone right and as soon as one little part of it [laughing] doesn't work out perfectly, your schedule collapses. And that was quite difficult when they were young and when I didn't have much job security and was exhausted all the time. But just the fact that they can fend for themselves for an hour or two at the end of the day, just the fact that if they are mildly sick but not miserable, you know, they can stay home in bed and I can phone and check on them, it makes a huge difference.

Cynthia is a married, young assistant professor who is planning a future which includes children. She believes that she can “have it all” by not delaying her career for her children; yet she admits that she is unwilling to put all of her efforts into her career if that means sacrificing a family life. Instead, in order to have both a career and children, she is more willing to sacrifice a few career related achievements.

Certainly the health of my husband ... [and] children, a relationship with my husband ... [and] children, I would say come before my job but I think I can have it all. ... I think I can keep this good job and have a good family. Certainly I wouldn't put the job before everything. Like I have this picture of myself at the age of sixty with a stack of three hundred papers I've published and maybe a couple of awards and no family and no life and that I would never want to happen. I'd rather have a stack of half the number of papers and no awards and have a husband and have children and have a life.

Patricia, an assistant professor, notes that having children means that she has been unable to have much of an impact in her position. Thus, some of her career goals have been postponed for the sake of the children.

... with having had two kids in four years, I don't really think the Department has fully felt ... my impact as a feminist, or a person who, you know, is willing to sort of put those values and beliefs into practice... So sometimes ... my husband will say 'that Department won't know what hit it, once you get tenure, if you ever have some time to ... do something.' I'd like to let them know who I really am, [but] that takes a lot of time.

Having two children, Patricia says, makes her an “average” academic rather than a very successful one, but she is a “very good mother.”

I made a conscious choice to have these kids early, and the reason was I wanted the option of having a big family. ... I know that it has, put me on a completely different

path,... [in that] I'm used to being really productive, I'm used to being ... one of the top graduate students in terms of performing, and I fully would have expected to have been like a hot shot young academic if I hadn't had kids. So in a way it's been hard to take, being like this average woman. But I made that choice and ... if I had to do it over, I would still do it over because of how important those kids are to me. ... I have it set up so that when [Jody's] three, if I want another baby I'm still young enough and I can, so I did that on purpose.

I asked her, "Why did you say average woman?" She replied, "I'm a very good mother and I think I'm really an average academic with a lot of potential ... That's how I see it and I think if I didn't have kids, I'd be really good."

Career Risks

Another way in which women academics perceive inequities related to children and career is by speaking of pregnancy as a *risk* factor which may impede career progression or success. That factor is the *risk* that women associate with having children prior to tenure.⁴ In the previous chapter we saw that full and associate professors who had children before 1985 referred to pre-tenure babies as May babies. It was risky in career terms to have children at any other time than spring or summer and they were planned that way. For assistant professors currently in their childbearing years, there is still a certain amount of anxiety associated with the timing of pregnancy. They would rather have post-tenure children, if possible, and avoid the risk to their career progression. Nonetheless, there is a difference in the way in which this inequity is understood by older and younger women academics. Some of the full and associate professors believe that maternity leave plans and policies such as adding a year to the tenure clock have enabled many younger women to have pre-tenure babies. For instance, Irene's view is that:

... the clock stops ... I think that's a very important part of making it more possible for women not to have to make that choice ... between love and career. ... Now we have

a generation of people ... who don't expect that they have to live a cloistered life and dedicate their whole thing to scholarship on the one hand or they can have a family, but they can't do both. It's very difficult to do both but at least you don't have to rule it out.

In fact, the perceptions of younger women closely match those of their predecessors on the subject of risking pregnancy prior to tenure. While it is true to say that younger women no longer feel forced to control and plan their fertility quite as carefully as the older women have done, it is also true that young assistant professors believe that the new policies related to tenure and children are insufficient to alleviate the risk to their careers by having pre-tenure children. This point was demonstrated in the previous chapter through the words of some of the younger women academics. In other words, pregnancy prior to tenure was viewed as a risky matter in the past and still is perceived in that way by many women at the present time.

Unfair Differences

Still another way in which women academics perceive inequities related to combining childrearing and a demanding career is by comparing their work, in the form of *record, time, and ethics* relative to that of their male counterparts; in turn those *differences* are seen as unfair. Sandra Acker and Grace Feuerverger (1996) also find that women academics tend to compare their work with that of their male colleagues and perceive injustices in those comparisons. Most of the women academics in my study, regardless of their rank, mentioned that it is this difference between the work that women do and the work that men do that constitutes an inequity. For instance, Paula, a full professor, notes that her publication *record* differs from her male colleagues as a direct result of childrearing. Paula has had both older

stepchildren in her early career and her own biological children after she gained the status of full professor.

I think my publication record is pretty good but I think it's trickier than men, connected to when I've had children. I've paid a price for having a family which I don't think ... my male colleagues have. So I can certainly identify weaker parts of my CV and link them to when I had children. The first year particularly. It puts a dent in the time that you have and if I recall the first few years of working I happened to marry someone who already had children but they were of school age and I worked a lot of extra hours and I think that is how you get publications, especially at the beginning, you just work a lot and when you then have young children it's just difficult to continue working at that level. You don't have the time available. ... But there's no question I think ... [there] is a different level of responsibility between men and women toward children.

Nancy, an assistant professor, also notes differences in publication records between herself and a comparable male colleague.

I have a junior male faculty member who is five years ahead of me and I can't imagine having published as much as he has when I'm at his point. But I think that he's also made choices not to spend time with his family, not to participate in childrearing and care so that he has had time available that I will not have. So in that sense, yes, I probably will publish less than he has published.

Women academics with children point out that they have less *time* than their male counterparts to devote to their research in particular, when their children are young, which in turn has an impact on their publication record. We saw in the previous chapter that Bridget, an associate professor, believes that quality, not quantity, of publications should equal excellence for women with young children because she, a mother of three children, could juggle her schedule with that of child care facilities only by working a maximum of forty-five hours per week. Below she describes her tenure process and her perception of the Chair's attitude toward her work.

I think he was unable to look at productivity from a different point of view and accept that there's really a huge philosophical difference between quality and quantity. Quantity is so easily measured that it is easy to fall into that trap. I had maybe half the number of publications as the men who were going up so my portfolio appeared

weak. However, ... if you were to do a search and look through the number of [professors in this field] who had ever published in premier journals ... men or women, you would only find three in Canada who had ever published in the top quality journals, ... I being one of them. So I have very strong publications, very high quality, but I didn't have the volume.

In my interviews, many women mentioned that they consider themselves to be perfectionists, in the sense that they will not submit an article for publication unless they view it as an excellent piece of work. Bridget is one of these women; however, she believes that the high quality she emphasizes in her work is not valued to the same degree as quantity of publications. If women do in fact put a great deal of time and effort into each publication to the betterment of quality and detriment of quantity, then the work that they do can be considered undervalued even in this sense. As Bridget puts it, "The fact that I was up there competing with two hundred years of ... history in publishing in these journals, ... it's not quantified, I guess so I found it wasn't valued." Additionally, Bridget believes there are other ways that women show dedication to their work other than producing publications. Even while on maternity leave she supervised graduate students and served on committees. She notes: "At the ... time we were going through a lot of appointments. We were expanding the program and so I continued in an informal capacity on the appointments committee so I would come in for meetings of that every two weeks or so." This type of dedication also appears to be undervalued in the tenure process.

The large amount of committee work that women do due to their under-representation in the profession is another area which requires greater recognition. Lauren, who does an enormous amount of such work, notes that "it is really time consuming." She is the only woman in her department and there are very few women in Faculty of Science as a whole. Therefore she is asked to sit on committees often but she wonders if it is her personal

contribution that they are interested in or simply the fact that they need a female representative. If her latter assumption is true then her committee work is undervalued on two levels: 1) it has no merit for promotion purposes, and 2) it is perceived as an obligation rather than a worthy contribution.

Teaching is another area which is undervalued for tenure and promotion; however, some women would prefer to do more teaching than research. Nancy would like to teach a women's studies course but she has been informed by her female colleagues that it is unwise to do so before tenure. She points out, "Whatever contributions you make to curriculum or ... cross disciplines ... are simply not recognized ... it's very risky to take on that kind of teaching burden when it won't count in any way towards your promotion."

Women academics also advise and supervise more students than men due to their low representation in the profession and the fact that women students are concentrated in some disciplines. Ellen states, "I do more counseling than most men, just by virtue of being a woman." This is another area which is excluded in tenure and promotion decisions.

There is some evidence in the literature that women academics believe they have less time to devote to their careers than their male colleagues. Linda Duxbury and her colleagues (1993) in their Carlton University study on work and family find that women academics devote more time to home chores and child care and they have less leisure time than their male colleagues. Women also report that they have less time for research and teaching than men. Overall the women are more likely than men to experience a "work-family conflict" which results from assuming the multiple roles of worker, spouse, and parent. According to Duxbury et al. (p. 8): "Each of these roles imposes demands on the incumbents requiring time, energy and commitment to perform the role adequately. The cumulative demands of

multiple roles can result in role strain of two types: overload and interference.” The women academics are more likely than male academics to experience work overload, and to report that their careers interfere with (and are limited by) their family roles.

Most of the women academics in this study perceive the meaning of their work *ethic* as being different from that of their male colleagues. Rachel and Cynthia, both assistant professors, mention how work is different for their male colleagues because they do not have to address any of the issues related to pregnancy and children combined with a career: such as when to have children, how much time to take off from work, who will care for the children, and so on.

I wish it was ... easier for a ... person to take a little bit more time off ... to have children, or to be with their children and not have to worry about picking up their career again. One of the things that I would worry about is if I take a year off, I couldn't give up the research because that would hurt the career. If you haven't done research for a year that means you don't have any papers being published, you're taking yourself out of other people's eyes, and you're not supervising students. It takes time to rebuild a research program: make sure you have a constant flow of students, [and] a constant flow of projects. If you're going to take a year off and stop doing that [work], ... by the time you come back you have to rebuild again and you don't want to do that. You don't want to do it. (Rachel)

It does make me angry when I think about how easy so many men have it. ... [W]hen I look at my male colleagues and they aren't addressing any of these [career-child related] issues at all. They just don't have to worry about it and it's frustrating. (Cynthia)

Additionally, Bridget identifies an unwillingness on the part of some academics to accept change or the *different meaning in ethics* and responsibilities that women bring to the profession. For instance, when Bridget served on committees during her maternity leave she found that, “there was the odd member who, you know, wasn’t entirely happy with the idea that they would be at a university meeting and they would have a child breast-feeding in the same room.”

Resisting Career-Child Related Inequities

We will see that the women in this study resist the view that upward mobility and the attainment of power are incompatible with motherhood which is commonly identified with the notion of a lower level of career commitment. Sari Knopp Biklen (1995: 25) states, "A woman's career commitment is measured by the amount of time she devotes to work as opposed to family." Career commitment consists of two components: long-term commitment or the length of time for which a woman expects to pursue her career goals; and short-term commitment which provides a means of distinguishing between careers and jobs. Whereas jobs are defined by specific hours, say nine-to-five, careers overlap these time frames and require one to complete the designated work regardless of time considerations. Biklen (p. 40) points out that the school teachers in her study "resisted framing their lives to fit social science definitions; for example, they refused to visualize the bearing and nurturing of children as signifying a lack of career commitment."

I define the act of resisting career-child related inequities in much the same way as Nadya Aisenberg and Mona Harrington (1988) describe resisting "old norms." In their study, the "old norms" say that women academics must choose between a family and a career; those who resist manage to combine both of these experiences in their lives. Similarly, most of the women in my study resist career-child related inequities which consist of inequities corresponding to choosing between pursuing an academic career or raising children; inequities associated with the career-related *risk* of having children prior to tenure; and inequities derived from the *differences* in the work that women and men do. The way in which they resist and sometimes overcome those inequities is by choosing to have both

children and a career, by having pre-tenure children, and by demonstrating that the work that women do should be valued.

Resisting Sacrifices

One of the ways in which women resist *unfair sacrifices* is by refusing to prioritize between a career and children but instead sharing their time between these two life experiences. Carol is one who resists this form of inequity by demonstrating behavior which differs from the norm. For instance, during the interview Carol's three-month-old baby was present. Apparently she brings the baby with her to work a few days per week and walks the carriage up and down the hallway in order to quiet the crying baby. In fact, I watched her carrying out that particular activity during the interview. Her colleagues' offices are located by the hallway and none of them complain about the crying baby; rather, they inquire about the baby's whereabouts when Carol does not bring him to the office. For some women, taking their small children to work permits them to have the flexibility and piece of mind required to successfully balance career and family life.

Another factor which permits these women to resist *sacrifices* is that most of those who are married (with the exception of two) tend to be involved in non-traditional relationships. Both Carol and Patricia mention their non-traditional marriages as contributing factors which enable them to have pre-tenure children and still be successful at their careers. Their spouses are at home and assume the role of primary caregiver for their children. Parson et al. (1992:16) in their United States study also show that "the primary source of support for faculty was a spouse or significant other." Carol states that the reason she was able to have pre-tenure children is because her spouse assumes most of the child care responsibilities. In

the interview I asked for clarification: "You mentioned that to him (spouse), that you would only have children if he would take care of them?" She replied: "Yes, and you know, he does." I probed further: "But you have the baby today so would you say that you share the child care arrangement fifty/fifty or does he do more?" She stated: "He does more." "How much more?" "Right now it's tricky because he's still so little, but he probably does seventy/thirty."

A final way in which these women resist sacrifices is by acknowledging that they will have more time for their career once their children are older. In this sense they believe that the time that they devote to their young children will eventually become time devoted to their career; hence the two are evenly balanced.

Resisting Childbearing Inequities

An important point about women's abilities to resist *the notion of May babies or post-tenure babies* is that their success is dependent on their particular rank and faculty.

Differences Among Ranks

Some of the untenured women are only partially successful at resisting *inequities related to the timing of childbirth*. Bridget's tenure story is a good example of the consequences of having children before achieving tenure. She begins by explaining how she found the expectations for tenure difficult to accept: "The fact that for tenure ... everything you do has to be excellent and I don't find that compatible with the human experience." She is now an associate professor in a professional school. In the end, Bridget won her appeal for tenure, but she also lost her faith in the system and experienced personal trauma.

By the end of it all I had quite a full case of clinical depression. I took a sabbatical immediately and went away as far away as I could ... to kind of help recuperate from

the process, but it took its toll. I was probably only depressed for about six months. I didn't realize that my signs and symptoms were depression. It wasn't until after the fact when I started going to a self-help group that I realized that I was depressed ... I might have gone to a group much earlier had I realized ... you see it had affected all of my thought processes and it comes on rather slowly and insidiously so you don't even realize that it's happening. So over a year's time I slowly but surely had been transformed from a very positive individual to a very negative individual. But it wasn't until the last six months that I started to get a bit more physically ill. Most of it was lack of appetite, difficulty sleeping, nausea and vomiting when I came to work. I was always fine at home in the morning. And it was not until I actually got in the building that it would strike me.

Vivian is another young woman academic and mother who was recently denied tenure. She appealed that decision but during the appeal process her reputation was discredited by her colleagues. She heard gossip which implied that she would receive tenure despite her alleged incompetence because her spouse held the rank of full professor at that same university. As she puts it, "Oh, people would just say, '[Tim her spouse] is fairly well known around the University, and, you know, so she'll probably get it anyway.' Okay, then why did you have to put me through all that?"

Those junior women who resist inequities by combining children and a career prior to obtaining tenure (rather than choosing one or the other) and do not anticipate problems over tenure are the exception rather than the rule. Recall that Carol and Patricia (see previous chapter) are young assistant professors who feel comfortable with their decisions to have had children before tenure and although they have not yet undergone the tenure process, they both are confident that they will eventually obtain tenured positions. There are mitigating factors which permit them to have pre-tenure children and still expect to be successful in their tenure attempts. One such factor is that their spouses assume primary childrearing duties.

It is important to note that women academics are more likely to successfully resist childbearing inequities *after* they are established in a tenured position; that is, they are willing to show their desire to have children. For instance, Janice notes that her pre-tenure child was a May baby but her post-tenure child was a December baby. Additionally, as we saw earlier, two of the senior women had their children after they became full professors without harboring concerns about their careers. In contrast, some of the more senior women who had children prior to receiving tenure kept their pregnancies hidden; and the junior women indicate that they would rather wait until after they obtain tenured positions in order to have children.

Differences Among Faculties

Both of the young women with children in the faculties of Arts and Social Sciences, Carol and Patricia, believe they will receive tenure and eventually promotion to the level of full professor. The other two junior women in the same faculties have similar expectations. An important factor that serves to explain such expectations for career success is that these women tend to be in departments where issues of feminism are recognized and other women academics are supportive. Carol mentions that the woman who is Chair of the department has two children and represents a good role model for junior women such as herself. Having a woman Chair who is sympathetic to women's issues probably makes a difference in this department. Carol further notes that many of her colleagues within the department support feminist scholarship and are accepting of behaviors which differ from the norm. Patricia also points out that her colleagues in the department recognize feminist issues and her own particular strength in that area. As she puts it: "I think that there are people in the Department that recognize that one of the things that I bring to the Department, is a ... gender

analysis and they see that as an advantage.” On the other hand, the junior women in the Faculty of Science are reluctant to have pre-tenure children for fear of not receiving tenure. In the professional schools one of the junior women is reluctant to have pre-tenure children and the other has pre-tenure children but has been an assistant professor for 18 years. We begin to see a distinction among faculties which is even more apparent in the stories of the tenured women.

All of the women associate professors in the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences who were interviewed have had pre-tenure children and most of them (with the exception of Vivian) expect to receive promotion in due course. The women associate professors in the Faculty of Science, both of whom had pre-tenure children, believe that they are unlikely to reach the level of full professor; namely, Janice with one pre-tenure and one post-tenure child and Madeleine with three pre-tenure children. Janice and Madeleine both cite their publication record as the reason behind the above belief. When I asked Janice, “What are your expectations for achieving full professor,” she replied:

Not great... [this] University has very high standards for full professor and I don't know if I'll ever get there.... In the Faculty of Science my impression is they want somebody who is a world class scholar with above average scholarship funding for that discipline in the country, basically they want stars with very long publication records.

Janice was the first woman in the Faculty of Science at that University to have a pre-tenure child and receive tenure. She had no role models. Similarly, the junior women in that faculty only have a few role models at the present time. In the professional schools the two associate professors with pre-tenure children do not believe that they will reach the level of full professor. Field of study therefore seems to play a role in increasing or decreasing inequities for women with pre-tenure children. Women in the Faculties of Arts and Social

Science seem to be more likely to resist and overcome career-child related inequities in that they are more likely to have pre-tenure children and still receive promotion. Therefore, the level of resistance required by the women in these faculties appears to be of a smaller magnitude than that needed by the women in the Faculty of Science or professional schools.

Resisting Unfair Differences

One way in which women can resist *unfair differences* is if they are financially capable of having full-time help to care for their babies at home. Patricia describes her view of combining childrearing and career as follows.

...when I come up for tenure I want to be able to look back and say, 'you spent a lot of time with your kids, so you were a good Mum. You spent as many hours as you could at your job, and you did your best.' And so, if you don't get it then you are meant to do something else. And it was my choice to have the kids when I had them, so, probably, it would have been much easier had I not. I figure it took two years to recuperate from the first baby, but this baby, I think I'll be back in September. ... I hired a wonderful woman whose coming in, and I think that in September, when [Jody's] nine months old, I'll be where I was when [Ann] was twenty months [that is] in terms of how my life is organized...

Another way in which women resist *unfair differences* is by demonstrating that the work which they perform (be it similar or different to that of their male colleagues) should be valued. For instance, Bridget and Vivian successfully appealed their tenure denial by emphasizing the value of quality of publications as opposed to quantity; and by pointing out the value of other work that women do such as teaching, advising and supervising students, and that a large amount of committee work deserves recognition.

Senior women academics have successfully demonstrated that excessive workload can be a deterrent to career progression, especially prior to tenure. Their efforts to reveal gender inequities in workload have made a difference in the lives of junior women assistant

professors who tell stories of the benefits which they reap from this change in workload. All five women who are junior assistant professors believe that their workload is either similar or lower than that of their colleagues. Rachel devotes about 10 percent of her time to committee work and she teaches the same number of courses as others in her department. She speaks of her colleagues' position on the issue of workload as follows: "They have this theory that assistant professors shouldn't be doing a lot of committee work. I think that in the grand scheme of things they believe that when you go up for tenure ... at the faculty level ... they care a little bit about administration but not that much." Cynthia indicates that she does very little teaching because the decision as to whether or not she receives tenure is entirely based on publishing papers and renewing grants. Regarding her colleagues she notes, "They have been treating me really well, they have protected my time from teaching so I can set up my lab." Carol notes that her workload is the same as that of her colleagues with one exception: she advises and supervises fewer students. Patricia mentions that although her workload is similar to that of other faculty members, after the birth of her child her committee work was further reduced so that she sat on only one committee. Martha points out that her teaching load is lighter than that of her colleagues: "this was in my contract ... so that I would have more opportunity to do research." The words of these women reveal some change surrounding the excessive workload obstacle.

Additionally, the women resist *unfair differences* by demonstrating that time spent with their children is important. For instance, they take their children to work, they pick-up their children from daycare at a reasonable hour, and they remain home when their children are ill. Some might argue that this shows a lack of commitment to their careers. But these women believe that such actions imply a commitment to both their children and work. For what

other reason would they perform the task of taking their children to and from daycare were it not to tend to their careers. At night, once their children are safely tucked in bed they continue with their academic work before providing themselves with a short night's sleep.

Resistance further becomes apparent in the women's behaviors as they demonstrate how they bring different responsibilities to work than their male colleagues. For instance, we can interpret Bridget's action of breast-feeding her baby during a committee meeting as an indication that neither responsibility can be neglected.

Conclusion

The women express a sense of unfairness or a belief that there is much injustice in the academic system since their male colleagues do not have to address the issues of balancing career and family. The superwoman syndrome is not one that these women uphold. Rather "having it all" is a myth because being both a mother and a professor requires *sacrificing* either a part of the personal or the professional life. We see that many of the women prioritized in favor of their young children and later once their children are older (about eleven years of age) they devote more time to their careers. Junior and senior women alike are reluctant to have pre-tenure children due to the anticipated *career risks*.

As a direct consequence of their responsibilities toward their young children the women identify *unfair differences* between their publication record and that of their male colleagues. While their children are young these women have less time for research and although they emphasize quality in their publications, quantity of publications seems to command greater value in the tenure and promotion process. Furthermore, the difference in ethics that some

women bring to the profession, due to their responsibilities towards their children, lacks understanding and recognition.

The women in this study can be said to be using subtle means of addressing these sometimes hidden career-child inequities. Each in her own way is making a difference. For instance, the single act of a woman breast feeding in a committee meeting or bringing a baby to the office will not stimulate change; however, the different acts of resistance initiated by a large number of women can create a recognition of issues specific to women academics and can begin the process of change.

In their own ways, these women resist *unjust sacrifices* by having both children and an academic career and by choosing non-traditional relationships where the spouse assumes at least an equal share in child care and other responsibilities. They also acknowledge that there are only a few years while their children are young and require the extra care. Unfortunately these childrearing years can correspond with the stage in which they are attempting to establish their careers. These years appear to undermine their career efforts.

Women academics are more likely to resist *career risks* after they are well established in tenured positions. Job security permits them to express their needs more openly and to pave the way for younger women to combine children and a career by instituting child friendly policies and welcoming junior women with children into the academic environment. The alternative is to resist inequities early on in the career by going ahead and having pre-tenure children despite the potential for a denial of tenure. Even those who appeal negative tenure decisions and win tend to lose to some extent because they can suffer depressions or scarred reputations. While some practices (related to the planning and timing of children and career) have changed, these changes have not taken place uniformly and across the faculties. Junior

women in the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences are more likely than those in the other faculties to have pre-tenure children. Part of the reason for this phenomenon is support from their senior female colleagues who adhere to feminist practices in the department.

The women in this study resist *unfair differences* by emphasizing the importance of quality as opposed to quantity of publications. In fact, Bridget appealed her tenure denial and won by focusing on the quality of her work. These women also continuously attempt to demonstrate that the work that women do (such as larger teaching loads, advising and supervising more students and/or serving on more committees) can exceed that of their male colleagues due to their under-representation in the profession and should be recognized as career dedication. This is one area in which the senior women's efforts to influence change has made a difference for the junior women academics report that they have been protected from excess committee work, teaching, and advising and supervising responsibilities.

I was looking for new and somewhat subtle inequities pitting women's roles of home and work but I found lingering "dinosaurs." Granted some old inequities have been overcome through policies such as maternity leave which acknowledge a woman's need for time away from work in order to raise children. But many inequities with old, tainted themes (such as the notion that having children before tenure may imply a lack of career commitment) still haunt junior women. The women in this study have strived to instigate changes in policies and prevailing stereotypical ideologies. Their alternative career path consists of integrating the experiences of career and children in their lives and demonstrating that the differences that women bring to academe are important and should be incorporated into the everyday lives of the women and men in this profession.

Endnotes

- 1 Since there is no abbreviated form of this type of inequity in the literature and in order to simplify the reading style, I have hyphenated the words *career-child*. Thus career-child related inequities refers to the inequities that women academics encounter by simultaneously having children and building a career.
- 2 Some career-child related inequities can be grouped under multiple categories. This inequity clearly depicts the *sacrifices* that women academics make; however, it can also be categorized under *difference* because there is clearly a difference between women and men with respect to choice (i.e., if and when to have children, how many, and what impact will such a choice have on their career). Viewed in both these ways it may lead more readily to a remedy of the situation, perhaps in the form of policy or public opinion.
- 3 Once again this inequity can be placed under the category of *differences*; that is, the different choices that women and men make regarding their careers and children. In this case I believe the inequity has a more profound impact when categorized under *sacrifices* since it implies a need rather than a choice on the part of the woman to give up some aspect of either the personal or professional life.
- 4 Since I discuss this factor in much detail in the previous chapter, I only briefly mention it here to acknowledge that the women in this study view this issue as a prominent gender inequity in the academic profession.

Chapter Eight

Sleeping Models, Sleeping Tales:

Approaches to Recognizing Women's Contributions to Academe

Introduction

The analogy of sleeping tales is one which I use to demonstrate that the women in this study tell stories that have been passed on from generation to generation of female academics, yet they are not recognized by the profession as a whole. These stories reveal some of the differences that women perceive themselves contributing to the academy. It appears as though these tales are put to sleep after they are told based on the university's lack of acknowledgement of the women's concerns; hence the tales remain inert until the next telling. Moreover, I envision these tales as providing the knowledge base for alternative ways of organizing academe — these are the tales that can awaken the sleeping models.

Perhaps because women have been socialized to assume the labor of love, the art of caring for others is one difference that women bring to the academy. The women in this study demonstrate a sense of caring not only about their families, but also about those with whom they work on an everyday basis. This difference provides them with a vision of academe

which is geared to meet their particular life course. In turn, this alternative vision supplies the means for influencing change through both individual and collective action.

To illustrate the ways in which the women are taking measures to alter the unjust nature of academia and society at large, I begin by presenting the women's powerful and eloquent stories concerning their acts of caring for their students, colleagues, and children. Drawing from the women's intellectual perspectives on working toward ending academic inequalities, I subsequently outline the women's perceptions of remodeling the academy to better serve social needs. My intent is to conclude by showing how the women are using their own power to begin the process of transforming oppressive social and institutional structures.

Caring Academics

Some women academics spend a great deal of time mentoring, supervising, and advising students as well as participating in committee meetings and other departmental and university wide services (see Chapter Five). At the heart of the matter is more than just the time spent carrying out the above tasks for the women in this study express a genuine sense of caring for their students and others in the faculty; that is, they care about the well being of their department. To paraphrase Sandra Acker (1999), they are being good department citizens. Acker also finds that the women professors in her study speak about "the help and nurturing they provide their students" (p.6).

This caring necessarily entails a greater time commitment to work related duties; however, it does not necessarily mean that their efforts will be recognized by their colleagues or superiors. There seems to be an assumption that women academics because of their gender will "naturally" be more caring than their male colleagues. This belief not only leads to a

taken-for-granted notion of female responsibilities that are presumed to be instinctual and therefore undervalued, but it also places an unfair burden on those women who do not display caring sentiments towards their students or colleagues.

The responses below were elicited from one of my interview questions: “How does being a woman influence your career?” Ellen indicates that since she is the only woman in the department, she does not get much “support from other women.” But she “makes time for other women” by devoting long days to making the university environment “a familiar climate for women.” As a consequence of being the only woman in the department she notes that when compared to her male colleagues she does more committee work and counsels more students. Natalie believes that being a woman influences her teaching and research insofar as she presents a female perspective in class, “you can raise questions and objections based on your own experiences of the world that might not occur to male professors,” and insofar as she conducts research on gender issues, “what research questions seem legitimate I think has to be affected by one's gender.” Other women note that they listen patiently to students’ problems, that they understand female students, that they encourage women students into academic careers, and that they “mother” their students.

I'm certainly more interested in and willing to talk to women who are considering an academic career and encouraging of it, very encouraging. (Martha)

I think you sometimes understand better what female students are trying to say but may not have the vocabulary to say it because the vocabulary is just [being] invented [and] you can be helpful. (Natalie)

Certainly being a woman has an unconscious effect ... perhaps I am more patient than men. I tend to listen more to students as they rattle on, at least that's what my colleagues tell me... (Rachel)

I think women feel comfortable in a nurturing, supporting role and perhaps because of my age ... it's probably been truer of me than someone who is twenty years younger

than me ... if a student has a problem it costs a little bit of time to sit down and listen to her problem and do what you can to help her find a solution. (Madeleine)

Moreover, there appears to be reciprocated appreciation among the generations of women academics in this study as illustrated by the four excerpts presented below. The older women describe how they take pleasure in supporting and encouraging junior women. In turn, the younger women are depicted as having made their own contributions to the departments and developed friendships with the older women.

In this department we've been exceptionally lucky ... [the two junior female professors] are both incredibly energetic, committed and hard working. You know if I can do anything to make them feel how valued they are to the department, that's a contribution I want to make ___ just fostering their careers. If anybody has questions or wants to talk, I try to be here. If anybody asks for advice, I try my best to give it... (Natalie, associate professor)

I think that the one [woman] who is more junior would feel that I had played a mentoring role but we're now more on equal footing. ... We consider each other friends. And in terms of a professional relationship, I'd say she certainly sees me as the first one she'd ask about anything to deal with what she should do about a departmental issue or getting something published... (Paula, full professor)

The younger women recognize that the senior women provide not only unequalled direction in their own professional lives, but also that in a more general sense these women have paved the way for the work of female faculty.

I've never really felt that it made any difference being a women because I think the senior women sort of paved the way and ... our colleagues have never questioned our credentials in this department because [the senior female professor] is really very well respected and so the notion that a women can be a good professional in ... [this field] was never really an issue. I don't know what she had to deal with... (Janice, associate professor)

All three Departments I've been at, my BA, my Ph.D. and this Department I've had women Chairs, and they've all served as helpful role models, I've been given lots of advice. I haven't viewed any of those relationships as adversarial, they've all been supportive of my finishing the Ph.D., and publishing and getting tenure... I feel like there are people there who want me to succeed at this. (Carol, assistant professor)

Caring Mothers

In this section I demonstrate the different ways in which the women use their own personal time as they progress through academic ranks and (for the women with children) stages of childrearing. The notion of a well-rounded life includes time for work, family and/or a relationship, and leisure. The women with young children express a high level of stress. Beyond the stress, however, is the dedication to their children — a willingness to forego leisure time for the sake of child care.

Leisure Time is Child's Play

The junior women academics with young children have stated over and over again in the interviews that they have little or no leisure time to call their own. Many of them describe leisure time as time spent playing with their children. The Collins English Dictionary (1986) defines "at leisure" as "a. having free time for ease, relaxation, etc. b. not occupied or engaged. c. without hurrying." If I apply this definition to the child play activities that these women define as leisure, I find that the women are actually *preoccupied* with ensuring the safety of their children and *engaged* in children's games that are designed ultimately to bring happiness to their children. This does not mean that those activities will not be enjoyable for the women as well; instead, it implies a motive which is geared toward their children's needs and not necessarily their own personal needs of relaxation. These academic mothers of young children are trying to use their time efficiently. Thus, combining free time with child play can be described as a time building strategy.

I asked Patricia, a young assistant professor with two young children, "How do you use your leisure time?" She replied, "To be honest ... I don't have any, none. He (spouse) goes

out, he plays tennis ... two nights a week and my new thing is to try to get a half hour before he goes. So on Monday, and this is just terrible, I went up and had a bath.”

One of the main reasons the women cite for not partaking in leisure activities is that they believe that they do not have sufficient time to spend with their children despite giving up leisure activities. As Patricia points out, “I guess I could do less in the family and then pick up leisure, but I feel like I don't have enough time for my kids as it is, so every second ... I spend with them.” Carol is another young assistant professor who also devotes her leisure time to her children and attempts to schedule activities that both she and her children will enjoy. When I asked how she finds time for her children, work, and leisure, she replied:

What leisure time? [Laughter] I guess children to a portion they take my leisure time, so I have lots of time for the kids and I try to do things with them that I also enjoy. I try to make sure that when I'm spending time with them that I'm also having fun because it's got to be my fun, ... it can't feel like I have leisure time above and beyond my time with children and time for my research. It helps that I love my research and I view reading in my area as fun and it helps that I love to spend time with my kids and I love going to parks and camping and most of the things that I love to do are things with kids. During the school year there's not much time for anything else, and that's why I feel envious of people without kids when I see them going to the gym or movies, I don't do things like going to the gym or going to movies. ... I do a reading group that meets once month... Other than that I'm reading kids books. I socialize with members of the department, I try to combine trips to professional association meetings with pleasure. So I try as much as I can to combine those things.

On the other hand, Martha who is a single young assistant professor finds time for several leisure activities. As she puts it: “Well, I've been [out-of-town] this weekend to visit my sister. I like to walk, ... play the piano, ... sing a little bit, ... read, ... watch TV, ... sleep, ...[and] play on my computer.” Even the single women feel that they do not have sufficient leisure time due to the demands of their careers. Martha states: “I don't have as much [leisure time] as I'd like.” Martha is planning to have a child and she too realizes that her leisure time will be devoted to her child.

Well I think that the child will be leisure time. ... I mean I don't feel my life is full and I've always enjoyed children so ... if they [leisure activities] are foregone because the child takes up my time, that's absolutely fine with me.

Cynthia, who is married without children, also engages in some leisure activities. She notes, "Over the winter ... I took up downhill skiing, ... I play the piano, and I've been watching TV." She too would like to have children but realizes that that implies sacrificing her leisure time. "I don't think I'll have any leisure activities once I have kids."

Partly as a result of being a caring mother, Audrey has not received promotion to the associate level after over two decades of employment at the university. In response to my question, "how has being a woman influenced your career," she states:

I think it influenced my career strongly because of the fact that I was never willing to subvert my family's needs enough in order to a) either do the extra education or b) spend the hours needed in order to push ahead in my career because if I had really been willing to do that when my youngest was born, I would never have gone back to part-time but I said, I'm on tenure track, if I want to get tenure, I'm going to do the research and the writing and ... it will get me there. ... I enjoyed my work but I also wanted to spend the time with my family.

Natalie's two children are close to the age of ten. She reminisces about their younger years and the difference their age makes in terms of her sleeping hours but not necessarily for her leisure time.

[M]ostly my leisure is reading the newspaper. I take 15 or 20 minutes to read the newspaper. When I feel like I really have to escape I read a junky novel usually a murder mystery. But that's about it. I mean if you're talking hobbies and so on, forget it.

I try to just keep myself to a schedule with 55 hours with the kids every week, 55 hours on my job. Of those 10 hours overlap. Okay? So that's a 100 hours of kids and [work] and the rest of the time is taking a shower, being in transit, between places, my 20 minute reading the newspaper, and so on. So I mean I do sleep now more than when the kids were young. I used to get about five hours and I'm up to almost seven so I suppose I could have worked in a hobby there [laughing] instead of extending sleep. And that's not to say you never relax. I mean if you're watching the kid's baseball game ... that's a kind of relaxation but it revolves around the kids.

Enjoying Leisure Time in Later Life

Naturally it's different now because I don't have the responsibilities for young children. I do quite a bit of photography, [and] I'm an avid serious gardener. I read a lot outside my field. I probably have more freedom at this point in my life than I've ever had before and I value that quite a lot. (Madeleine)

The general consensus among the older women professors with children seems to be that while their children were young the women had very little leisure time but now that their children are grown-up they engage in numerous leisure activities. All of the women cited in this section are currently mothers of adult children. Some of these women compare and contrast their earlier life with young children and their later life with adult children. I begin with the women's past experiences in which they describe their lives as mothers of young children.

(Past) I'm thinking now about ... [my son] when he was just a baby, you know, I would be, say lecturing up until twelve o'clock, I'd have an hour, I'd bicycle home, ... she'd [housekeeper] have everything organized. So, the baby would be ready, the lunch that I would be eating would be ready, I'd bicycle home, do this, eat all this lunch, bicycle back, do my next class. But, you know, it requires this kind of maintenance at home, where she's getting everything in position. (Irene)

(Past) I think that when my children were small I didn't have much time for leisure activities; ... whereas I've got time now to indulge me and so I do. (Audrey)

(Past) I suppose it didn't leave much time when they [children] were really little, I mean I probably didn't read, I probably didn't do much gardening. (Pamela)

Below these same women depict their present day experiences. Note the differences in the women's use of leisure time as the children grow-up. For instance, originally Irene discusses the time constraints which she experienced in the past as the mother of an infant and her current involvement in various activities.

(Present) For example, this past weekend we went camping. And what I try to do is have a certain amount of time each week which is dedicated to sort of physical activities: bicycling, hiking, generally things that are aerobic. I am also strongly interested in reading, and I like to have a certain amount of time there. Quite often

*the only time I can find is between one in the morning and three in the morning.
(Irene)*

(Present) My leisure time, what little of it I have ... I love to walk, ... garden in the summer, golf ... [and] ski. I love to go to the theater, I enjoy music. ... and play ... both the guitar and piano. I've got dear, dear friends that I play a lot of bridge with. And I've got other friends that I socialize with. (Audrey)

(Present) Oh, I garden, I swim, I walk, I grandparent, [and I] read. (Pamela)

Not all of the older women academics in this study had adult children at the time of the interview. Those who decided to delay having children for the sake of their career, such as Paula and Megan who are both full professors, had young children at home. Like the younger women academics with children, these women devoted most of their leisure time to child play.

Alternative Models of Academic Careers

In this section I describe changes that the women would like to see occurring in the academic profession in order to make their lives better. The responses are derived from one of my interview questions: "How would you change academic careers to favor women and their lifestyles." The women's words formed several patterns which I have grouped into five categories: a recognition of women's work preferences and contributions, a collegial climate, an end to the gender power differential, a link with the community, and a recognition of women's life course.

A Recognition of Women's Work Preferences and Contributions

The women in this study perceive differences among the work preferences of faculty members; accordingly they would like to see individuals make their own decisions as to the

amount of teaching, research, and service which they perform. Rachel, who is planning a family, states: "I don't have children but if I did ... I would want to focus on my research and on my teaching and not research, teaching, and administrative work." Bridget points out: "if I was to find true satisfaction in my job, it would be to have the university recognize ... that some people should teach more, others should research more, [and] to not expect a single individual to do everything." She elaborates:

When I went up for tenure there were two of us who went up. One individual was a very strong teacher but had a relatively weak research profile. I had a very strong research profile and a relatively weak teaching portfolio. So, the two of us together benefited the department greatly because we had an excellent teacher and we also had an excellent researcher. It just so happened that that wasn't found in the same individual. The woman who was the excellent teacher failed her tenure and had to seek new employment. I had to go through an appeals process to get my tenure. ... I just found it quite demoralizing.

Additionally, the women academics want greater value assigned to the work which they perform in recognition of their contributions. Natalie suggests that the kinds of work that women do in the department (that is, the extra time that they devote to committee work, counseling students, and so on) should be weighted positively in promotion and tenure decisions. In order for this change to occur, however, teaching, research, and service must be assigned fairly equal values in the assessment of tenure and promotion possibilities.

Although Audrey takes pleasure in teaching she notes: "I seriously don't enjoy the writing piece. I know that I have to do it because ... it's publications that get you to survive in this system. ... I just find it sheer drudgery." She further points out that her faculty "devalues undergraduate teaching and involvement with students [even though] the workload in the undergraduate program is extremely heavy." Madeleine, who teaches more courses than her colleagues, states:

Looking at things realistically I'm 57. My colleagues, most of them are in their early 40s. Two of them have lost their grants ... if I could do more in the teaching and administration so they've got their time to do the grants and keep the department well represented in the research areas. It's better than my saying, well, I'm doing my share but you guys. In other words, I have a commitment to this department to make it work and to do it well.

Madeleine does not believe that that she has met the requirements in terms of research publications to be promoted to the level of full professor. "I'm Associate, I'm still there. I did a lot of administrative work ... and as a result of that probably my research has not done as well ... I've increasingly done more in terms of teaching [and] in terms of developing our undergraduate program." So I asked Madeleine: "Sometimes if a person is a very good teacher, for instance, wouldn't they promote on the basis of excellence in teaching?" She replied: "It's unusual in our faculty, [but] it does happen ... and I hope it will." Similarly, Paula describes the lack of gratitude on the part of her colleagues and superiors toward her particular work-related contributions.

I am directing this research center and most people wouldn't be doing that. And I have some disagreement in terms of what I have perceived to be a lack of appreciation of that on behalf of the faculty as well as the department. I think that currently there's an issue where I've been able to offer them a very good option in terms of having someone else do a bit of my teaching which would be good for that person which I think would benefit the department because it would mean another woman and it would cost them very little... I don't think they are going to come through with it and I think that's a case where I feel, I'm doing extra and they don't perceive the contribution it makes.

Moreover, Paula believes that her particular research, some of which can be called feminist work, is undervalued in the department. She notes that the assessment of "merit from year to year has not been done fairly. ... I don't think it values equally different kinds of contributions. ... [I]f as a women ... you're working in an area which isn't shared by your colleagues, I think your contributions are downplayed." Even as Chair of her department, Natalie is having difficulty diminishing the women's workload due to prevailing ideologies

about women's and men's roles. "I try to make an effort ... since I have some control over it as Chair, not to overburden the women but I think they see many more students and they are asked to sit on more faculty level and Senate level committees." Below she explains how the expectations about women in general are carried over to female professors.

Both students and one's colleagues expect more attention, more time, more nurturing and because the expectations are different, the reactions to being brushed off or sent away, or not sufficiently attended to I think are different and people tend to resent it more when female faculty aren't sufficiently nurturing. So you know, I think that there are all kinds of extra pressures on faculty women. Some of them I suppose you could quantify by just counting up committee work but others of them would be more difficult to quantify unless you sat outside ... a number of people's doors for a long time just watching the traffic flow.

Clearly the women's stories reveal a need to recognize the contributions which they make to the area of caring for students (i.e., supervising and sitting on more dissertation committees, advising or counseling more students). There are at least two possible solutions to this dilemma: reduce women's service/caring responsibilities, or reward this form of caring. The first solution seems difficult to achieve, for as Natalie points out, even as Chair she finds the task of decreasing women's workload insurmountable. Recognizing caring activities as part of the legitimate reward system not only values what has become "women's work" in the profession, but it is also likely to encourage men to take up such activities and thereby indirectly alleviate women's academic housekeeping tasks. Another theme which flows from the women's stories is that both women and men may have work preferences (e.g., some academics would rather do more teaching and less research) and these preferences deserve greater consideration in the operation of the reward system and in the academic culture as a whole.

Margie Burns (1993: 18) describes how women's role expectations and/or work preferences have been used to "reinforce a system of discrimination against female faculty."

She notes that nontenure-track instructors hired for the mere purpose of teaching courses, who tend to be mostly women, are overlooked for tenured positions. These “service-course programs” do not provide women with opportunities for professional development; that is, there is no grant support, travel funds, or time-off for research. The heavy teaching loads further discourage research and networking efforts. Whether the underlying explanation for an overwhelming number of women in service programs is based on role expectations or the role preferences, when combined with a tight job market, the result is a devaluation of so called “women’s work” in the academy. One solution might be the provision of institutionalized benefits for this reserve labor force.

A Collegial Climate

One area which requires close scrutiny is the insensitive (gendered, racist, classist) culture of the university (see Chapter Five). The women academics in this study have the impression that they are different and less successful than their male colleagues, especially in those disciplines in which women are under-represented. Lauren states, “It’s a very male oriented environment and you’re just not one of the guys. They have their own secret handshake ... you just sort of have a sense that things would be different if you were more like them.” Megan comments, “I think that ... the chilly climate is the most serious problem of all. It’s a set of cultural norms and values that are very difficult to change overnight.” According to the women these environments are in need of change in the sense that they would like women’s contributions respected and valued on equal terms with those of their male colleagues, and the women would like male faculty members to be more collegial so that the culture of the department embraces women and men as equal colleagues.

Sometimes it's hard for women to get listened to in [this field] because they may be making very rigorous arguments but in a soft voice ... or they would offer very good arguments if only they could get a word in edgewise... Just being taken seriously ... having the same kind of weight attached to one's work and one's opinions, I think it's the main obstacle that faces young women who are getting started. (Natalie)

There's the perception among some male colleagues and I've heard these comments made that this is the female representative on the committee. So you feel like your being put there not because of your expertise or because you have something to contribute but because of your gender. You realize that you're the only woman sitting there when occasionally you make a comment and one or two of your colleagues will look at you and you get the sense that they are thinking that you're different ... if you were a man you wouldn't have made that comment or something of that nature. (Lauren)

Not only would the women like to be accorded the same respect as men, but also they wish to be more involved in the social events taking place in the department. In other words, they seek both intellectual and social inclusion within the academic milieu. The following are further examples of inequities that persist in the workplace environment and point to unfair practices which the women want to see addressed.

Our department is such that people don't relate very well to each other. It's historical, it's related to the difficulties of the previous Chair. The Chair of our department ... carried more respect for men ... than [women]. I think he just inadvertently tended to foster the careers of ... the men in his networking circle. ... [I]t was viewed more positively from one man to another to have a forceful opinion or to have that drive, ... that ambition, than it would be perceived in a woman. The inequities that were very glaring at the time between men and women fostered a lot of rifts ... they haven't recovered. I feel that if the environment at work was a bit more friendly, a bit more of a team spirit that would make me happier. (Bridget)

I was talking before about being excluded, I think especially for the first few years you feel very compelled... particularly in a department that is so predominantly male to appear a good sport... But at the same time I'm not exactly soft spoken... I'll say what I think, so I was always recognized as someone who ... thought that men should be treating women in a certain way and I think that's been the basis in part, certainly in some sectors of the department for exclusion. ... I think that's ... [attributed] to being a woman, a feminist, even in those days when they wouldn't have known to call it that. (Paula)

In short, the women believe that their male colleagues and superiors want them to be “good sports” and adapt to the culture of the university, to act like women with stereotypically “soft voices” and “no forceful opinion,” and to accept that those opinions will “not be taken seriously.” Moreover, the women are made to feel as though they are “different” because of their gender, but they cannot act so differently so as to “poison” the environment by not fitting into the male model. The contradictory expectations described in many of these stories require women to perform impossible feats, for they face only extreme choices that serve to disadvantage their position — a compromise or middle ground is beyond the realm of available options. On the other hand, the women are seeking to foster a “team spirit” and a “friendly” environment — one which accepts any differences between women and men and treats both sexes fairly.

An End to the Gender Power Differential

In some disciplines the vast majority of faculty are men and the vast majority of students are women; this numerical difference is problematic for it reinforces the perception of a gender power differential. Hence, we need more women to serve in positions of power and mentoring roles which inevitably means the employment and promotion of a greater number of women. Both younger women and men need to see that women can excel in influential positions. Paula indicates that her department is particularly traditional, in that there are very few women faculty members and she receives little support from her colleagues. She reports:

If I look at other departments, I don't see the same level of support in my life... I think the most obvious thing is you have to have more women that would serve in a mentor role. ... I could think for example in our department that it would be very easy to have an undergrad degree and never have had a woman for a professor, but it's

pretty incredible for both the men and the women... [I]n the end I think that comes back to hiring women.

Additionally, the gender power differential may translate into more work for women academics as a result of their low representation in the profession. For instance, I asked Ellen: “Since you are the only woman in this department what effect do you think it has on your career?” She replied: “Well I do most of the counseling and I get put on more committees.” Natalie elaborates:

I don't think that enough is done to recognize the extra work that female faculty do. It's not just administrative in the sense of committee work ... it's also extra work in terms of counseling students. If you have an undergraduate student body that's half female. I think [this university] is now more than half female at the undergraduate level. And you have very few female faculty and generally the women faculty end up doing a lot more work with students than the average male faculty. I don't really think we've found ways to adequately take into account the extra work that the typical, young female faculty member does.

This power differential can lead to women’s loneliness and stereotyping. In response to the same question, Cynthia states:

Well I find it frustrating to have lost my female colleagues because I think men and women do relate to each other differently. For example, if I went to lunch every day with a male professor, especially in a place like [this city] which is very small and very conservative, people would start saying we're having an affair. ... Certainly being here without my husband ... I feel I have to be careful. So I actually have lunch a lot of the times with [the only other woman in the department] and then you get into this other thing that there's rumors that she's a lesbian, so maybe I'm a lesbian. ... I mean it's ridiculous ... in some ways you can't win ... no matter what you do.

No doubt, the gender power differential adversely affects the relationships between female and male faculty for they become “unequal colleagues” (a term coined by Glazer and Slater 1987); that is, the lower the number of women in the department, the less power they seem to have vis-à-vis their male counterparts. For example, although Lauren is a full professor with about eleven years of seniority, she feels that she is treated as a subordinate with respect to her junior male colleagues.

I have unquestionably the worst office in the department. ... It's very small, it has no window and it's just stacked with paper ... and I don't have enough filing cabinets... I need a second filing cabinet and the department will not give me [one]. ... I've had this office for 11 years and I've sort of joked about the office I've got with the Chair. The last acting Chair left the chair's position early so I sometimes made a joke about, 'Oh, I think he left because I asked too many times for an office with a window.' So that's an example, there's something which I personally want and need, an office which has a window, which is sort of a little bit bigger and more comfortable and certainly my male colleagues have that without question but it's never happened. ... Whereas, we have junior male colleagues ... who have, you know, offices with windows. (Lauren)

The obvious repercussion for women concerning the ongoing nature of a gender power differential within universities is that the men are reaping benefits partly as a consequence of their strength in numbers. In a male dominated academic milieu the women are experiencing a low level of support in their professional lives, larger work loads, rumors which attack their character and credibility, and fewer work benefits (e.g., smaller office space).

A Link With the Community

Another aspect of academic careers which is in need of change, according to the women, is lack of appreciation of their work from the general public which in turn they believe results in insufficient funding for their research. As Vanessa puts it, "I don't think the public understands or values what we do and that can be a real problem." Similarly, Bridget states:

There isn't enough money in the system to support research. The general populace doesn't appreciate the importance that research has for our society. With this budget crises and financial cutbacks etcetera, people are becoming very short sighted ... They think if it's not practically applicable today, then it's not worthy ... I feel that universities have to play a much larger role in making government and the general populace understand the importance of research and development for our nation. Where will we be in twenty years time if we don't support this avenue ... most of the research and development for the nation is accomplished in universities or their satellite institutes. I get ... comments all the time, like 'university professors have it easy because they only work eight months a year.' ... And then they say, 'all you do is research in the summer,' as if research isn't a worthy activity.

Audrey describes the impact of budget restraints on the situation of faculty members in general and on her own life in particular. “The changing economic climate has restricted funding to universities so that we’ve got fewer and fewer faculty in order to do the same job... I can’t do ... the research that I would like to do because the funding isn’t available.” Moreover, Natalie discusses the negative impact of cutbacks on equity initiatives. “It’s been particularly hard the past year because of the severity of the cutbacks made by the provincial government. I think that people have sometimes underestimated the effect that those are going to have on equity initiatives. She continues: “I think that there has been an erosion of the policies we fought to get established at [this university] ... race relations and sexual harassment [policies] and we’ve lost some very good people from Equity Services.” A link with the community might be a way to alleviate the potential repercussions of financial constraints on research funding and equity policies, especially if the public is aware of, and sympathetic to those issue.

A Recognition of Women’s Life Course

Where young children are concerned women’s lifestyles become increasingly complex and encumbered by the needs of dependent little ones. Patricia identifies the pressure associated with constantly having her children on her mind while attempting to accomplish work related duties. She explains that at one time when her spouse took her daughter on a trip she was able to work without experiencing the burden of worrying about family responsibilities.

I was at home, in this house by myself, that was like a first sense of no kids, no husband for a while. And I sat down to do some work, and I remember thinking ‘oh my God,’ just the difference in working, I guess I’ve never realized, how in the back of

my mind ... there's still things that I don't realize, like what am I cooking for dinner and should I call and check on [my children]...

Nancy describes the difference between her career and that of her academic spouse, as follows:

Interestingly I think the missing obstacle that he doesn't have to encounter is the psychological anxiety around, the conflict that comes up between career and children because even though he's a full and active parent, he doesn't worry about her in the same way that I do and he doesn't worry about the conflicts between [work and family], they come up and he doesn't have the same psychological baggage attending maternity and career that I feel certainly hurt me and hold me back and it would really be great to be able to just to let go of that. Because he's able to be an active parent without feeling like his career is jeopardized.

In response to my question “How would you change the academic career to favor women and their lifestyles,” the women focused overwhelmingly on the need to recognize the difference between the typical female and male life courses. Audrey states: “There has to be something to make it such that women can have a career without having these gaps that hurt them so badly in their career. Because the men come out of school, they go to their career and they work steadily and having a family doesn't really affect them.” Irene mentions the creation of alternative models such as job sharing as a possible solution to accommodating the daily lives of academic mothers.

It's very difficult for a woman to have enough time to read stories to her children if she's got to do eighty billable hours a week. [W]e need to move in the types of directions that people are [going]. ... Some doctors are in clinics where they can share time and so on, so those might be changes in disciplines.

Some women indicate that the profession should provide women academics the option to leave the system to raise children and give them research funding when they return.

You survive or not in this career on your research so there has to be some way of getting a system which is friendlier and allows people a little more flexibility in terms of different points in their life. I think there's a lot of contributions that could be made by people, women and men, at different points in their career where they can opt out for a little while and then come back into the system when, maybe after their

children are grown or whatever. But the system doesn't allow that... I think that's the really big thing because we're hired based on our research and we're promoted based on our research ... it may look like it should be equal to teaching but the reality is it's not. (Lauren)

I wish it was perhaps a little bit easier for a women for anyone, not just a woman but a person to take a little bit more time off ... to have children, or to be with their children and not have to worry about picking up their career again. You know one of the things that I would worry about is if you take a year off, I couldn't give up the research because that would hurt the career. (Rachel)

Audrey notes that to accommodate women faculty who want to combine career and children, there is a need to consider their biological clocks and therefore develop a different career path for women in the profession.

There seems to be a problem in that for women to go ahead and get their Ph.D., even if you do it straight out of school, chances of your being done before you're thirty are not good. ... If you want to have a family, you either have to have it while you are a student ... or you have to have the family right at that period which should be probably your most productive period after finishing school in order to get yourself established in your career. ... Like if men wait till they are forty to have a family, well, I mean they will be older fathers but other than that, it doesn't make ... a lot of difference physiologically. Women who wait until they are forty to have families, they may find that they can't. Or have to worry about things like abnormalities and that sort of thing with babies. Plus they are physically not as likely to do as well at that age. I mean there are some more physical risks when you get older than 35.

Policies such as maternity leave and stopping the clock provision for promotion and tenure are useful and I believe that along those lines we could think of more ways to change policies to favor the life course of women. The combined role of both women and men in caring for children seems particularly important. Madeleine states, "I think for the nurturing of children it is just as important for men to be actively involved as it is women." Parental leave policies should be standard across universities. The women further report that better daycare facilities, which take into consideration the time requirements of faculty, would lead to a major improvement in women's lifestyles. For instance, Audrey notes: "There are so many women working here ... and they need real on site daycare where you can get at your

children. ... I also think we have to do something more to convince men and society that .. childrearing and parenting ... and housework ... is our work..." Similarly, Pamela states: "If there were daycare facilities here [to accommodate] faculty members' hours ... that would be really helpful." Additionally, junior women need to be reassured that the use of established women-centered policies will not be detrimental to their career progression. For instance, Patricia was hesitant about taking maternity leave for she thought her colleagues might view this time-off as a lack of career commitment on her part. At a later date, she came across feminist scholarship which highlighted that, as Patricia puts it, "there are a lot of policies out there that women, especially professional women, won't take [and] what that does is undermine the validity of the policy." Patricia realized that not using existing policies merely serves to legitimize the male model of academe. "I wanted to take the six months, I really did [and] then I felt better about it because I thought it's fair and if women don't take it, then it can be eroded."

Most of the women indicate that the whole pattern of academic careers is designed to meet the typical male life course and women must adjust their lives to conform to a male-defined standard. To begin transforming this predisposition of academic careers, some women suggest that important faculty meetings held early in the morning or late at night should be eliminated so that women can be involved in policy making.

One thing that I find very difficult is the fact that I can't serve on committees or take on jobs however influential or important they might be if they have meetings at 7 in the morning or if they have meetings that, you know, drag on until 10 or 11 o'clock at night. I think that's an issue for lots of women, maybe not so much in the beginning of their career but middle and later when they're in a position to really influence policy around the university and take on more and more powerful administrative jobs [such as] sit on committees that are close to the center of power. But the times are impossible. (Natalie)

I would never have a seminar that started or that ran from like four-thirty to five-thirty at night because you're just asking for women to have to leave or not go at all because they have to get to the daycare by five-thirty. I would never call eight o'clock meetings because it's also extremely difficult for women ... I have a very difficult time getting here for eight and I can only do it on a severe crisis. (Bridget)

Moreover, Bridget suggests that universities should consider establishing mechanisms to determine quality for faculty performance appraisals rather than primarily emphasizing quantity. She believes that women academics with young children do not have enough “disposable time” to direct their productivity efforts toward the “quantity game,” whether it be in terms of number of publications produced, courses taught, or services performed. As she puts it: “with more emphasis on quality, women wouldn't have as much to fear in terms of their performance appraisals and their possibilities for promotion.” In her opinion the lack of free time for women with children also influences their ability to obtain administrative positions. She proposes the following solution.

I feel that women are at a disadvantage for promotion to Chair, or associate dean, etc., because in your first few years when you're kind of establishing your network on campus, establishing your research profile, etc., if you have more disposable time then you will spend more time on this, that, or the other committee and be able to position yourself better to gain the experience that may be required for some of the administrative posts ... Now why is it that there are so few females in senior administration.... I think women are capable and interested in those posts, but you have to gain the experience before someone will put you in those posts. So I think ... life would be better for women if people could ... give them a chance even if they have less experience than their male counterparts in some of these jobs and that I think the women would rise to the occasion. (Bridget)

The women with children experience anxiety and pressure associated with raising their children and pursuing academic careers. They believe that members of the academic profession should explore ways to accommodate women's typical life course. Suggestions for improving the academy to meet women's everyday needs focus on alternative models such as job sharing and the option to leave the system for a long period of time; as well as

ingredients which may contribute to alternative models such as consideration of women's biological clock, improved women-centered policies, the need for men to share equally in child care responsibilities, committee meetings that are not scheduled beyond the hours of daycare facilities, performance appraisals that focus on quality rather than quantity of work, and the use of such appraisals to promote women not only through academic ranks but also to administrative positions.

Some authors have explored alternative ways of operating the tenure process. Diana DiNitto, Marian A. Aguilar, Cynthia Franklin, and Cathleen Jordan (1995) surveyed twenty-five women faculty members to discover their experiences with tenure. These scholars find that the women offer numerous suggestions for improving the tenure procedure, including the following items. First, greater value could be attributed to teaching and service, for these are activities which tend to particularly interest the women in the study, and a lesser value could be placed on research. Second, more women could be involved in the review process to ensure fairness and a demise of the "old boys" network. Third, formal structures could be changed to establish supportive academic cultures for women including mentors and a fair sharing of departmental housekeeping tasks among female and male academics. Fourth, academic workloads and salaries could be equalized between the sexes and leadership training opportunities could be enhanced for women. Many of the same concerns are shared by the women in this study. When women academics in a number of studies relate similar stories, then the problems in question appear to be widespread within universities.

Shelley Park (1996: 74) points out that using research as the most important criterion for tenure and promotion combined with increasing restraints on research funding serves to disadvantage women faculty "who may have little time (and in some cases little inclination)

for grant-writing and article-publishing given their extensive teaching and service responsibilities and their tendency to take these responsibilities seriously.” Further she notes that the response to this situation has been to “blame the victim”; for rather than seeking to remedy the “gendered division of labor” in the academy, women are advised to focus on their research and do minimal service and teaching tasks. Park refers to this situation as “a masculine perspective that mirrors sexist attitudes outside the academy. Such advice assumes that child-rearing (teaching, advising, mentoring, and nurturing students), home-making (departmental and institutional service), and volunteer work (community service) are unimportant uncreative and unchallenging” (p.75). Faculty evaluation systems should include teaching and service as important criteria to assess women’s contributions in a fair manner.

Teaching and service are an integral part of academic institutions for without the willingness of women and men to advise students, teach classes, and manage the day-to-day needs of the department, the academy could not survive. Hence, it is important, as Bridget suggests below, that we consider alternative means of evaluating these tasks.

I think it's a good start to have peer appraisals of your teaching, to have external reviews like you do for your research. People don't actually see you do your research; they just review the output of your research: the paper that you produce. For teaching I feel you could send your course materials out for external review regardless of which discipline you're in to see if they're up to date, if they're in the direction that experts in your field would want the course materials to go. And that's certainly never done.

Influencing Change

In this section I describe the ways in which the women in this study seek to transform their career paths as well as the university culture in an attempt improve their personal and professional lives. The responses are mainly derived from one of my interview questions: “How do you get what you want?”

Individual Power

Some of the women indicate that by virtue of their position they are able to influence change via the media or general public. They can voice their concerns on certain issues and some people will listen. Natalie elaborates on this point:

Another thing that is gratifying is the fact that when you have opinions on other issues, for example feminist politics, or things that are happening on the news, generally those opinions will be taken seriously simply because you are a professor. And if you have something you want to say usually a newspaper or a TV station ... is going to be willing to listen to it so there is a kind of credibility, a kind of access to information outlets that goes along with the job. And if you did have feminist interests and if you are a woman, if you are interested in changing things, I don't think you should sneeze at the kinds of perks and advantages that go with being a professor. I mean you shouldn't take them for granted, or take them too seriously... I just think that if there are perks and advantages that are attached to the position that you have, then the fact that you can use them for a cause to process what is important to you is a good thing.

Tenured women are more willing to speak out than untenured women. Although Paula believes that major change will only take place if and when more women are employed as faculty members, in the meantime she indicates that there is a need for women academics to be “more vocal.” She also points out that there has been some improvement since the 1970s when she began her academic career for now women have greater freedom to speak. Paula believes that being a tenured academic means that she has a voice. She states:

I do think that's one of the beautiful things about becoming experienced, you feel much freer to say what you think, because it can't hurt you if you do ... and I think it is a reflection of the increased context for women and certainly that growing understanding that there's a context here based on gender and even when people don't know what to do with it, they know it's there.

One way in which tenured women academics use their voice to help institute change is by becoming members of important committees and stipulating their concerns. Natalie states:

No matter how tired you are of sitting on all those committees, you have to keep sitting on [them] because ... at least you get your one vote, you get your information, your chance in front of other people. [On] small working committees like Senate Committees and so on, sometimes the vote can actually be significant but more important is I think the chance ... to argue for a position that perhaps nobody else has espoused... [I]f you're not there, it's easier for people to do what they want and not consider alternative positions. But if you're there and you're articulating this position, then at some point you have to be taken into account. ... I think it's effective [and] we can't let up.

In contrast the untenured women indicate that they are less likely to speak their mind.

These women would rather wait until they are tenured to exercise their right to freedom of speech. William Tierney and Estela Mara Bensimon (1996) also find that junior professors are not privy to academic freedom. However, it is more than just a denial of academic freedom but actually a lack of power that the women in this study express. They believe that one wrong move may jeopardize their possibilities for achieving tenure. This notion is supported by Bridget's experience who dared to "talk back" to the male Chair and was denied tenure until her appeal. Rachel states: "[B]ecause it's a male environment ... I try to leave the gender issues at the door." She further notes that she is not involved in the decision making process in the department because "the [male] Chair, will make decisions unilaterally." Although Carol indicates that one of her goals is to be involved in decision-making when she becomes a senior academic, she also notes that she feels "cautious" about speaking out in her department at the present time and that she defers all decision making to

the senior faculty members because she does not want to “step on toes.” This power differential is unfortunate, for the junior faculty may have much to contribute. I asked Cynthia, an assistant professor, “do you have strategic actions that you use when you want something?” She replied:

I talk to [a senior woman in the department] and she helps me. But really if I wasn't that close to her, how would I do it. Well, I think people are reasonable enough that if I go into somebody's office and say, 'this is what I'm thinking, do you have advice for me?' I definitely take the non-threatening approach of asking advice and saying can you help me because I find that that works really well.

Moreover, junior faculty women tend to be less outspoken in other aspects of their careers. Patricia teaches a gender class in which she is extremely careful not to upset the students for fear of backlash. She reports:

Some feminists would ... say, you know, you're too mild mannered. ... I can start my class by saying, it's not politically motivated, it's not a male bashing course. ... [T]hen they're almost glad to get into the nitty gritty, because I've done all the stuff conceptually, which is much harder for them, and so they're not as resistant when we actually say, "this is what women's jobs are really like, what marriage is like, you know, this is how men have more power, and we're actually talking about men and women. I don't think it's as hard to take as if I stood up there in the very beginning and said women are disadvantaged."

While changes taking place in departments affect junior academics in terms of the different courses that they will be teaching and the number of students in each class, they are not always involved in the decision-making process. Martha notes, “As a junior faculty, I'm just sitting there and listening to it and I'll say, yeah, yeah ... so it does tend to be a little bit topped out with that perspective. ... I'm way too low on the ladder to be involved.”

Even the senior women indicate that they waited until their positions were secure to use their voice and to pursue non-mainstream research such as feminist work. Thus, the impact of tenure on the women's lives should not be underestimated. This increased willingness on the part of senior women to use their voice is important because there is much talk of

eliminating tenure altogether or only providing a few tenured positions. The latter option may have a negative effect on women's career prospects because they are likely to be the ones who are untenured and as we have seen untenured positions are subordinate to tenured ones in the sense that they do not provide for faculty members in such positions to voice their concerns. The result might be the creation of an elite group in academe and a subordinate group without the means to be promoted to positions of power.

In response to my question, "how do you get what you want," the tenured women report that they use such strategic actions as applying their "powers of persuasion," and voicing their own opinions in public.

You have to figure out first of all what it is you want, who has the power to help you get it, why it would be in that person's interests to have whatever it is you want ... and then use your powers of persuasion. If we don't get this, if we don't do this then it's going to have a detrimental effect on this, that and the other thing. If we do it then we'll be able to do these other things. (Madeleine)

If I think that this is an important issue, no matter how unpopular it might be... I have to be on record, as saying, "the group may decide to go ahead and do this but I just want to say that I've got really serious concerns about it and this is why." (Irene)

Additional strategic methods that the women use include surveying other people's views on issues that are particularly important to them, and persevering in the face of obstacles or initial rejections to their proposals by colleagues and/or superiors.

If I think [I have] a good idea, then I would go and talk to people. And I would say "... I would like to work on this, I think this is where we should be going. ... However, what do you think?" ... [I]f you have a number of people who think it's a good idea and they're willing to work with you, then I would say, you know, bring it to the next stage, knowing that when this came up in some kind of discussion or vote, that there would be people that would be supportive. (Irene)

I've found a very persistent approach that is calm and methodical to be very effective. There is absolutely no point in getting visually upset or emotional in any circumstance because I believe that that ... discredits the content of the material that you're presenting. If you don't get what you want on that one occasion, you just keep coming back to it. (Bridget)

It becomes clear from the women's stories highlighted above that many use collaborative means to get what they want. Audrey adds, "I think there's a lot to be said for the collaborative, non confrontational approach, that I see also being feminine, as being important for helping to come to consensus as opposed to ... perhaps a more authoritarian [stance]."

Senior women seem eager to promote women's cause. Below Madeleine describes two situations in when she provided help to female students. In the first scenario she outlines her involvement in the resolution of a harrowing sexual harassment case. In the second scenario, Madeleine proceeds to tell another story in which she ran interference in a situation of miscommunication between a female student and a male instructor.

[I]t was a situation where she was harassed and truly frightened by the behavior of a man, actually a graduate student who was severely disturbed. But ... I had to educate the Dean that this was a case of true sexual harassment, this was attention of a sexual nature that was clearly unwanted, that was interfering with her ability to work. ... I was afraid that it would slow her progress toward a degree.

There was also an incident a couple of years ago in our department where a young women felt that she had been pointed out and treated badly by one of the demonstrators... So I said, 'I suggest that you talk to him about it, this is the first step to take, and if you feel uncomfortable about doing that I'm happy to be with you.' ...In fact they had a very productive and very useful conversation. I never heard another word of complaint by her. She felt good about it afterwards.

As senior academics, Irene and Natalie indicate that they provide career advancement advice to junior women faculty in their respective departments.

I'll say to them, 'well, you're coming up for P and T and if you want me to take a look at your CV and make some suggestions about it, I'd be happy to do that.' And they all do that. Or I'll say to them, ... 'what you should make sure that you do now is don't take on any committee work, you know, get these publications out.' (Irene)

[I]t's a big disadvantage for young female faculty women to be out of the loop and not to hear the informal stuff. ... It's the informal gossip, the informal connections, the informal understanding of the lay of the land that's absolutely crucial to establishing your career. If you are in an administrative position you generally have

good access to that kind of information and gossip and of course you have the opportunity to pass it along to younger women. ... I think, that is a valuable thing about taking on administrative work. That's also the valuable thing about Wednesday lunches, that's where we exchange much of this information. (Natalie)

Some women report that their feminist stance facilitates their career progression especially after tenure when they become more productive due to feminist research. Megan notes: "My career began before I overtly knew feminist material. Well let me put it this way: I don't think I'd be as productive now as I am without it, it's made a huge difference to my motivation and to my interest at this point in both my writing and my teaching." Natalie believes that being open about her feminist views makes her everyday life in the academic milieu more pleasant.

[I]t's much better to be active and on the offensive, so that people have to deal with you instead of you always reacting to them and trying to get up the nerve to respond when you think something has happened. In the end it's much easier if people just know you're a feminist, then they tend to monitor themselves a little bit more...

Although I would describe the women in this study as feminists, very few identified themselves as such and they cited the negative (or radical) connotation that the word entails as the main reason for refusing the label. All of them agreed that they believe in equality of the sexes. Those who identified themselves as feminists either tended to be in departments where feminism was recognized or they tended to be younger assistant professors. Susan Twombly (1996), in her study of women administrators in a Costa Rica university, also finds that the women were unwilling to assume the title of feminist. She writes: "Although most defined the term as equality between the sexes, most agreed that to adopt the label would make change more difficult for women because of the hostility it engenders" (p.121).

Some women academics in administrative posts may use the power granted to them by virtue of their position to pursue equity issues. Natalie, who is a Chair, indicates that she

uses a collaborative leadership style consisting of talking and listening to people. Below she describes the ways in which she has influenced change in her department:

In the past, ... this [department] was famous for being an old boys club ... what I tried to do is change that ... in terms of how we advertise for new people, [and] what kinds of people we are willing to take seriously. ... I don't want the women to feel like secondary citizens... [C]ertain issues, questions, considerations, worries that may not have been treated as legitimate a few year ago are generally treated as legitimate and that's true at the hiring stage. You can say that there just aren't enough women on the short list and people will take that seriously. Similarly when we are admitting graduate students, if it becomes clear that we have very few offers going out to females, we'll go back and we'll look again. It doesn't mean that we let in under qualified females, it's just that when we find good females, we'll go after them strenuously.

Paula describes the various paths available to women academics who wish to succeed in academe. She indicates that she chose the path of using her own individual power to influence change in the academic environment rather than being an “active feminist” or supporting the status quo.

*It seemed to me that one way in being involved with women was to be active as a feminist. ... That was the primary route. I guess the other way was to be more traditional and to just accept everything as it was and then I think there was the road that I probably took which was pretty much be on your own and to be aware of what was going on around you and be feeling fairly determined to make it so that you'd be in a position eventually where you might be able to actually hold some sweat.
(Paula)*

By and large, the junior women academics are reluctant to voice their concerns in an effort to avoid “stepping on the toes” of their senior colleagues and/or superiors. On the other hand, senior women faculty use various means of exercising their individual power to instill change. For instance, they speak-out by voicing their concerns in public, during committee meetings, and with their colleagues and/or superiors. As well, they use their powers of persuasion, perseverance, and collaboration to promote women’s causes. To further ensure continued employment opportunities for future generations of women

academics, these senior women help facilitate the career progression of junior women faculty.

Collective Power

The women at this university also hold official Women's Caucus meetings. At these meetings, one of which I attended, they speak about women's issues and seek innovative ways to improve provisions for women in the university. The Women's Caucus has been successful in improving such policies as the maternity leave plan. It has also sought to develop and help maintain a Women's Studies Program. Natalie, who was influential in the development of a center for women's studies and research, describes the impact of the establishment of the Women's Caucus on the evolutionary process of transformation occurring at the university as a result of the efforts of women faculty.

It's been a gradual process at [this university] ... most of the feminist organizing started between 1979 and '81. About the same time that the Status of Women Action Group was getting started in the city as a whole in which many of us were active, the University's Caucus on Women's Issues was also starting and the Caucus has been a very influential group at the [this university]. It's open to all women employees of the university, not just faculty, but grad students, T.A.s, staff, professional, managerial and that group has worked at a number of levels to bring about change at [the] university. Originally, part of our constitution was to try to lay the groundwork for some kind of Women's Studies program and to bring in speakers on feminist issues, that sort of thing. Those efforts contributed to the establishment of a ... [center for women's studies and research] which is a part now of the regular academic establishment at the university. The Caucus as a result has changed its focus in some ways, that is it doesn't have to be the group that brings in the feminists speakers because the center does that and sponsors conferences and so on but the caucus continues to be active in trying to effect policy around the university.

Through an organization such as the Women's Caucus, women throughout the university, including faculty, students, and staff, are encouraged to join together in using their collective power to abolish campus-wide injustices. Natalie's story outlines several important stages

that exemplify progress for women's issues at this university. The women began by inviting "speakers on feminist issues" — an action which can be subsumed under the stage of consciousness raising or creating awareness surrounding inequities. This awareness led to the establishment of a center for women's studies and research — a structure which symbolizes a recognition of the need for change, which we can label as stage two. The Center assumed the responsibilities involved in stage one, thereby leaving the Caucus free to pursue, in stage three, the creation of women-centered policies at the university and the development of feminist courses throughout various departments as noted below.

In the late 70's and early 80's the caucus pushed hard to get various departments to start courses on feminist issues and it was at that time we started our [first feminist] course... At that point I certainly wasn't Chair, I wasn't even full-time or tenure track but the same individuals by and large continued the work. You know as they were very junior in '79/'81 and are now more senior in 1996 ... what's significant is the fact that people who did work on issues that were regarded as trivial, fluffy, whiny in 1979 to 1981 are now taken seriously enough that they can actually occupy administrative positions that have a lot of work and a little power attached to them. I mean I suppose that's progress, right? ... Maybe I was more important when I was really young and sticking my neck out without the comfort of tenure. And that's looking back, you know, in '79 most of us who were organizing this Caucus, many of us had no job security whatsoever and now we do and that's certainly a help; what's also been a help has been that younger women have come along.

Having reached stage four, the women who worked toward change for almost three decades are now occupying administrative positions, which grant them the power to continue further the process of transformation. One way in which this process lives on is through the efforts of smaller groups of women who can also establish a locus of collective power. Natalie describes the ways in which she and her three female colleagues have influenced change in their own department:

We do have a committee on women's concerns, this is a standing committee in the department, not an ad hoc committee. I hope what has changed is the legitimacy of certain kinds of issues, certain kinds of questions, for example we now have ... graduate and undergraduate courses in feminist issues... We have students now

doing dissertations that sometimes, in some part, deal with gender. That's not the sort of thing that would have been regarded as legitimate in [this field] in the past and I'm not saying that's because of me directly. I hope I've contributed a small part to legitimating certain kinds of questions, certain kinds of issues, not just inside the discipline but even in terms of how the department runs, you know, that one has to take allegations of sexual harassment seriously and one can't just laugh off certain kinds of behavior or concerns on the parts of students. And again, I don't think that I individually have had that much influence but there are four of us, you know, two relatively senior women and two quite junior women, all of whom would describe ourselves as feminists. And all of whom take a fairly strong position on these issues. I think that that's changed the dynamic of discussions in the department ... how we talk to one another, how we talk to our students, how we operate as a department.

These four women have also been successful in increasing the number of female graduate students in the department. Women faculty who work toward change in their own small groups within individual departments can simultaneously contribute to the larger goal of university-wide transformation by paving the way for other groups in other disciplines to follow suit.

Beyond these small-scale and/or large-scale changes derived from the women's collective power is the ultimate desire to foster the enhancement of women's everyday lives at the university. However, being women in a profession which is still largely male, the women realize the necessity to provide one another with ongoing support, as they await the outcomes of their efforts. For example, since 1979, the women have formed a support network by establishing a long tradition of getting together for lunch one day a week. By talking to women in other disciplines at this unofficial weekly Caucus event, the women try to counteract the kind of loneliness and isolation which they experience from having very few women in their own discipline. Thus, some of the characteristics comprising the women's collective power include: large group action, small group action, and a support network that meets frequently to address the women's needs for social interaction among female scholars.

Conclusion

The women's stories reveal the need to value the different perspectives which they bring to the academy. This recognition would entail a greater sensitivity to women's career interests and an academic work environment that is supportive of women's needs. The personal and professional aspects of women's (and men's) lives are intertwined and a certain amount of compatibility among these two spheres is necessary to ensure success in both. The women demonstrate how they make little distinction between their work and their family lives, for in similar ways they care about their children, students, colleagues, research, homes, and departments. If the profession as a whole were to acknowledge its responsibility to accommodate the needs of women, perhaps more women would be inclined to make the pursuit of scholarship their life's work.

The women would like to see many changes in the structure of academic careers and in the culture of the academic environment. Nonetheless, their various suggestions for alternative models of academic careers all include some aspect of caring. The first approach that the women embrace is a recognition of variations in work preferences and contributions, which implies an act of caring for individual differences much like establishing a "community of difference," which Tierney and Bensimon (1996) call for in academe. This aspect of the model requires the system to reward equally these work preferences and related contributions made toward departmental, faculty-level, and university-wide caring responsibilities. The second approach, creation of a collegial work climate, advocates for caring and respect among colleagues in the work environment. The third change that the women would like to see occurring in the academy is an end to the gender power differential, a change which calls for caring and respect for women academics and female students. The

fourth change, a link with the community, is a way of people showing mutual respect for each other. The fifth approach requires a recognition of the typical female life course in much the same way that the typical male life course is currently acknowledged. This entails a general appreciation of women's sense of caring for the dual responsibilities of work and family. Further research may seek to ascertain whether these arguments can be extended to include minority faculty and students.

The women's sleeping tales represent the stories that tell the ways in which women deserve praise and reward for their hard work — work which involves caring and remains virtually invisible by academic standards. One of the sleeping models or arguments which the women advocate is that men should assume more of the caring responsibilities in academe. Claiming “caring” as work which is valued in reward systems means that those women already devoting their time to this labor will be properly rewarded. I view this as a way of fostering academic ethics and responsibilities that are sensitive toward women.

By using their individual and collective power the women in this study have begun the process of transforming structural and cultural inequities within the university. For over a decade, they have been actively involved in seeking justice for women. They have demonstrated their collective power through university-wide group action, small group departmental action, and the establishment of support networks for women. Equally as important is the senior women's use of their own individual power to bring about change by generally voicing their concerns, voting in committee meetings and employing such strategies as persuasion, perseverance, and collaboration to promote women's issues and improve women's lives. The senior women remain optimistic that the future generation of women academics will continue foster university-wide social and structural transformation.

Chapter Nine

Conclusion:

Engendering Women's Lives Inside and Outside Academe

Introduction

I began this work with the assertion that women can tell their own stories, which in turn illustrate the ways in which the university and society operate, and with the decision that the data for this feminist study would consist of the lived experiences of women. By placing at the center of my work the experiences of women academics and the elements that influence those experiences within a framework which rests on several tenants derived from feminist theory, I formulated some of my goals, which were to explore reality from the women's perspectives, to ask and answer questions framed by women, and to explain certain phenomena for the sake of women. Rather than using historically embedded assumptions that tend to structure universities around men, as a critical feminist I question the assumptions surrounding existing policies and practices and I attempt to reformulate those assumptions to be more responsive to women. The richness of this data may contribute to the enhancement of theory through a greater understanding of women's lives. Embodied

within this framework is a hope or goal of transforming various oppressive characteristics of the academy.

In the introduction, I also stated that women are involved in institutions that reproduce social and gender inequities, and incorporate power and hierarchy. In each of the subsequent chapters, I then attempted to describe the inequities that women encounter as actors in academic careers that are gendered, racist, and classist. I sought to interpret women's reports of experience in order to provide a clearer understanding of the ways in which their careers and family lives are intertwined within the context of a patriarchal society. In this sense, my research offers a deeper understanding of women's particular situations, and explores the relationship between oppression and the reality of women's lives.

I also began this study with the claim that women are capable of generating resistance to inequality with the hope of bringing about social change. Barbara Townsend (1993: 36) points out that "women's experiences need to be more fully portrayed ... including women's contributions to the academy not just their problems with it." In keeping with this line of thought, I highlight and praise the efforts of the women, which in many ways have transformed the university and enhanced their own career progression. I also attempt to address the women's visions for alternative career paths that offer hopes, possibilities, and promises of a better future for women academics.

What I hope has become clear in this work is that the private lives of women are as taboo in academe as they are in much of the public world. Significant aspects of women's stories sustain invisibility as a result of the lack of acknowledgement of a profound connection between women's personal and professional lives. To include adequately women's lived experiences in academe, we must reinterpret the academic world as an interwoven tapestry of

the private and public lives of individuals. In the meantime, tabooed subjects and practices result in forms of inequality, in the sense of oppressive values, attitudes, and practices that continue to disadvantage women academics, and women continue to challenge these taboos that serve to maintain their second-class status in academia.

In this chapter, I use feminist theory in conjunction with the data from the previous chapters in order to develop a conceptualization of the taboos that the women professors in this study encounter in the academy. Later, I combine feminist theory with the women's thoughts for improving academic careers to provide a vision of woman-centered academic careers. I conclude by calling attention to how the process of transformation requires a greater sensitivity toward women's personal lives in the public domain of the university.

Viewing Academia From a Feminist Perspective

Feminist scholars depict universities as patriarchal organizations for male dominance is prevalent throughout the system (Bensimon and Marshall 1997). White male dominance is characteristic of administrative and tenured academic positions. A number of assumptions underlie the maintenance of male dominance within universities. For instance, men tend to recruit and support those similar to themselves (Aisenberg and Harrington 1988); men in positions of power choose to reproduce mainstream literature, curriculum, and pedagogy in academe (Rich 1993); and challenge directed at the status quo is strongly resisted by those in power (Stalker 1998). Mary Evans (1995: 73) writes: "because what is studied in universities has been constructed by long years of male domination of academic life, the very assumptions of the academy — its claims to universal and generally applicable knowledge — have to be challenged." Val Walsh (1995: 87) notes that white men "monopolize the

construction and production of knowledge” and “[w]omen academics who research, write and teach, infringe this monopoly.”

The gendered consequences of white male dominance in universities have been widely depicted by the literature in terms of overt discrimination such as women’s lower salaries and subtle discrimination such as the “chilly climate” for women. The women faculty in this study have contributed stories from their own personal experiences that support the prevalence of overt and subtle sexism in their academic milieu. Some have experienced difficulty obtaining academic employment and/or tenure and promotion, which they attribute in large part to their gender. Others report a lack of support from their colleagues, a lower level of appreciation of their service work in the department, and a sense of being assimilated into the system rather than being accommodated on the basis of their own needs. This white, middle-class male-defined culture is problematic for it leads to a blindness to the notion of difference on the basis of gender, race, and class.

Indeed, both overt and subtle inequality, and the academy's resistance to change continue to bar women faculty from full participation. According to Stalker and Prentice (1998) there are a number of ways in which some white men attempt to discredit equity seekers. First, they critique the sources and samples by pointing out that the anonymity provided to women and minorities might lead them to speak falsities, and that men’s stories which would be quite different are excluded from the research. Second, they deny accountability by labeling human rights legislation as unfair, for they dislike the notion that it holds those in positions of authority accountable for their behavior. Third, they reject responsibility by shifting the blame to the victim such as the insinuation that a woman cannot accept a joke, albeit sexist.

Fourth, they demonize women by describing their equity efforts as the result of radical feminist groups practicing male abuse and a conspiracy to take over the academy.

Male dominance within universities also facilitates the maintenance of male-defined careers and makes them incompatible with the needs of women faculty. Thus, women need not only new ways but also new words (hook 1989) when attempting to “dismantle the master’s house” (Lorde 1984: 112). This study demonstrates that in a number of ways women academics are afflicted by career path taboos (forbidden behavior, language, and ideology) that undermine their efforts toward career advancement. Nonetheless, they use individual and collective power to challenge these taboos.

Conceptualizing the Taboos

What has been learned from this feminist study? The use of a critical feminist perspective has allowed me to reveal five taboos that have either previously gone unnoticed or remain silent in the academy. For the purpose of this work, I define taboo as a “forbidden or disapproved of” behavior, language, or attitude “resulting from social or other conventions” that is institutionalized within the university (Hanks 1986: 1549). As stated in the introductory chapter these taboos result in the silence surrounding issues such as privileged lives, engendered contradictions, childbearing, childrearing, and caring. There are two categories of taboos that I identify. One category consists of behaviors that are tabooed such as childbearing, childrearing, and caring. The other category qualifies issues of privilege and contradictions as near-taboos because the behavior itself is not forbidden; rather, there seems to be a taboo on open discussion of these issues. For instance, literature on women academics that addresses the question of women’s position relative to men rarely explores

the relative privilege held by white women academics as opposed to minority women. Thus, both the privileged lives of women academics and the contradictions that they experience on an everyday basis can be viewed as near-taboos in the sense that there is relatively little discussion in the pertinent literature or in the halls of academe about these issues. In contrast, other issues, such as childbearing and childrearing prior to tenure and valuing the caring work that women do, can be viewed as actual tabooed practices in many ways. For instance, the women in this study deal with childbearing and childrearing taboos by having either May babies or post-tenure babies. As well, caring work is not valued in the reward system. None of these taboos or near-taboos appear as officially written policies within the university; rather, they are hidden and have become part of the unwritten policy. These taboos result in inequities for women academics. In my view stronger language, such as tabooed subjects and practices, is required to help eliminate inequality for women academics. In conceptualizing the taboos, I refer to several common elements that help foster an understanding of the women's lives, which include:

- Using feminist theory to describe the taboo;
- Identifying the assumptions underlying each taboo particularly as depicted by the women in this study;
- Drawing examples from the data to illustrate the reality of each of the taboos;
- Illustrating the ways in which these taboos are reproduced in the academy; and
- Understanding the gendered consequences of specific practices and ideologies that create each taboo.

For the purpose of applying theory to research, I have chosen to focus on feminist themes that seem particularly relevant to my work, including issues such as the social construction of

gender, the concept of difference, and gender binaries such as male dominance and female subordination. I also use the three assumptions that form part of the theoretical framework for this research, which are outlined in the introduction and reiterated at the beginning of this chapter: that women can tell us about how the university and society function; that women participate in a system that reproduces social inequality; and that women are capable of resisting inequality and transforming the oppressive nature of the academy. By drawing heavily on these themes and assumptions, I clarify some of the key issues surrounding the taboos. I conclude by examining the possibility of creating women-centered academic careers by focusing on the data gathered from the women's lives. To illustrate one way in which the process of transformation can take place, I combine the women's stories with one of the goals of feminism — that is, to disrupt power hierarchies — and with a possible means to achieve that goal — writing and living beyond the ending.

Taboos Surrounding Issues of Privilege

In power and politics feminist theory, gender is a fundamental category of analysis used for critiquing the binary gender/sex system, which in certain instances hierarchically places women below men (Smith 1987b, Reinharz 1992). But the apparent binary of the gender/sex system is complicated by structures of race and class so that a white, middle-class woman is not regarded as subordinate to a non-white man (hooks 1983). One of the goals for using gender as an important analytical category is to depict and ultimately destroy patriarchal domination. Another goal is to remedy the silence and distortion of women's experiences in a male-defined world (Lather 1988). Using gender as the sole analytical tool in feminist research ignores the ways that class, race, sexuality, religion and so on help determine

women's experiences. Feminist scholars inform us that white, upper- and middle-class women tend to be blind to the differences among women on the basis of race, class, sexuality, and disability (Lorde 1984; Spelman 1988; hooks 1989). In particular, feminists of color point out that white, middle-class feminists focus on sexism because it is most important to their situation. Such a focus overlooks the ways that women may practice racism or domination (Collins 1991). Thus, several ingredients contribute to the social construction of gender and individual experiences of oppression (hooks 1989). Gender constitutes only one category for feminist research and it must be understood within the context of women's historical and present day situations.

In recent years feminist researchers have begun to use self-reflection to describe the ways in which their own privileged lives influence their studies. Less common is the analysis of the privileged lives of the women who participate in the studies. Privileged women (white, upper- or middle-class, heterosexual) in this society should reveal the ways that those privileges influence their lives. This discussion does not mean that gender should not be used as a category of analysis in feminist research, but rather that there are in fact multiple *genders* as gender is constructed simultaneously by race, class, sexuality, and norms of embodiment. Those whose gender is inflected by race and class privilege experience gender oppressions as salient because they enjoy race and class privilege. Thus, at the beginning of my work I describe the privileged lives of the women in this study and then I proceed to focus on gender as the central analytic category because for these women sexism is the more prominent issue in their lives. Sexism determines the power relationships between women and men of the same class and race groups in their personal lives and in the public sphere and therefore ending patriarchal domination is a central goal of feminism (hooks 1989). The

importance of identifying privilege among women as a tabooed subject in academe is to indicate that the status of privileged women faculty is not often discussed in the halls of academe nor in academic scholarship.

Insofar as the women in this study depicted relatively privileged lives, I was able to examine how their privileged status influenced their decisions to become academics. By and large these women are white and tend to have middle-class backgrounds. None of the women experienced simultaneously the three prominent forms of disadvantage, namely: gender, race, and class. The women from a working class background report that their white racial identity provides them with some form of privilege. Even the minority woman feels relatively privileged as a result of her middle-class status.

Numerous childhood and adulthood experiences influence the women's career decisions. First, the women cite their relatively privileged status as a major factor contributing to their decisions to embark on academic careers. They stress the point that their privilege does not rest in their gender but rather in their class and/or race background. Consequently, the advantages that they derive from their class and/or race allows many of them to surmise that their gender plays a more important role in their lives as they attempt to renounce traditional barriers and develop a professional identity. Second, all of the women report that they received uncommon support from their parents to acquire an education. And some of the women report that their fathers provided uncommon support to pursue an academic career. While only one woman describes her mother as a role model in her career decision, seven women depict their academic fathers as persuasive figures in their young lives and several others note that their non-academic father encouraged them to pursue professional careers.

Thus, the women cite their relatively privileged status and the uncommon support received by their parents as important factors contributing to their career decisions. Once the women reach the level of a university education a number of other factors help solidify their career decisions. In some cases the women report the love of subject matter and the presence of faculty encouragement or role models as particularly important, and in other cases the women report the discovery of an accidental career path. In terms of financing their education, a predominant theme is that the parents of many of the middle class women in this study financed their undergraduate education, but the women then financed their own graduate education through scholarships, teaching assistantships and/or by working part or full-time. However, some of the women financed their own undergraduate and graduate education, especially those from a working class background. Those who paid for their own undergraduate education may not have gone to graduate school were it not for scholarships. Some were married during graduate school so their partners' income helped with the finances. Working class and minority people may not be privy to such advantages. In this sense, privilege is a taboo word for these advantages are silenced in the halls of the academy.

One of the consequences of using the social construction of gender as the primary analytic category in feminist work is that it may provide a "false promise of universality among women" (Bloom 1998: 141). Therefore, I believe that it is possible to both analyze the concept of gender and to combine it with other analytical categories which reveal women's multiple subjectivities. Future research can compare and contrast the everyday lives of privileged and less privileged women in academe, providing it is possible to find women of different classes and races who are willing to relate their stories.

Taboos Surrounding Issues of Contradictory Experiences

Another feature of this critical feminist research is that it involves the study of women's diverse lives in academe. In other words, the primary sources of data are the women's accounts of their lives, which focus on personal experiences. Feminist scholars often use personal experiences as a starting point for developing feminist theory (Mies 1991). Sometimes generating theory is accomplished by interpreting women's personal narratives. The Personal Narratives Group (1989: 6) notes that "each life provides evidence of historical activity — the working out within a specific life situation of deliberate courses of action that in turn have the potential to undermine or perpetuate the conditions and social relationships in which the life evolved." Hence, placing women's lives at the center of the analysis provides an understanding of the diverse ways in which women work through everyday gendered relations. In this section, I want to focus on the ways in which women faculty perceive and experience contradictions in a male dominated academic milieu.

The *tenure-child* contradiction involves the inconsistencies inherent in the expectation that women academics should plan the timing of their maternity to fit their career schedules. Some of the young women in this study receive clear messages from their colleagues that having children prior to tenure reduces their likelihood of achieving tenure, for the assumption is that women with children are not serious about their careers. The same assumption, however, does not hold true for male academics. Men with wives and children are perceived as being "settled down," and therefore able to place their full concentration on their work. Since women who enter academic careers are at least in their thirties, those who choose to have children may want to do so in the earlier stages of their career for biological reasons. Another difficulty with this scenario is that the university culture attempts to fit all

women into a particular mold. Not every woman can plan her maternity and not every woman has an easy pregnancy or delivery. Accommodations must be made on an individual basis. In this sense, trying to assimilate women into the male model of an academic career is virtually impossible. An obvious distinction emerges between the social expectations of women and men; that is, unlike men, women academics are expected to forego having children in order to affirm their career commitment.

The *child-career* contradiction pertains to the numerous conflicts that the women experience in attempting to balance both an academic career and a family life. For instance, the women claim that their work provides the flexibility necessary to accommodate the care of young children. In contrast, they note the time consuming nature of their work and the conflict which they experience between work and family, as well as the resulting stress and fatigue associated with balancing career and family responsibilities. One of the major inconsistencies between events in their lives which they indicate is the difficult task of finding sufficient time to for research and publishing while attending to young children. Some of these women cannot escape their feelings of guilt. When they are spending quality time with their children they feel guilty about the enormous amount of work left undone and when they are working they wonder if they have allocated sufficient time to their children. Even when they are caring for, and playing with, their children they report that they are preoccupied with their work and therefore they feel guilty about not giving entirely of themselves to their children. Much of the internal conflict that the women experience can be attributed to the time consuming nature of both forms of labor and the reluctance on the part of the profession to accommodate the female life course.

The *time-consuming work* contradiction addresses the inconsistency between the control that the women claim they have over their work and the limitations placed on their work due to time restrictions. While they appreciate the lack of supervision, the right to choose their own course of research, and the control over working hours, they also declare that the enormously time consuming nature of their work causes time conflict and extreme stress. Even though they enjoy their research, conducting research leads to stress because time for research is limited due to other work-related responsibilities. This lack of time interferes not only with their research output but it also reduces their abilities to receive funding. In turn, low publication output undermines tenure and promotion endeavors. The impact of lack of time on tenure and promotion possibilities causes stress in the sense that assistant professors worry about their ability to receive tenure, and associate professors worry about their limited possibilities for career advancement. In the current economic climate even the full professors worry about the lack of time for research and its potential impact on job security. Dealing with stress, guilt, and worries becomes a facet of the women's lives partly as a result of the time consuming nature of their careers.

The *excessive workload* contradiction relates to the imbalance in workload between female and male academics, as identified by the women, and the corresponding lack of acknowledgement in the reward system for this extra work that the women perform. The women report performing the bulk of the service work in their department, such as committee membership as well as supervising, advising, and counseling the students. One reason for this inequitable workload is the large and growing number of women students in university compared to women faculty and the apparent desire on the part of these students to work with women professors. As well, women academics sit on more committees and

sometimes teach more courses than their male colleagues. Consequently, the women have less time than their male counterparts to devote to scholarly research and publications. Unfortunately the current system of tenure and promotion does not reward the extra work that women academics perform. And there is no other recognition either in the department or the faculty for their hard work and dedication. Instead, because of their gender, they are expected to perform these tasks, which can undermine their tenure and promotion possibilities.

For most of the women in this study, *social and intellectual isolation* is a common everyday experience and can be viewed as a contradiction for it is inconsistent with the feelings of pleasure that they express towards their career. For instance, in one breath the women report that they enjoy the interaction with the students, the intellectual stimulation, the teaching, the research, the traveling, and so forth. And in another breath they utter the discontent that they experience working in an academic surrounding that allows them to feel different from their male colleagues, alone, and somewhat unappreciated in the work that they do. Although I make the distinction that women in departments where they are underrepresented tend to experience isolation more readily than other women faculty, it is important to understand that women academics have a tendency to be underrepresented in most university faculties and departments and this is especially the case for the university in question. Specifically the women are looking for a more caring, supportive, trusting environment, one which embraces social and intellectual diversity and makes it possible to have female friends. What they describe is a “community of difference” (Tierney and Bensimon 1996) – a place where individuals are recognized, appreciated, and rewarded on the basis of their differences. Instead they receive overt and subtle messages from their male

colleagues indicating that women are different and somewhat inferior. This impression is provided in overt ways in that some women must undergo an appeal process to obtain their tenure status and few women are promoted to the senior level of full professor. In subtle ways women's exclusion from the "old boys' network" fosters their social and intellectual isolation, and increases the difficulty of career progression. Conventional literature treats professional socialization as an essential experience for individuals who want to become full members in the academy. Failure to achieve tenure is attributed to the individual's inability to adopt practices that facilitate publication productivity. In contrast, feminist scholars argue that women and men undergo different socialization experiences due to sexist practices within the university. Women become outsiders who are not privy to the important nonacademic information obtained through informal networks, known as the "old boys' club" (Aisenberg and Harrington 1988).

The gendered assumptions that underlie these contradictions include: the stereotypical notion that women are primarily responsible for home and children; the related pressure for women to assume a greater part of the caring labor in academic departments, and the gender stereotype that women are somewhat inferior to men. The gendered consequences of such sex role expectations is that women academics are burdened with excessive workloads on a daily basis as well as experiencing social and intellectual isolation amid circles of colleagues. Partly as a consequence of these assumptions, the contradictions that the women experience in the academic milieu are taboo subjects. Very little discussion revolves around such issues in the halls of academe and some of these contradictions receive little recognition in academic scholarship. I argue that these contradictions form obstacles to women's career progression in the form of micro-inequities. These invisible barriers to women's full

membership in the academy are not found in the statistical data, but become evident through conversations with women faculty. It is difficult to eliminate the effect of micro-inequities through legislation because they can only be totally abolished once traditional values and perceptions about gender are altered.

The Childbearing Taboo

While conventional research answers questions that men have about women, yet another feature of feminist critical analysis is that it attempts to address the questions that women have concerning their lives (Harding 1987). The purpose is to discover ways in which women can have authority over, and control of, their own lives. The relationship between childbearing and academic careers is not an issue that has been studied by conventional research, nor is it an aspect of life that is discussed in the halls of academe, but for those women contemplating or actually combining the birth of a child with the start of an academic career it is a time filled with many unanswered questions.

In this study, the stories of the older women academics answer questions or provide lessons about the difficulties of having children before securing their careers. These messages, which appear to be in the form of career advice, are passed on to the younger women and include: 1) *taking time off from work for child care can be harmful to women's career progression*; 2) *benefits for academic mothers do not address every woman's needs*; and 3) *having children before tenure can reduce the likelihood of achieving tenure*. One of the gendered consequences of these messages is that young women are unwilling to interrupt their careers or even take maternity leave before tenure. In this sense, childbearing becomes a taboo for the women are forbidden the necessary time to care for their newborns and they

are forbidden the necessary benefits to help them balance the dual responsibilities of work and children. Another gendered consequence of the childbearing taboo is that the women demonstrate a belief in the necessity of carefully planning their pregnancies to fit their demanding career schedules. Older women academics indicate that in the past, they attempted to have their babies in the month of May so as to not disrupt the teaching sessions in their departments. This event was so widespread at the university that it became known as the May Baby Phenomenon during a Women's Caucus meeting. Similarly, the younger women's anxiety associated with the prospect of pregnancy is manifested in an unwillingness to have pre-tenure children. Most of the women agree that childbearing before tenure is a taboo in academe for it reduces the possibility of obtaining a tenured position. Each of the three above messages helps to reproduce the childbearing taboo because both older and younger women express a certain amount of anxiety around issues of pre-tenure pregnancy and newborn infant care. As evidence that their anxiety is not unfounded, the experiences of some of the older women faculty with pre-tenure children show that they produce fewer publications and are consequently denied tenure. Some of these women appeal negative tenure decisions and win. But this difficult process affects their personal life and their relationship with their colleagues.

Hence, the childbearing taboo appears to result in what I refer to as the *hidden pregnancy phenomenon* which consists of the practices of older women to have May babies, the practices of younger women to have post-tenure babies, and the practices of both groups of women to hide their pregnancies during academic job interviews. Part of the reason for this phenomenon concerns the way in which benefits for pregnant women are viewed. While in the past those benefits did not exist, today benefits such as maternity leave and extension of

the tenure clock tend to exclude some women, while others fear that the career risk is too great to take advantage of the benefits. Another reason for the existence of this phenomenon relates to the ambiguities surrounding tenure; that is, the required number of publications remains a mystery. According to Tierney and Bensimon (1996), there is a certain mystery surrounding the productivity demands for tenure, no one seems to be quite sure of the quantity and quality of publications necessary, and the junior faculty sometimes get conflicting messages from their colleagues and the chair. Therefore women may not want an extra year before tenure because their colleagues' expectations about their productivity may increase. The gendered assumption that women who have children prior to tenure are not serious about their careers further contributes to the phenomenon. In the women's words, the hidden pregnancy phenomenon persists because the academic profession does not allow women their own career path.

For junior women in academe, the childbearing taboo virtually requires them to seek the help of medical technology in order to become mothers. Although many women are at least in their thirties when they begin an academic career (Committee on the Status of Women 1988), in part due to a lengthy educational preparation, and although fertility decreases at the around the age of 35 (Creasy and Resnick 1994), these women nonetheless are willing to wait 6 or 7 more years for a tenured position before considering maternity. The women credit the advances in medical technology which provide them with the possibility of experiencing motherhood later in life as one of the reasons for choosing post-tenure children. The other reason is that the academic profession limits the number of years to tenure thereby insisting that they pursue their career goals first. Another gendered consequence of the profession's unwillingness to accommodate the needs of women is that these women wanting

children may be forced to undergo infertility treatments which are not only costly, but also time consuming. In spite of medical advances childbearing is not a guaranteed result and some women may discover that they are unable to have children of their own at later age. Many of the costs, inconveniences, and disappointments that women academics can experience may be avoided if women are allowed a career path of their own.

The Childrearing Taboo

Feminist research can examine both questions of interest to the participants and questions that intrigue the researcher. In this way, the researcher is able to address issues that may relate to her own life. This is partly what Mary Margaret Fanow and Judith Cook (1991) refer to when they indicate that one can use “the situation at hand” for framing research questions. As a student for most of my adult life, I chose to defer the question of whether or not to have children of my own until about the time that I began this research. Thus as a starting point for this work I became interested in women’s dilemma of balancing career and family commitments. I sought answers to questions such as: Do women academics have children? What is the impact of childrearing on women’s academic careers? From such questions a larger project evolved. Nonetheless, in exploring women’s beliefs, experiences, and commitments to academic and family life, it became abundantly clear that part of my interest in this study was related to my desire to understand these issues for myself, and that seeking this knowledge may also have been the motivation to participate for the women in this study.

A major goal of power and politics feminist work is to disrupt power hierarchies and improve the situation of women, based on the tenet that patriarchal power disempowers

women. The sexual division of labor is one way in which male dominance is maintained in our society. It is assumed that masculinity is achieved when the man distances himself from routine daily household responsibilities (Hartsock 1987). Thus, private life becomes the female world and is distinguished from the male world of public life. Most importantly, women's gendered roles in the private sphere are devalued. Little significance or prestige is attributed to such tasks as cooking, cleaning, and even raising children. It is assumed that all women are equally capable of performing such tasks due to their "simplicity." The lack of appreciation and respect for this so called "women's work" is clearly understood among both women and men, since remuneration is not a part of the outcome of this type of work when performed by a woman spouse or partner in the private sphere. The implicit inferiority of home and child responsibilities may leave women vulnerable to preferring male-defined tasks (Hartmann 1987). This view becomes even more problematic, if women entering male dominated professions characterize themselves as more male-like or accept a gender role reversal by disassociating themselves from the traditional female role of homemaker, regardless of their competence in this role, merely because "it does not conform to society's perception of a competent person" (Mulqueen 1992: 3). In contrast, central to feminist thought, from a cultural feminist stance, is the positive image of women. These two notions lie in conflict with each other, for to succeed in a "male world" the women who accept the first point of view do not see themselves as victims of sexism, but rather as being different and perhaps even better than other women. Thus, while patriarchal discourse devalues traditional female roles, feminist thought rejects the negative stereotypes of women consistent with the master script.

One way to examine what makes childrearing issues taboo in academic life is to uncover organizational beliefs and symbols that affect the individual's behavior. The silencing of childrearing issues in professional life stems from the doctrine of separate spheres, which relegates women to private/domestic duties and men to public/professional tasks. On the basis of this doctrine, a life of the mind belongs to men. Nonetheless, in recent years more and more women have gained access to this male dominated sphere but the male culture persists in the public domain. The underlying assumption is that to become full members in the academic world women must gain not only a professional identity, but also a male one. There is no room for the private sphere in the work world created by men, and therefore women are expected to conform to such male-defined standards despite the fact that many of them continue to shoulder the burden of the domestic sphere.

Consequently the women in this study express a belief that the academic system is unjust since their male colleagues are not concerned with the conflicting issues of balancing career and family life. The women report that the superwoman syndrome is a myth because combining the roles of motherhood and professorship requires making *sacrifices* either in one's personal or professional life. For the women with children, time management means devoting more time to their children when they are young and more time to their career once the children are older. Junior and senior women alike identify *career risks* related to having and raising children, especially prior to obtaining a tenured status. As a result of their time commitment towards their young children, the women see *unfair differences* exhibited in their publication record compared to that of their male colleagues. Because they have less time for research when their children are young the women view the emphasis on quantity of publications in the tenure and promotion process as an unfair measure of their abilities. And

though they are able to focus on quality in their publications, this aspect commands a lesser value in the reward scheme. Even the different work ethics that some women bring to the profession lack recognition, especially when we consider their acts of caring for the students and other members in the department.

The gendered consequences of combining childrearing and childbearing with professional life are numerous and can significantly influence women's academic career paths. Their stories show that taking time away from their careers for the purpose of childrearing can be detrimental to their career progression; that the benefits extended to academic mothers do not sufficiently cover their needs; that using such benefits can be risky; and that simply having children prior to tenure can reduce their possibilities of achieving tenure. It seems that the very practices of bearing and rearing children are taboos in the towers of academe, given that the women either hide their pregnancies (recall the May baby and hidden pregnancy phenomenon) or delay having children until after they receive tenured positions, and that the women perceive childrearing as a risk to their career development.

Indeed, childrearing can be viewed as a tabooed practice in the academic world simply based on the fact that work benefits do not provide the necessary time for child care purposes. Over a decade ago the Committee on the Status of Women (1988) outlined numerous recommendations to help women academics balance family and career. Some of these suggestions seem to have gone unnoticed by policy-makers. Clearly, there is still a need for part-time positions that lead to tenure possibilities, job sharing that allows both of the colleagues to be eligible for tenure, special leaves to accommodate family responsibilities, both maternity and paternity leave to help the couple share family commitments, adoption leave, and appropriate child care facilities. These are policies and

practices that acknowledge the interconnection between the personal and professional lives of academics.

Taboos Surrounding Issues of Caring

The caring work that women do in the academy can be viewed as a tabooed subject for it too survives silence in the halls of academe. Caring as labor is “disapproved of” in the sense that it is not valued in the academic reward system, nor is it recognized in the university culture as a genuine form of labor. It seems that assigning value to caring is virtually forbidden in the academy for research, teaching, and service are appreciated differently in the reward system. Keeping in mind that part of emotional labor can be subsumed under the categories of teaching and service, the differential value placed on research, teaching, and service also appears in the way that activities are ranked in each area of evaluation. According to Shelley Park (1996: 48): “The more ‘pure’ the scholarship is (in form, content, and intended audience), the more value that research is accorded. To the degree that scholarship is ‘tainted’ by its affiliation with teaching or service-related activities, it is devalued.” She elaborates by noting that within the area of publishing, the production of journal articles for the benefit of peers is rated higher than writing textbooks for the benefit of students, which in turn is more important than the virtually insignificant task of making one’s work visible in the popular media for the general public. Likewise, she reports that teaching activities that are related to research (e.g., teaching graduate rather than undergraduate courses) are ranked higher than those related to service (advising students). In terms of service, she points out that being the representative or chair of a journal or conference is deemed more valuable than university service — unless one is in a noteworthy

position such as dean, suggesting that administrative work is more important than committee membership.

For the women in this study, caring is an aspect of their everyday lives which overlaps private and public boundaries. They demonstrate a genuine sense of caring not only for their family members, but also for their students, colleagues, and the overall well being of their department. From a cultural feminist perspective, the art of caring is one difference that some women academics bring to the university. To accommodate the needs of others the women I interviewed are willing to relinquish their scarce leisure time. For instance, they illustrate a commitment to emotional labor over and over again by turning their leisure time into child play if they are mothers of young children, or by devoting countless hours to the needs of their students. The very act of caring, however, becomes problematic for women faculty. Insofar as emotional labor does not count in any significant way when an academic is being considered for tenure and promotion, then why are women expected to assume the bulk of the caring work in the department, and why are women who refuse to involve themselves in such emotionally intensive work poorly treated? If emotional labor, teaching, and service are to be considered an important part of the institution's identity, then these activities should be properly rewarded. Similarly, William Tierney and Estela Mara Bensimon (1996: 85) find that a form of accommodation that junior women faculty engage in is what they call 'mom's work,' or "the imposition of nurturing and care taking roles on women." Within the academic culture they also discover a gendered "pressure to be popular with students"; in that women who do not make time for students are considered selfish, whereas male academics have more important work to do (p.85).

In order to play the academic game women would have to focus on research and publications by taking time away from teaching and saying no to committee work. The point is that, on the one hand, women must follow the typical academic career path which requires them to focus their efforts on research. But on the other hand, unwritten rules require women to assume the stereotype of the nurturing woman. Department cultures which foster such stereotypes place women academics in a double bind, for those who accept the nurturing role may find that they have little time for research and those who do not want to assume this role may discover that they are burdened with caring responsibilities regardless of their wishes.

Women-Centered Academic Careers

Feminist critical research aims to transform the academy's oppressive structures, policies, processes, practices, and ideologies. While conventional analysis tends to blame the women (or the victims) for their own situation, feminist analysis problematizes the system. Rather than assimilating women into the academy, critical feminists hope to dismantle the master's house so that women can be accommodated. In this sense, two major goals of feminist research are to disrupt power hierarchies (male dominance and female subordination) and create alternative discourses that are inclusive of women and their positive image. To disrupt power hierarchies, feminist scholars are looking more critically at ideologies, maintained by both women and men, which serve to fragment rather than integrate women's personal and professional lives. They challenge binary notions which privilege male-ascribed characteristics such as rationality and objectivity and marginalize female-defined features such as irrationality and subjectivity (Bartlett 1993). Moreover, feminists have recognized that under patriarchy women have "limited discourses" since much of our knowledge comes

from those in power. According to Dale Spender (1983: 379), as a result of white male power, “feminist theories encounter a problem of major proportions, for all feminists develop theories and attempt to make them available in a male dominated world.” She continues, “this means acknowledging that we can only make sense with what we know and yet so much that we know is suspect because it has been encoded by men and may work against our own interests.” In this sense, a major transformative goal of feminist work is to construct alternative discourses that are women-centered.

When focusing specifically on professions, power and politics feminist theory assumes that careers are gendered, racist, and classist; that is, they are embedded in the interaction of gender and power (male supremacy/female oppression), race and power, and class and power (hooks 1989; Tong 1998). Other scholars argue that academic careers are socially structured around the male life course (Orlans and Wallace 1994; Tierney and Bensimon 1996). Before women’s entry into academe the typical professor was the white academic man; hence when thinking about a university professor the image depicted was masculine and the pronoun used was “he.” Tierney and Bensimon (1996: 92) note that today “we talk about faculty as if they are an undifferentiated class of people, disembodied and sexless. This generalized image of faculty makes some women professors with children feel aberrant.” While universities have made progress in terms of employing larger numbers of women academics, their career paths still function according to norms from a distant past in which the exemplary academic was a white, middle-class male whose spouse handled all the domestic responsibilities.

The women in this study identify several ingredients that would contribute to the development of women-centered academic careers. First, they believe that the profession should recognize women’s work preferences and contributions. That is, individuals must be

able to make their own decisions as to the mix of research, teaching, and service that they perform. As well, each of these areas should be properly acknowledged in the reward system. The women also want a recognition of their contributions within the tenure and promotion assessment process, partly to compensate for the extra work which they perform in the way of emotional labor or service work. Second, the women would like to see a collegial environment that is inclusive of women in all aspects of university life, so that women no longer feel different, lonely, and isolated. Third, the women express a desire to see an end to the reproduction of the gender power differential, which positions the majority of women as students and the majority of men as professors, and adversely affects the relations between female and male faculty members. They hope to eliminate the power imbalance in the university structure by hiring and promoting more women into positions of power. Fourth, the women would like to see a link with the community in order to have the general public gain an appreciation of their work. In turn, this public support might be a way of alleviating the potential repercussions of financial restraints on research grants and equity policies. Fifth, the women want a recognition of women's life course in the academic profession. Broadly speaking the academic profession should acknowledge and support the interconnection between personal and professional lives.

Through both individual and collective power these women have begun the process of transformation within their university — a process aimed at meeting women's specific needs with respect to academic career paths. These needs consist of eradicating the various academic taboos that serve to silence their personal lives. Thus far they have succeeded in institutionalizing policy changes to help women with children pursue an academic career but there is a great deal of terrain to cover before academic careers begin fully to accommodate

women. According to the women academics the transformation process consists of at least three steps. First, the women have exercised individual and collective resistance to oppressive conditions. Second, they have established policies and practices to redress the situation. Third, they have sought changes in curriculum, everyday behavior, and ideology that positions women as second-class citizens.

For the women academics in this study, resistance to inequities that relate to combining an academic career with having children entails seeking a balance between personal and professional *sacrifices*, finding solutions to *career risks*, and addressing the *different treatment* of female and male academics. Job security permits tenured women academics, in particular, to pave the way for younger women to combine a personal and professional life by creating child friendly policies and welcoming junior women with children into the academic circle. However, changes related to the planning and timing of children and career have not taken place uniformly and across the faculties. Junior women in the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences are more willing to risk having children prior to tenure than those in other faculties. Apparently there is a need for the support of junior women from their senior female colleagues who adhere to feminist practices.

In terms of improving academic careers to reflect women's lifestyles, the women have pursued the following strategies: mentoring of junior female faculty by senior female colleagues, insisting that more women be employed and promoted at rates similar to their male colleagues, and advocating women's issues for the purpose of creating widespread awareness especially with respect to the insensitive climate that hinders women's career progression. They have also been instrumental in bringing about change in areas of policy that directly impact on a woman's career path such as maternity leave and the extension of

the tenure clock for the purpose of childbearing. The women have formed collective fronts by developing a women's caucus at the university and establishing a women's studies and research program. The collective power of these women remains alive and strong, for some of the older women who have worked toward change for a few decades now occupy administrative positions of power and some of the younger women have joined the cause to continue the process of transformation.

Conclusion

In the halls of academe, the bustling of everyday lives camouflages the inequities shrouded in silence that serve to impede women's efforts towards the inclusion of women-identified needs, preferences, and contributions in the very definition of academic career and professional life. The experiences of the women academics in this study are alive with taboos, struggles, contradictions, ambiguities, resistance, and transformation. The expectation that everyone can be guaranteed a particular kind of academic experience and result, regardless of gender, race, and class, is discredited by the diversity in the women's stories. These stories are shaped by a multiplicity of experiences that are based largely on gender because most of them are white, middle-class women and gender appears to be the more salient issue in their lives. Through these stories we gain an understanding of how the women perceive and respond to their roles both in the private and public sphere. As a critical feminist, I derived a list of tabooed issues from the women's perceptions of the ways in which cultural norms at the professional and institutional level influence their everyday experiences. Taboos revolving around issues of privilege, contradictory experiences, childbearing, childrearing, and caring appear to be fashioned by a white male-identified

academic way of life. For instance, the childbearing and childrearing taboos are not the result of women's lack of efforts in determining how to identify and protect their specific needs. Neither are taboos revolving around issues of caring and contradictory experiences related to problems of women doing too much service work or not engaging themselves in faculty social events. Rather, as a critical feminist I believe that these taboos and resulting inequities are derived from professional norms characteristic of a predominantly white male setting which operates at a level distinctly unaware of how the maleness and whiteness of its professional standards engender and race the lives of women faculty. The structure of academic careers serves to silence women's personal lives.

This silence with regard to the personal sphere results in disadvantages for women with children, which universities fail to address. For instance, the women appear to cope with childbearing and childrearing taboos by either having May babies (past) or post-tenure babies (present). The alternative for young women joining the academy is to resist such taboos by having children prior to tenure despite the possibility of negative tenure decisions that may cause personal trauma in the sense of possible depressions or scarred reputations. Even policies designed to recognize a woman's need for time away from work in order to raise children, such as maternity leave and extension of the tenure clock, seem powerless to confront stereotypical assumptions, such as the belief that having children before tenure may imply a lack of career commitment. Clearly, the acceptance of personal lives in the public academic sphere demands a transformation in prevailing traditional ideologies that serve as underlying principles for policies and practices.

That women have a different status than men in academe is evident from the division of labor. Women advise, counsel, supervise more students, and do more of the service work in

the department. The experiences of these women are influenced not only by their personal actions but also by the relations of gender and power that permeate the culture of the department and university. The portrait of women faculty as the “others” in academe is not uncommon and the women in this study further illuminate the reasons underlying their outsider status. The academic workplace sustains both overt and subtle inequality. Several terms can be used to describe these inequalities such as patriarchy, harassment, discrimination, and insensitive workplace climate. Underlying each of these inequalities is the social construction of gender — how we expect women and men to behave. While I am not prepared to say that essential differences exist between women and men, for I think that such differences may be minimal, I have come to the understanding that the social construction of gender has contributed to a gendered division of labor in the academy which when combined with women’s family responsibility and other workplace inequities only serves to add to women’s cumulative disadvantage.

Additionally, the notion of gender blindness, which assumes that the professor’s gender is invisible, helps perpetuate the myth that female and male academics are treated equally. In reality, gender-based assessments of academic structure, policies, and practices are necessary to eliminate overt and subtle discrimination against women. Clearly, the women in this study believe that they are treated differently in comparison to their male colleagues. For instance, some women are denied tenure, some sit on too many committees or advise/supervise too many students, some are told not to have children especially before tenure, and others have small offices without windows. Issues of career path, workload, and office space provide distinct messages about the power relations between women and men. The lower level of power ascribed to women becomes evident not only to faculty and staff, but also to the

students which may act as a male-defined career model to be reproduced by future generations.

Thus, the women's stories reveal a gendered hierarchy which is built into the structure of the academy. In preference to internalizing this structure, these women exercise resistance. They would like to see women-centered academic careers that are responsive to gender differences as well as to race and class differences. Such careers would challenge the notion of separate spheres by acknowledging the interconnection between personal and professional lives. Women's private lives would be accommodated as needed on an individual basis. The women spoke with much fervor about gaining acknowledgement for their contributions, work preferences, and life course. These greatly needed changes may lead women to acquire a sense of acceptance in the academic milieu. Through both individual and collective power women academics challenge the notion of separate spheres at this particular Canadian university. They also highlight the hope that one day they may celebrate the interdependence between their private and public lives.

Appendix A:
Invitation to Participate
and Consent Form

Electronic Mail Subject Title: Research on Women Academics

Ms. Carmen Armenti
295 Pall Mall
London, Ontario
N6B 2G8
(519) 645-7263

3/5/96

Professor
Faculty
Department
University

Dear Professor:

I am writing to request your participation in a study about women's experiences in the academic profession in Canadian universities. I am a Ph.D. student in the department of *Sociology in Education* at the *Ontario Institute for Studies in Education* (OISE). I am doing my thesis work on the lives and careers of women academics. My thesis committee members are Professors Sandra Acker (supervisor), Margrit Eichler, and Ruth Roach Pierson. I will interview twenty women academics in the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professors in order to appreciate what academic work is like for women. I will conduct interviews in departments where women academics represent a very low, an average, and a very high proportion of faculty members in order to get a complete picture of the variety of work that women do in academe. The aim of this study is to describe academic careers from a female perspective. I am interested in covering such issues as the connection between family and careers, as well as gender equity, workplace climate, scholarship, teaching, and workload.

The interviews will last about 90 minutes and will focus on your perspectives and experiences concerning issues of careers, family, and life as discussed above. This study will *not* evaluate the work or opinions of the participants, rather it seeks to *describe* women's experiences in academe. I hope to tape the interviews, with your permission. During the interview you can refuse to answer some or all of the questions, retract any statement, ask that I turn off the tape recorder and/or withdraw your participation at any time. I will strive to ensure anonymity and confidentiality by using pseudonyms and codes to replace the names of people and places when the interviews are transcribed. Only my thesis committee members will have access to the transcripts.

Before or after the interview, I will ask that you complete a brief questionnaire on your current position, departmental profile, and demographic information. I would also appreciate copies of departmental information (if available) such as directories and handbooks that reveal the proportion of female to male faculty and the same for students.

In the final written text, I will use pseudonyms and codes to replace the names of people and places. While I will be using the quotations from the interviews in the text, individuals will not be identified because the data will be pooled into categories. For example, I will indicate that “an associate professor stated” or “in departments where women tend to be underrepresented, one woman stated.” All of the raw data (i.e., tapes and questionnaires) and the interview transcripts will be stored in a locked filing cabinet.

I would really appreciate your participation in this study. I am available to answer any of your questions at the above telephone number. Please sign the next page in order to indicate your consent to be a participant in this research and return it to me.

Yours sincerely,

Carmen Armenti
Ph.D. student, OISE

Consent Form

I have read the letter outlining the research on women academics which is being conducted by Carmen Armenti for her Ph.D. thesis. I understand the research objective, process, and safeguards, and I agree to participate.

Date: _____

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Appendix B:
Interview Questions

Questions for Interviews with Women Academics

Education and the Beginning of an Academic Career

1. Tell me about your graduate education and how that led to your first academic job. How did you happen to embark on your career?
2. When did you first academic job begin?
3. How did your career progress from there? (not for assistant professors)
4. Did you encounter any difficulties/ barriers?

Responsibilities in the Current Academic Position (optional section)

Teaching

1. Tell me about the courses which you currently teach (description and quantity of courses).
2. Do you teach women studies/feminist or equity/diversity courses?
3. Have you made any changes in your course content and/or your teaching style over the years? What kind? (gender/diversity, pedagogy) (not for new assistant professors)
4. Is feminist or equity/diversity scholarship part of the curriculum in this department? Has it been in the past?

Research and Supervision

1. Tell me about your research interests (current research projects)?
2. Have you research interests changed over time?
3. Do you supervise graduate students? What is that like?

Administrations and Associations

1. Are you a member of departmental or university committees? How many? Which ones?
2. So you have any other administrative duties?

3. Are you involved in any of the decisions made in this department? Are any of the other women involved?
4. Are you involved in any professional associations? (explain)
5. Are there any other activities that you do that are related to your work?

Gender Equity: Issues of Marginalization, Chilly Climate, and Countervalues

Tenure and Promotion for Associate and Full Professors

1. Tell me about your experiences with tenure and promotion (number of years to tenure, difficulties if any).
2. What do you think of the amount of time that it took you to progress through the ranks relative to your colleagues?
3. In this department, do you think that merit and service lead to tenure? (or do internal politics play an even bigger role (follow the unwritten rules and networking)
4. What are your expectations for achieving the level of full professor (only for associate professors)?

Tenure and Promotion for Assistant Professors

1. How do you see the tenure process?
2. How are you preparing for it?
3. What are your expectations for achieving tenure?
4. In this department, do you think that merit and service lead to tenure? (or do internal politics play an even bigger role (follow the unwritten rules and networking)

Scholarship

1. What is it like getting funding for research?
2. How would you describe the process of publishing? What strategies do you use?
3. Some literature suggests that women have fewer publications than men. Would you say that you publish as much as other at your level?

4. Do you also publish feminist (equity/diversity) scholarship? If yes, follow-up with questions 5-7.
5. Is your feminist (equity/diversity) scholarship accepted for publication at the same rate as your non-feminist work?
6. What do your students, colleagues, and superiors think about feminist (equity/diversity) scholarship?
7. In terms of rank advancement, is your feminist (equity/diversity) scholarship valued as much as your other work?
8. Would you consider yourself a feminist? If yes, how has this influenced your career?
9. How has being a woman influenced your career?

Workload

1. Is your workload similar to that of your colleagues in this department?
2. Do you teach the same number of courses; assist on the same number of committees; and supervise the same number of graduate students as others?
3. How do you manage your time with respect to your professional workload (teaching, research, administration)? Do you devote more time to one area another?

Mentoring and Support Networks

1. Have you ever had a mentor or role model during your career? Was the mentor/role model a female or male?
2. Do you find that there are plenty of other women faculty in the department to offer support if you need it?
3. What is the ratio of female to male faculty in the department?
4. Are you a member of any women's organizations?

Harassment

1. The literature shows that some academic women experience harassment. Have you experienced harassment during your career?
2. Have you experienced discrimination? (employment, salary)
3. How do students, colleagues, and superiors relate to you? How do they address you? (stereotypes)
4. Have you had any experience with equity policies (employment equity, sexual harassment)?

How do Women Academics Influence Change: Environment and Restructuring***Workplace Environment***

1. Tell me about your department. Do the administrators make all the decisions or does everyone participate in decision-making?
2. Are issues of equity and diversity recognized (gender, race, sexuality, disability and so on)? Do these issues lead to conflict/ backlash?
3. Are feminist issues recognized?
4. Do faculty members engage in social events? (are women involved)
5. Do you feel free or cautious about speaking out?
6. What are the ways that you get what you want (strategic actions)?

Restructuring (optional questions)

1. Recently, have there been any significant changes (restructuring) in the department?
2. If yes, have these changes increased or reduced gender equity? How have the changes affected you?
3. Are you aware of any changes in the department curriculum? (introducing feminism, equity, diversity)
4. Have there been changes in teaching style or pedagogy, and supervision?
5. Have you been involved in bringing about any of these changes?

Balancing Family, Career, and Leisure Time

Career and Family

1. Tell me about your family (or relationship). Do you have a partner and children?
2. How many children and how old are they (if applicable)?
3. The literature shows that women academics forego having children (and reject marriage) for their careers. What are your thoughts on that? Would you say that this applies to you?
4. How do you manage your time between work and family or work and household responsibilities? Does one or the other take priority?
5. The literature suggests that some women academics place child care and household responsibilities first and their careers second. Would you say that this applies to you?
6. Did you delay your career while your children were young (work part-time, took time off) (if applicable)?
7. Did you ever make a geographic move in order to further your career or that of your partner?
8. Do you hire “outside help” to care for your children or home responsibilities?
9. Do you and your partner share child care and/or household responsibilities?
10. What do you think about the parental leave and child care policies at this university?

Career and Life

1. How do you use your leisure time?
2. How does your career impact on your leisure activities (or vice versa)?
3. How does the combination of career and caring for children (if applicable) impact on your leisure time?
4. Is it difficult to integrate a personal and professional life (why, why not)?

Positive and Negative Aspects of Academic Careers

1. Are you satisfied with your job?
2. What are the positive aspects of your career (what do you like about it)?
3. What are the negative aspects of your career (what do you not like about it)?
4. Do you consider your career/life to be stressful?
5. What coping strategies do you use?
6. How would you change academic careers in order to make them more favorable for women and their lifestyles?

Race and Class Privilege

1. Do you mind if I ask your ethnic and class background?
2. Has that background had any influence on your personal career experiences?
3. Did your parents' occupations steer you in the direction of an academic career?
4. This is a hypothetical question. If your parents were from the working class, do you think you would still be an academic today?
5. This is another hypothetical question. If your parents were part of a minority group (say a person of color), do you think you would still be an academic today?
6. Did you finance your own education?

Representation***Underrepresentation***

1. Since there are so few women faculty in this department, what effect does that have on you?

Equal Representation

1. Since there are approximately an equal number of women and men in this department, what effect does that have on you?

Overrepresentation

1. Since most of the faculty members are women in this department, what effect does that have on you?

Appendix C
Questionnaire

Questionnaire **The Careers, Families, and Lives of Women Academics**

Current Position

1. What is the name of your faculty and department?

2. What is the title of your position?

3. What is your tenure status?

4. What is your salary (optional)?

Demographic Information

1. What is your age?

2. What is your place of birth?

3. What is your ethnic origin?

4. What is/was your mother's primary occupation?

5. What is/was your father's primary occupation?

6. Please indicate your academic degree (begin with your first university/college degree):

Undergraduate or Graduate Field	Degree/Certificate	Name of Institution	Date Completed
---------------------------------	--------------------	---------------------	----------------

7. What is your present marital/relationship status?
8. Please indicate if you have ever been divorced (if applicable)?
9. What is your partner's primary occupation (if applicable)?
10. Please indicate the number and ages of children (if applicable)?

11. Is there any information that you wish to add?

Thank You Very Much For Your Time and Participation

References

- Abella, Rosalie. 1984. *Equality in employment: A Royal Commission report*. Minister of Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa.
- Acker, Joan, Kate Barry, and Johanna Esseveld. 1991. Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. In *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived experience*, ed. Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Acker, Sandra. 1994. *Gendered education: Sociological reflections on women, teaching and feminism*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Acker, Sandra. 1999. Caring as work for women educators. In *Challenging professions: Historical and contemporary perspectives on women's professional work*, ed. Elizabeth Smyth, Sandra Acker, Paula Bourne, and Alison Prentice. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Acker, Sandra and Grace Feuerverger. 1996. Doing good and feeling bad: The work of women university teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 26(3): 401-422.
- Acker, Sandra and Grace Feuerverger. 1997. Enough is never enough: Women's work in academe. In *Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from post-secondary education*, ed. Catherine Marshall. London: Falmer Press.
- Acker, Sandra, Amy Sullivan, and Margaret Kamau. 1996. Women academics in teacher education and the chilly climate metaphor. Paper presented at the Canadian Society for Studies in Education Annual Conference, Canadian Association for the Study of Women in Education Symposium on "Rethinking the Chilly Climate for

- Women University Students and Faculty,” Brock University, St Catherines, ON, June 5.
- Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women. 1986. *A future for women at the University of Toronto*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Aisenberg, Nadya and Mona Harrington. 1988. *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Aisenberg, Nadya and Mona Harrington. 1993. Rules of the game. In *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*, ed. J.S. Glazer, E.M. Bensimon, and B.K. Townsend. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Alcoff, Linda and Elizabeth Potter eds. 1993. *Feminist epistemologies*. New York: Routledge.
- Allen, H.L. 1994. Workload and productivity in an accountability era. *NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education*, 25-38.
- Allen, P. 1985. *The concept of woman: Classical to current concepts, 750 BC-AD 1250*. Montreal: Eden.
- Anderson, Kathryn and Dana C. Jack. 1991. Learning to listen: Interview techniques and analysis. In *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*, ed. Sherma Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai. New York: Routledge.
- Andrews, A.R. 1993. Balancing the personal and professional. In *Spirit, space and survival: African American women in (white) academe*, ed. J. James and R. Farmer. New York: Routledge.

- Astin, Helen S. and Diane E. Davis. 1993. Research productivity across the life and career cycles: Facilitators and barriers for women. In *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*. ed. J. Glazer et al. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Backhouse, Constance. 1995. An historical perspective: Reflections on the Western employment equity award. In *Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty*, ed. Chilly Collective. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Backhouse, Constance, Roma Harris, Gillian Mitchell, and Alison Wylie. 1989 (November). *The chilly climate for faculty women at UWO: Postscript to the Backhouse report*. London, ON: Unpublished report, University of Western Ontario.
- Backhouse, Constance, Roma Harris, Gillian Mitchell, and Alison Wylie. 1995. The chilly climate for faculty women at Western: Postscript to the Backhouse report. In *Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty*, ed. Chilly Collective. Waterloo Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Baines B. 1980. *Women, human rights and the constitution*. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Committee on the Status of Women.
- Bannerji, Himani. 1991. But who speaks for us? Experience and agency in conventional feminist paradigms. In *Unsettling relations: The university as a site of feminist struggles*, Himani Bannerji, Linda Carty, Kari Dehli, Susan Heald, and Kate McKenna. Toronto:ON: Women's Press.
- Bartlett, Katharine T. 1993. Feminist legal methods. In *Feminist legal theory: Foundations*, ed. D.K. Weisberg. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- Belenky, Mary Field, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberge, Jill Mattuck Tarule. 1986. *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bensimon, Estela Mara and Catherine Marshall. 1997. Policy analysis for postsecondary education: Feminist and critical perspectives. In *Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from post-secondary education*, ed. Catherine Marshall. London: The Falmer Press.
- Biklen, Sari Knopp. 1995. *School work: Gender and the cultural construction of teaching*. Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Billard, L. 1994. Twenty years later: Is there parity for academic women? *Thought and Action* 10:115-44.
- Blackmore, Jill. 1997. Disciplining feminism: A look at gender-equity struggles in Australian higher education. In *Dangerous Territories*, ed. Leslie Roman and Linda Eyre. New York: Routledge.
- Bloom, Leslie R. 1998. *Under the sign of hope: Feminist methodology and narrative interpretation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bogdan, Robert C. and Sari Knopp Biklen. 1992. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Second edition*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boyer, E.L. 1990. *Scholarship re-considered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brooker-Gross, Susan R.; Thomas A. Maraffa. 1989. Faculty spouses: Their post-migration job searches. *Initiatives* 52 (2): 37-43.
- Brooks, Ann. 1997. *Academic women*. Buckingham, England: Open Press University.

- Burns, Margie. 1993. Service courses: Doing women a disservice. *Academe*, May-June: 18-21.
- Butler, Avril and Mel Landells. 1995. Taking offence: Research as resistance to sexual harassment in academia. In *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*, ed. Louise Morley and Val Walsh. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Calas, Marta B. and Linda Smircich. 1993. Re-writing gender into organizational theorizing. In *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*, ed. J.S. Glazer, E.M. Bensimon, and B.K. Townsend. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers. 1986. *Brief to the Special Committee on Childcare*. Toronto: The Committee.
- Caplan, Paula J. 1993. *Lifting a ton of feathers: A woman's guide for surviving in the academic world*. A project of the Council of Ontario Universities Committee on the Status of Women. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Carnegie Foundation. 1989. *The conditions of the professoriate: Attitudes and trends 1989*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation. for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Carnegie Foundation. 1990. Women faculty excel as campus citizens. *Change* 22: 39-43, Sept./Oct.
- Cassuto, Leonard. 1998. Pressures to publish fuel the professionalization of today's graduate students. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, issue dated Nov. 27.
- Chilly Collective ed. 1995. *Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press.
- Chused, Richard H. 1985. Faculty parenthood: Law school treatment of pregnancy and child care. *Journal of Legal Education* 35: 568-596.

- Clark, Shirley M. and Mary Corcoran. 1986. Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty. *Journal of Higher Education* 57: 20-43.
- Cole, Jonathan. 1979. *Fair science: Women in the scientific community*. New York: Free Press.
- Cole, Jonathan and Harriet Zuckerman. 1984. The productivity puzzle. In *Advances in motivation and achievement*, ed. M.W. Steinkamp and M.L. Maehr. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Cole, Jonathan and Harriet Zuckerman. 1987. Marriage, motherhood, and research performance in science. *Scientific America* 256(2): 119-25.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1991. Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. In *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived experience*, ed. Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Committee on the Status of Women. 1988. *Employment equity for women: A university handbook*. Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities.
- Cooney, Teresa M. and Peter Uhlenberg. 1989. Family-building patterns of professional women: A comparison of lawyers, physicians and postsecondary teachers. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51: 749-758.
- Cotterill, Pamela. 1992. Interviewing women: Issues of friendship, vulnerability, and power. *Women's Studies International Forum* 15(5): 593-606.
- Creasy Leroy L. and Robert Resnick ed. 1994. Risk of chromosomal abnormality in newborns by maternal age. Table 1:71 in *Maternal fetal medicine: Practice and principles*. Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders.

- Creswell, John W. 1998. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE publications.
- Dagg, Anne Innis, and Patricia J. Thompson. 1988. *Miseducation: Women and Canadian universities*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Daly, W.T. 1994. Teaching and scholarship: Adapting American higher education to hard times. *Journal of Higher Education* 65.
- Davis, Celia and Penny Holloway. 1995. Troubling transformations: Gender regimes and organizational culture in the academy. In *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*, ed. Louise Morley and Val Walsh. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Davis, Diane E., and Helen S. Astin. 1987. Reputational standing in academe. *Journal of Higher Education* 58(3): 261-75.
- Davis, Diane E., and Helen S. Astin 1990. Life cycle, career patterns and gender stratification in academe: Breaking myths and exposing truths. In *Storming the tower: Women in the academic world*, ed. Suzanne Stiver Lie and Virginia E. O'Leary. New York: Nichols/GP Publishing.
- DeBeauvoir, Simone. 1952, reprint 1989. *The second sex*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Deitch, Cynthia and Susan Walsh Sanderson. 1987. Geographic constraints on married women's careers. *Work and Occupations* 14(4): 616-634.
- Denzin, Norman K. 1994. The art and politics of interpretation. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, ed. N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln eds. 1994. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.

- DiNitto, Diana, Marian A. Aguilar, Cynthia Franklin, and Cathleen Jordon. 1995. Over the edge? Women and tenure in today's academic environment. *Affilia* (10)3:255-79.
- Drakich, Janice and Penni Stewart. 1998. A profile of women faculty in Canada: Rank, discipline, and age 1957-1994. In *Status of women supplement*, ed. Status of Women Committee. *CAUT Bulletin Insert* 45(4): 7-11.
- Dubois, Ellen Carol. 1978. *Feminism and suffrage: The emergence of an independent women's movement in America 1848-1869*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Duplessis, Rachel Blau. 1985. *Writing beyond the ending: Narrative strategies of twentieth-century women writers*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Duxbury, Linda, Louise Heslop and Judith Marshall. 1993. *Results from faculty questionnaire on work and family roles*. Unpublished paper. Carleton University, Ottawa: 1-29.
- Dwyer, Mary M. and Arlene A. Flynn. 1991. Differential progress of women faculty: Status 1980-1990. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, VII, ed. J. Smart.
- Eggins, Heather ed. 1997. *Women as leaders and managers in higher education*. Buckingham, England: Open University press.
- Eichler, Margrit. 1986. The relationship between sexist, nonsexist, woman-centered and feminist research. *Studies in Communication* 3: 37-74.
- Eichler, Margrit. 1992. The unfinished transformation: Women and feminist approaches in sociology and anthropology. In *Fragile truths*, ed. W. Carroll, L. Christiansen-Ruffman, D. Harrison. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

- Ely, Margot, Margaret Anzul, Teri Friedman, Diane Garner, and Ann McCormack Steinmetz. 1991. *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Evans, Mary. 1995. Ivory towers: Life in the mind. In *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*, ed. Louise Morley and Val Walsh. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Ferber, Marianne and Jane Loeb, eds. 1997. *Academic couples: Problems and promises*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Fineman, Stephen. 1994. *Emotion in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Finkel, Susan Kolker and Steven G. Olswang. 1996. Child rearing as a career impediment to women assistant professors. *The Review of Higher Education* 19(2): 123-139.
- Fonow, Mary Margaret and Judith A. Cook, eds. 1991. Back to the future: A look at the second wave of feminist epistemology. In their *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived experience*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fontana, Andrea and James H. Frey. 1994. Interviewing: The art of science. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, ed. Norman K. Denzin, and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.
- Friedman, Teri. 1991. Feeling. In *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles*, ed. Margot Ely, Margaret Anzul, Teri Friedman, Diane Garner and Ann McCormack Steinmetz. London: The Falmer Press.
- Fox, Mary Frank and Catherine A. Faver. 1985. Men, women, and publication productivity: Patterns among social work academics. *The Sociological Quarterly* 26(4): 537-49.

- Gilligan, Carol. 1982, 1993. *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gindoff P.R. and R. Jewelewicz. 1986. Reproductive potential in the older woman. *Fertility and Sterility* 46: 989.
- Glazer, Penina Migdal and Miriam Slater. 1987. *Unequal colleagues: The entrance of women into the professions, 1890-1940*. London: Rutgers University Press.
- Glesne, Corrine and Alan Peshkin. 1992. *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Gluck, Sherna Berger and Dahpne Patai, eds. 1991. *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*. New York: Routledge.
- Goelman, H., A.R. Pence, D.S. Lero, L.M. Brockman, N. Glick, and J. Berkowitz. 1993. *Canadian national child care study*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada and Health Welfare Canada.
- Goggin, Jacqueline. 1992. Challenging sexual discrimination in the historical profession: Women historians and the American Historical Association, 1890-1940. *American Historical Review* 97(3): 769-802.
- Gordon, Jane and Helen J. Breslauer. 1990. *The model of an academic career: Implications for female and male academics*. Presented to Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Victoria, BC.
- Gumport, Patricia. 1990. Feminist scholarship as a vocation. *Higher Education* 20(3): 231-43.

- Gumport, Patricia J. 1993. Fired faculty: Reflections on marginalization and academic identity. In *Naming silenced lives: Personal narratives and the process of educational change*, ed. D. McLaughlin and W. G. Tierney. New York: Routledge.
- Hanks, Patrick ed. 1986. *Collins dictionary of the English language*. Second Edition. London: Collins.
- Harding, Sandra. 1987. Introduction: Is there a feminist method? In *Feminism and methodology: Social science issues*, ed. Sandra Harding. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harding, Sandra. 1993. Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is “strong objectivity”? In *Feminist epistemologies*, ed. L. Alcoff and E. Potter. New York: Routledge.
- Hare Mustin, Rachel and Jeanne Marecek. 1990. *Making a difference: Psychology and the construction of gender*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- Hartmann, Heidi I. 1987. The family as the locus of gender, class, and political struggle. In *Feminism and methodology: Social science issues*, ed. Sandra Harding. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hartsock, Nancy. 1987. The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In *Feminism and methodology: Social sciences issues*, ed. Sandra Harding. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hensel, Nancy. 1991. *Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family issues*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, n2. Washington, DC: George Washington School of Education and Human Development.

- Hoodfar, Homa. 1992. Feminist anthropology and critical pedagogy: The anthropology of classrooms' excluded voices. *Canadian Journal of Education* 17(3):3 03-320.
- hooks, bell. 1983. *Feminist theory from margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, bell. 1989. *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hornosty, Jennie M. 1998. Balancing child care and work. In *The illusion of inclusion: Women in post-secondary education*, ed. Jacqueline Stalker and Susan Prentice. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Hulbert, Kathleen Day. 1994. Gender patterns in faculty-student mentoring relationships. In *Gender and academe: Feminist pedagogy and politics*, ed. Sara Munson Deats and Lagretta Tallent Lenker. Lankam, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Janesick, Valerie J. 1994. The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodology, and meaning. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, ed. N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE publications.
- Johnson, R. Burke. 1998. Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education* 118: 2.
- Johnsrud, Linda K. and Christine D. Des Jarlais. 1994. Barriers to tenure for women and minorities. *The Review of Higher Education* 17: 335-353.
- Johnsrud, Linda K. and R.H. Heck. 1994. Administrative promotion within a university: The cumulative impact of gender. *Journal of higher Education* 65: 25-44.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

- Kasten, Katherine L. 1984. Tenure and merit pay as rewards for research, teaching, and service at a research university. *Journal of Higher Education* 55: 500-514.
- Kinnear, Mary. 1995. *In subordination: Professional women, 1870-1970*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Kirsch, Gesa E. 1999. *Ethical dilemmas in feminist research: The politics of location, interpretation, and publication*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kyvik, Svein. 1990. Motherhood and scientific productivity. *Social Studies of Science* 20(1): 149-160.
- Lather, Patti. 1986. Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange* 17: 63-84.
- Lather, Patti. 1988. Feminist perspectives on empowering research methodologies. *Women's Studies International Forum* 11(6): 569-581.
- Lather, Patti. 1993. Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly* 34(4): 673-693.
- LeCompte, Margaret D. 1993. A framework for hearing silence: What does telling stories mean when we are supposed to be doing science? In *Naming silenced lives: Personal narratives and the process of educational change*, ed. Daniel Mclaughlin and William G. Tierney. New York: Routledge.
- Lie, Suzanne Stiver and Virginia E. O'Leary eds. 1990. *Storming the tower: Women in the academic world*. London: Logan Page.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. 1993. I and thou: Method, voice and roles in research with the silenced. In *Naming silenced lives: Personal narratives and the process of educational change*, ed. D. Mclaughlin and W. G. Tierney. New York: Routledge.

- Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Norman K. Denzin. 1994. The fifth moment. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, ed. Norman K. Denzin, and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.
- Long, J. Scott. 1992. Measures of sex difference in scientific productivity. *Social Forces* 70: 1 59-78.
- Long, J. Scott; Paul D. Allison and Robert McGinnis. 1993. Rank advancement in academic careers: Sex differences and the effects of productivity. *American Sociological Review* 58(5): 703-22.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.
- Lugones, Maria C. and Elizabeth V. Spelman. 1987. Competition, compassion and community: Models for a feminist ethos. In *Competition: A feminist taboo*, ed. M. Longino and V. Miner. New York: Feminist Press.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1989. *Toward a feminist theory of the state*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Magner, Denise K. 1999. A new report details the graying of America's professoriate. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, issue dated August 30.
- Marginson, S. 1997. *Markets in education*. Sidney: Allen and Unwin.
- Marshall, Catherine, ed. 1997. *Feminist critical policy analysis II: A perspective from post-secondary education*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Mather, Jennifer. 1998. Fostering women's full membership in the academy. *Status of Women Supplement. CAUT Bulletin Insert* 45(4): 2.

- McElrath, Karen. 1992. Gender, career disruption and academic rewards. *Journal of Higher Education* 63(3): 269-281.
- Mclaughlin, Daniel and William G. Tierney. 1993. *Naming silenced lives: Personal narratives and the process of educational change*. New York: Routledge.
- Menges, Robert J. and William H. Exum. 1983. Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. *Journal of Higher Education* 54: 123-44.
- Mies, Maria. 1991. Women's research or feminist research? The debate surrounding feminist science and methodology. In *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived experience*, ed. Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1991. *Divided societies: Class struggle in contemporary capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Minister, Kristina. 1991. A feminist frame for the oral history interview. In *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*, ed. Sherna Berger Gluck and Dahpne Patai. New York: Routledge.
- Monture-Okanee, Patricia A. 1995. Surviving the contradictions: Personal notes on academia. In *Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty*, ed. Chilly Collective. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Moore, Kathryn M. and M.A. Sagaria. 1993. The situation of women in research universities in the United States: Within the inner circles of academic power. In *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*, ed. J.S. Glazer, E.M. Bensimon, and B.K. Townsend. Needham, MA: Ginn Press.

- Morley, Louise. 1995. Measuring the muse: Feminism creativity and Career development in higher education. In *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*, ed. Louise Morley and Val Walsh. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Morley, Louise and Val Walsh. 1995. Introduction. In *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*, ed. Morley and Walsh. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Mulqueen, Maggie. 1992. *On our own terms: Redefining competence and femininity*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Ng, Roxana. 1993. "A woman out of control:" Deconstructing sexism and racism in the university. *Canadian Journal of Education* 18(3): 189-205.
- Noddings, Nel. 1984. *Caring: A feminist approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Noddings, Nel. 1994. An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. In *The education feminism reader*, ed. Lynda Stone. New York: Routledge.
- Oakley, Ann. 1981. Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In *Doing feminist research*, ed. Helen Roberts. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Orel, Ann and Robin Whitmore. 1998. Academic careers and babies: Having an academic career and a baby at UCD, personal account of UCD women faculty. Women's Resources and Research Center, University of California, Davis. Web site: <http://wrrc.ucdavis.edu/babybook/default.html>
- Orlans, Lathryn P. Meadow and Ruth A. Wallace, eds. 1994. *Gender and the academic experience: Berkeley women sociologists*. University of Nebraska Press.

- Over, R. 1982. Research productivity and impact of male and female psychologists. *American Psychologist* 37(1): 24-31.
- Packer, Barbara Brown. 1995. Irrigating the sacred grove: Stages of gender equity development. In *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*, ed. Louise Morley and Val Walsh. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Paludi, Michele A. and Darlene C. Defour. 1989. Research on sexual harassment in the academy: Definitions, findings, constraints, responses. *Initiatives* 52(2): 43-49.
- Park, Shelley M. 1996. Research, teaching and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *Journal of Higher Education* 67: 47-84.
- Parson, A.L., R.G. Sands and J. Duane. 1992. Sources of career support for university faculty. *Research in Higher Education* 33(2): 161-176.
- Patai, Daphne. 1991. US academics and third world women: Is ethical research possible? In *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*, ed. Sherma Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai. New York: Routledge.
- Persell, Carol H. 1983. Gender, rewards and research in education. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 8(1): 33-47.
- Personal Narratives Group. 1989. *Interpreting women's lives: Feminist theory and personal narratives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Pierson, Ruth Roach. 1990. Introduction. In *No easy road: Women in Canada 1920s-1960s*, ed. Beth Light and Ruth Roach Pierson. Toronto: New Hogtown Press.
- Pierson, Ruth Roach. 1992. International trends in women's history and feminism: Colonization and Canadian women's history. *Journal of Women's History* 4(2), Fall: 134-56.

- Pierson, Ruth Roach and Margorie Griffin Cohen. 1995. *Canadian women's issues Volume II: Bold visions. Twenty-five years of women's activism in English Canada.* Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, Publishers.
- President's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women University of Saskatchewan. 1995. Reinventing our legacy: The chills which affect women. In *Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty*, ed. Chilly Collective. Waterloo Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Randall, Vernellia R. and Vincene Verdun. 1997. Two Black women talking about the promotion, retention, and tenure process in law schools. In *Black women in the academy: Promises and perils*, ed. Lois Benjamin. Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida.
- Reay, Diane. 1995. Feminist research: The fallacy of easy access. *Women's Studies International Forum* 18(2): 205-213.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. *Feminist methods in social research.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos. 1987. Status hierarchies and sex segregation. In *Ingredients for women's employment policy*, ed. Christine Bose and Glenna Spitze. Albany, New York: State University Press.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1993. Toward a woman-centered university. In *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*, ed. J.S. Glazer, E.M. Bensimon, and B.K. Townsend. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

- Romanin, Susanne and Ray Over. 1993. Australian academics: Career patterns, work roles, and family life-cycle commitments of men and women. *Higher Education* 26: 411-429.
- Rossiter, M. 1982. *Women scientists in America. Struggles and strategies to 1940*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sandler, Bernice R. and Roberta Hall. 1986. *The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students*. Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.
- Sandler, Bernice R. 1993. The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. In *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*, ed. J.S. Glazer, E.M. Bensimon, and B.K. Townsend. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Schmidt, Peter. 1999. A state transforms colleges with 'performance funding.' *Chronicle of Higher Education*, issue dated July 2.
- Serono Laboratories. 1997. *Infertility over 35*. Serono Patient Education Library of Booklets. Norwell, MA.
- Sheinin, Rose. 1998. The changing space of women in academe: The 'en-gender-ing' of knowledge. In *The illusion of inclusion: Women in post-secondary education*, ed. Jacqueline Stalker and Susan Prentice. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Simeone, Angela. 1987. *Academic women: Working towards equality*. Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey Publisher.
- Slaughter, Sheila and Larry Leslie. 1997. *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

- Smart, Mollie S. and Russel C. Smart. 1990. Paired prospects: Dual-career couples on campus. *Academe*, Jan.-Feb.: 33-37.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1987a. *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1987b. Women's perspectives as a radical critique of sociology. In *Feminism and methodology*, ed. S. Harding. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Spelman, Elizabeth V. 1988. *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Spender, Dale. 1983. Modern feminist theorists: Reinventing rebellion. In *Feminist theorists: Three centuries of key women thinkers*, ed. Dale Spender. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Stalker, Jacqueline. 1998. Let's start the revolution. In *The illusion of inclusion: Women in post-secondary education*, ed. Jacqueline Stalker and Susan Prentice. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Stalker, Jacqueline and Susan Prentice eds. 1998. Introduction. In *The illusion of inclusion: Women in post-secondary education*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- StatsCan Daily. 1998. *Full-time university faculty 1996/7*. December 15 issue. Ottawa: Minister of Industry Science and Technology.
- Statistics Canada. 1986. *Teachers in universities 1984-85*. Catalogue No. 81-204. Ottawa: Minister of Industry Science and Technology.
- Statistics Canada. 1993. *Teachers in universities 1990-91*. Catalogue No. 81-241. Ottawa: Minister of Industry Science and Technology.

- Statistics Canada. 1994. *Family and friends*. General social survey analysis series. Housing, Family and Social Statistics Division. Ottawa: Minister of Industry, Science and Technology.
- Steinmetz, Ann McCormack. 1991. Doing, Chapter 3 in *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles Within Circles* London: The Falmer Press.
- Tancred, Peta and Susan Hook Czarnocki. 1998. The revolving door: Faculty women who exit academia. In *The illusion of inclusion: Women in post-secondary education*, ed. Jacqueline Stalker and Susan Prentice. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Task Force on Resource Allocation. 1994. *The structure of academic work: Background paper*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Council On University Affairs.
- Teevan, James J., Susan Pepper and Joseph R. Pellizzari. 1992. Academic employment decisions and gender. *Research in Higher Education* 33(2): 141-160.
- Tetreault, Mary Kay. 1985. Feminist phase theory: An experience-based evaluation model. *Journal of Higher Education* 56: 363-84.
- Tierney, William G. and Estela Mara Bensimon. 1996. *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tokarczyk, Michelle M. and Elizabeth A. Fay eds. 1993. *Working-class women in the academy: Laborers in the knowledge factory*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Tong, Rosemarie Putnam. 1998. *Feminist thought: A more comprehensive introduction*. Second edition. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Townsend, Barbara K. 1993. Feminist scholarship in core higher education journals. *The Review of Higher Education* 17(1): 21-41.
- Twombly, Susan B. 1996. Culture and the role of women in a Latin American university. In *The social role of higher education: Comparative perspectives*, ed. Ken Kempner and William G. Tierney. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Twombly, Susan B. 1999. New scholarship on academic women: Beyond 'women's ways.' *The Review of Higher Education* 22.4: 441-454.
- US Department of Education. 1991. *Profiles of faculty in higher education institutions, 1988*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Vanier Institute of the Family. 1994. *What matters for Canadian families?* Booklet: Ottawa.
- Verrier, D.A. 1994. Perceptions of life on the tenure track. *Thought and Action* 9: 95-124.
- Walsh, Val and Louise Morley. 1995. Transgression and the academy: Feminists and institutionalization. In *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*, ed. Val Walsh and Louise Morley. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Wannell, Ted and Nathalie Caron. 1994. *The gender earnings gap among recent postsecondary graduates, 1984-92*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Wenneras, C. and A. Wold. 1997. Nepotism and sexism in peer review. *Nature* 23: 341-43.
- Wilson, Brian G. and Eileen M. Bryne. 1987. *Women in the university: A policy report*. Report of the University of Queensland Senate Working Party on the Status of Women. Australia, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

- Wilson, Robin. 1999. Timing is everything: Academe's annual baby boom. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, XLV(42): A14-5.
- Woolf, Virginia. 1938, reprint 1993. *Three Guineas*. In *A room of one's own and three guineas*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Books.
- Wunsch, Marie A. and Linda K. Johnsrud. 1992. Breaking barriers: Mentoring junior faculty women for professional development and retention. *To Improve the Academy* 11: 175-87.
- Wylie, Alison. 1995. The contexts of activism on "climate" issues. In *Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty*, ed. Chilly Collective. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Wyn, Johanna, Sandra Acker. 1999. *Making a difference: Women in management in Australian and Canadian faculties of education*. OISE/UT.
- Wyn, Johanna, Sandra Acker, and Elizabeth Richards. 1999. *Making a difference: Women in management in Australian and Canadian universities*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association annual meeting, Montreal.
- Young, Claire and Diana Majury. 1995. Lesbian perspectives. In *Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty*, ed. Chilly Collective. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Zuckerman, Harriet. 1987. Persistence and change in the careers of men and women scientists and engineers. In *Women: Their underrepresentation and career differentials in science and engineering*, ed. L.S. Dix. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.