

# Women, Academia and Identity: Constructions of Equal Opportunities in the ‘New Managerialism’ – A Case of Lipstick on the Gorilla?

Wendy Saunderson, University of Ulster, Coleraine

## Abstract

*This paper has two distinct foci. The first is an introductory focus on the current position and problems of academic women working in UK universities (despite the valorization of Equal Opportunities (EO), and within the context and constraints of the ‘New Managerialism’). The second and main focus is on the personal impact of university work on the lives of academic women, towards exploring and uncovering how higher education’s institutional structures and processes impact upon academic women’s identity structures and processes. Idiographic analyses of a small number of case studies suggest that despite considerable recent gains, some academic women’s identities are compromised, challenged and made ‘vulnerable’ through feelings of being undervalued, overburdened and often the subjects of unequal treatment – more than 30 years after the Equal Pay Act and almost 30 years after the Sex Discrimination Act. The paper’s conclusions therefore warn that continued valorization of EO policy without its assimilation into the underlying core institutional culture will sanction the valediction of any tangible or effective progress in HE’s ability to produce more robust academic identities and more satisfying daily working lives for academic women. Insofar as such assimilation is not achieved, the policy, practice and rhetoric of equal opportunities and equal treatment in UK higher education will remain little more than ‘lipstick on the gorilla’.*

### The nature of the beast

#### *The position of women*

The description, 'Bastions of male power and privilege,' comes not from some radical feminist tome describing the nature of professions, but from the Hansard Society Report (1990) as a description of UK universities. Almost a decade later, both the Bett Report (1999) and a NATFHE survey ([www.natfhe.org.uk/says](http://www.natfhe.org.uk/says)) confirmed Hansard's findings that British universities are amongst the least equal of British institutions in terms of gender equity (Bird, 2000, p. 652). And, while 'the poor showing of women in the higher reaches of universities across Europe is seen as being the worst in the labour market' (Ledwith and Manfredi, 2000, p. 7), back in the UK, 'compared to other companies, universities have one of the worst records in terms of the number of women reaching top academic and administrative posts' (Williams, 1999, p. 18). What is the reality behind this rhetoric?

The UK's 114 university institutions currently employ over 300,000 people (Universities UK, 2001a), of whom over 130,000 are academic staff (HESA, 2001). Women comprise only 35 per cent of all UK academic staff (Halvorsen, 2002), and occupy only 25 per cent of all senior staff posts in UK universities (Bett, 1999). Of part-time academic posts, women hold a 53 per cent majority (CVCP, 2000); and, in terms of fixed-term posts, almost one-third of women (compared to only 16.2 per cent of men) are employed on fixed-term contracts (Hearn, 2000, p. 171).

Academic women's under-representation in British universities has a long and slow history. In the inter-war years, as late as 1931, women comprised only 13 per cent of teaching staff in British universities, a figure that remained fairly constant from the 1920s right up until the 1970s (Rendel, 1980). However, second-wave feminism in the late 1960s and 1970s eagerly exposed and questioned women's minority status in the academy, and openly challenged 'the invisibility of women in the canon of accepted scholarship' (Woodward, 2000, p. 44). Women's under-representation in academia has since slowly, if unevenly, improved. The past decade has witnessed unprecedented expansion following the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act, when the number of universities in Britain increased from 46 to 112 (Morley, 2002, p. 87). The concomitant creation of more academic posts has helped to hasten the improvement of women's position from a 13 per cent minority to a 35 per cent minority.

In terms of vertical segregation (and the proverbial problem of the 'glass ceiling'), women comprise just 23 per cent of senior lecturers and only 10 per cent of professors (CVCP, 2000). Career progression statistics for 2002 from NATFHE show only 13 per cent of all full-time UK female academics progressing to senior lecturer level, compared to 22 per cent of males; and that only 4 per cent of all female academics progress to the level of professor, compared to 14 per cent of males. In short, academic men are securing professorships at more than three times the rate of academic women (NATFHE, 2002a, p. 13). These most recently available figures are supplemented by Halvorsen (2002) when she draws on the league tables published by the THES for the last half of the 1990s to report that, from 1994–95 to 1998–99, the overall proportion of female professors employed in HEIs increased by only 2.6 per cent. Further, by applying a linear regression model to this data, Halvorsen (2002, p. 11) estimates that at the current rate of growth, it will be 68 years before half of our professors are women! At the higher levels of university management and scholarship, there are even fewer women: only five women vice-chancellors out of a total of 76 university-status institutions, and only four women heads of the 17 general colleges of higher education (Woodward, 2000, p. 44).

The Cabinet Office's Women and Equality Unit (2002) confirms that women who work full time are paid on average just 82 per cent of men's hourly earnings. Since the Equal Pay Act (1970), this gender pay gap is said to have narrowed from 74 per cent to today's 82 per cent (but Profili (1999) pitches this current figure as low as 75 per cent). For women in academia, this pay gap translates into 16 per cent (NATFHE, 2002a, p. 12). Such differentials are compounded in academia where university pay, five years ago, had dropped as much as 20 per cent behind comparable professions in the public sector (Hay Report, 1997). Today that figure is estimated by NATFHE (2002b) to have plummeted to 30 per cent below the market rate. In fact, UK academic pay is amongst the worst in the developed world and ranks tenth in a league table showing comparative pay of academics in fifteen countries. According to NATFHE's (2002b) international analysis, the spending power of UK academics is well below Spain and Italy, and is only marginally above that of academics based in Greece, Mexico and Turkey; Canadian academics earn pay and benefits worth £72,700 compared to £21,800 earned by UK university staff. These figures throw into sharp relief the implications of a further gender pay deficit borne by female academics in the UK.

In terms of contractual status, the appointment of permanent staff

contracts has plunged from 93.8 per cent of appointments in 1970–74 to just 17.7 per cent in 1997–98 (AUT, 2000). The higher education sector is now claimed by some as one of the most casualised industries in the UK, second only to catering (THES, 27 April 2001). Unlike their male counterparts, of whom only 16.2 per cent occupy fixed-term posts, as many as 31 per cent – almost one-third – of all full-time UK women academics are employed on fixed-term contracts (Hearn, 2000, p. 171). Hence, casualisation and ‘contractual segregation’ – alongside the well-documented issues of horizontal and vertical segregation – are now claimed as pressing gender issues. Such casualisation, according to the AUT (1999), lowers staff morale; leads to feelings of insecurity and of being undervalued; can create financial difficulties in obtaining, for example, home mortgages; and, finally, such staff have poor career prospects and, with successive contracts, are rarely able to progress up pay scales.

So, a glaring gap exists in higher education employment for women vis-à-vis men in terms of their minority status, promotion and career progression, pay differentials, and their contractual status. It is the impact of these issues on academic women’s identity that this paper sets out to explore. And, while ‘the analysis of women’s presence in organisations can often degenerate into essentialised notions of critical mass theory, viewing a causality between women’s under-representation numerically, and horizontal and vertical segregation’ (Morley and Walsh, 1996, p. 3), this paper claims to avoid such essentialised notions.

Certainly, there have been gains, albeit measured in nature; one example is that more women’s careers are progressing into more senior positions. As stated above, currently 23 per cent of senior lecturers and 10 per cent of professors are women; a decade ago, the AUT (1992) reported that women held only 6 per cent of senior lecturer posts and only 3 per cent of professorships (Bagilhole, 1993). The journey is certainly underway, but has only just begun in relation to how far there is still to travel before we realise anything close to gender parity of esteem and equality of treatment in academia.

### *The ‘new managerialism’*

The issues surrounding and impacting upon women’s academic identity and experience of academia are couched within, and often compounded by, a dramatically changed and changing ethos, praxis and pedagogy of UK higher education institutions in the 21st century. The sweeping

pace and nature of the New Public Management reforms have been variously seen as a rational adaptation to the conditions of the new millennium (see Cutler and Waine, 2000); as part of an unfinished revolution (see Williams, 2000); or as a questionable commercialisation of public services, an undermining of political control and an unwelcome restructuring (fragmentation?) of the welfare-society-state relationship (Saunderson, 2001a, p. 760).

'Corporate colonisation' (Casey, 1995) has been used as a label to describe, somewhat disparagingly but perhaps not inaccurately, the storming, capturing and occupation of, in this case, the traditional hallowed corridors and ivory towers of academia by the unfettered forces of marketisation and corporatism. The 'new managerialism's' benefits are celebrated as producing enhanced levels of the so-called three E's – Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness – in tandem with accountability. Noticeably, asserts Morley (1999, p. 28), a fourth E – for Equity – is absent: 'Equity is off the agenda, inequality is a cornerstone of the market' (Ball, 1994, p. 125). The 'new managerialism' is seen by some as deeply gendered and 'archetypally masculine, associated with both behaviour and predispositions which resemble . . . loosely packaged testosterone' (Clarke and Newman, 1993, p. 431). Clarke et al.'s (2000) research, however, suggests that this 'macho managerialism' presents both threats and opportunities to academic women aspiring to senior positions in UK academe. Opportunities for women, while highly variable between and within institutions, were found to be available only to those willing to embrace managerialism; but, even then, they were still predicated upon a modified and 'softened' form of it. Academic women's opportunities within the new forms of university regulation appear to be dependent on the achievement of 'a more positive and humane form of managerialism, one that is not hostile to, but supportive of, an open and egalitarian collegiality' (Clarke, 2000, p. 183).

The aspect of the 'new managerialism' appearing from the literature to incite most resistance in women is its values, both implicit and explicit. The lack and shallowness of values in the new global discourse of 'managerialisation' is seen by Clark and Hoggett (2000, p. 239) as exemplifying 'a form of unreflexive [and unreflective?] modernisation which construes change as a "good" in itself. It is preoccupied with the "how" of things rather than the "why" and thus exhibits a shallowness in its use of values.' Given women's well-documented preference and propensity towards reflexivity and the 'why' of things (in feminist epistemology, methodology and ideology), a fundamental incongruence/anomaly is

suggested between the values of academic women and the values of academic managerialism. Morley (1999, pp. 28-9) goes further in her analysis, to question whether this managerialism has any 'values' at all: if values of social justice are perceived as irrelevant to marketisation, and if values of equity, collegialism and cooperation are seen as an anathema to efficiency, individualism and competition, where and how can social inequalities be acknowledged? In drawing conclusions to their edited book, Salisbury and Riddell (2000) note the strong emphasis on the 'values' of performance, standards and improvement in the discourses of performativity and new managerialism, and how these have been fused, incongruently, with social justice values and issues in the narrowly-focused equal opportunities culture of the 1990s.

The 'new managerialism' has been held responsible for effectively 'handcuffing' equal opportunities in the academy. Some writers (e.g. David, 2000; Walsh, 2002) lament how the absorption of equal opportunities (EO) into the new managerialism's structures has sanctioned the increasing demise of 'equality' and the diminishing of the social justice roots from which EO has grown. While the incorporation of EO into personnel reduced the complexity of equal opportunities to a general notion of 'access', Walsh (2002) contends that, 'the politics of equal opportunities was sidelined as EO became a new PR mechanism, torn from its liberatory and oppositional roots, and appropriated into the rhetoric of new managerialism' (p. 33).

This incongruence is also asserted by Deem (2000):

Values about markets, business, enterprise, efficient management, individualism and competition sit uneasily with those which emphasise public service on the basis of need, social justice, collective ideas, human development of the aesthetic and the emotional as well as the cognitive. (p. 204)

She asserts that, although resistance to the former kinds of corporatist values has certainly not been confined to women, there is some indication that mothers, and women teachers, are amongst those who resist them most strongly. This paper attempts to uncover whether (and how) such resistance to the 'new managerialism' in current university life poses a concomitant challenge to women's academic identity.

### **The personal impact of the beast**

#### *Women, identity and academia – the literature*

The past decade has seen a rapid expansion in the plethora of work on wide-ranging issues and aspects of women's positions in HE – as

students, mature returners, researchers, academics, teacher-educators, senior managers and administrators. Much valuable work is being produced on the statistical characteristics, circumstances and consequences of women's academic careers. And a considerable body of literature uses self-narrative and qualitative analyses to document the responses of women to their academic careers (a notable contribution is Anderson and Williams, 2001). But there exists a relative paucity of work attempting, specifically, to tap into the identities of academic women; and much of what does exist tends to use the concept of 'identity' without situating or 'grounding' it within a particular framework or tradition of enquiry, or tends to conflate the concept of 'self' with that of 'identity'. However, by using identity as a powerful sensitising concept, interesting and valuable findings have been produced about academic women's perceptions, feelings, positions and responses to their working lives in the university sector.

In terms of the 'new managerialism', certainly, 'the corporatization and privatisation of universities through the process of restructuring have significant implications for academic operations and practices, and for academic identities' (Brooks, 2001, p. 28). According to Marginson (2000, p. 193), academic identities are being restructured and compromised by the new-style research management, which 'colonizes the identities of researchers themselves', where academics 'self-censor' away from their personal research convictions towards the institution's research strategies for 'success' – which usually privilege research that can attract grant money over 'pure' research (in Mackinnon and Brooks, 2001, p. 7). Harris et al. (1998) explored the ways in which patterns of academic and managerial 'success' within universities are constructed by gender. They argue that, in a deeply gendered way, production is privileged over reproduction, and output over process.

Regarding the privileging of production over reproduction, Wager's (1994) work is an excellent contribution to the area; it examines academia-femininity tensions in the identities of Finnish academic women (mothers and non-mothers) in the sciences and humanities. In looking at academics as women, and women as academics, Wager found mothers in the humanities managing the identity tensions much better than those in the sciences (and vice versa amongst non-mothers). All of the women in the study, however, aimed at resolving this 'perceived dilemma' of their identities by, variously, valorizing their academic work and aspiring to redefine their concept of femininity. Many of the women in Wager's study aspired 'simultaneously to nourish [their] intellectual needs and to be feminine, whatever femininity entails. That is, to be

woman and researcher at the same time' (Wager, 1998, p. 242). In examining the 'entwined' relationship between motherhood and employment in a sample of middle-class women, Bailey (2000) also found the 'continuities and contrasts' between working identity and motherhood identity to be 'multiple and complex'. But in terms of privileging production over reproduction, there was much evidence of women feeling that 'motherhood was passivity and absence, while work was activity and presence' (p. 64).

Regarding the privileging of output over process, Blackmore and Sachs (2001) use the concept of 'the managed self at work' to describe the response to the

... new accountability practices ... [that] set up norms about who you ought to be, standardize practice and practise close surveillance of outcomes ... This leads to a focus on work for its own sake and not how it contributes to teaching or knowledge production. (p. 55)

While much of this type of work is driven by competition and therefore emphasises 'results' and outcome, much of women's work is about process, for example working with support groups or voluntary organisations, lobbying, and educating other women. All such work has process value, but not necessarily output value. Collegiality, as a process and not an outcome, is also deemed very important for academic women. Brooks (2001) asserts that competition for 'output' 'is the antithesis of an environment promoted by women based on collegiality and consensus modes of operation' (p. 29).

If Harris et al. (1998) revealed how gender constructs patterns of 'success', Gayle Letherby and John Shiels (2001) examined their own experiences to reveal how gender constructs patterns of a 'gendered division of academic labour'. Recording their personal experiences of how the gendered expectations of students impact upon their own gendered identities (and the division of academic labour), Letherby experienced the nurturing role as a primary demand, whereas Shiels was primarily assumed to be a giver of academic advice. The authors note that it is generally accepted that women are primarily responsible for 'working with emotions' in both the public and the private sphere. But the emotional labour of care has become such a 'maternal', feminised and therefore marginalised activity in higher education and the wider community (Cotterill and Waterhouse, 1998) that women who 'want to get on' sometimes make deliberate efforts to dissociate themselves both from 'women's issues' and expected 'feminine' behaviour (Bagilhole, 1994, in Letherby and Shiels, 2001).

In examining how the use of EO concepts and the construction of women's identities are both shifting and contradictory, Goode and Bagilhole (1998) revealed how such ambiguities act as control devices to keep women 'in their place', while preserving an image of good EO practice. Their case study (not of academics but of technicians) showed the ascription of 'negative' identities through sexist and ageist discourse, and a university management role that was inadequately informed by EO principles and practice. Their conclusion was not of a 'failed' EO strategy, but a call for the need to be aware of and to address the shifting ground on which the construction of equal opportunities takes place.

Issues of equal opportunities in UK universities were central to the issues found to disadvantage academic women, vis-à-vis men, in Brown's (2000) analysis of the personal accounts of academic women attending her women-only professional development courses. Women lacked confidence and self-esteem, not in their own academic ability, but in the likelihood of their promotion; this resulted in many simply not putting themselves forward. Many reported marginalisation and isolation from disciplinary, departmental and organisational networks – deemed very important for 'success' in the current 'corporatist' academic culture. Further, old perceptions and dualisms (of public/private, reason/emotion, mind/body, etc.) may now be 'unseen', but they still persist, setting up tensions in self-perceptions between 'self as woman' and 'self as academic'. Asked about the potential for indirect inequity in universities, the academic women believed there was seldom any conscious intention to discriminate, but stressed that the unconscious discrimination they perceived was much worse, since it was so difficult to prove and therefore expose.

The empirical findings on women's identity in academia are succinctly summed up by Weiler (1993):

The challenge for feminist theorists is to try to take account of and comprehend the *complexity of all forces of identity formation* acting upon women in relation to educational institutions and policies in a rapidly changing world. (p. 213, my emphasis)

As noted above, while there exists a relative paucity of work attempting to tap into the identities of academic women, much of what exists tends to use the concept of 'identity' without situating or 'grounding' it within a particular framework or tradition of enquiry. Methodological considerations – ontologically and epistemologically – in terms of situating, conceptualising, defining, accessing and analysing identity, are often left

untold. Notable and conceptually rigorous contributions to the area do exist (e.g., Dillabough, 1999; Henkel, 2001). Using the framework of ISA (outlined below), this paper demonstrates how the methodological potential of research in this area may be expanded. It also enhances the existing findings gained from using more traditional methodological approaches. In so doing, it makes an important contribution to the study of women, identity and academia.

### **Women, identity and academia – identity structure analysis**

‘Identity Structure Analysis’ (ISA) (Weinreich, 1986) is a metatheoretical conceptual framework drawing upon self-concept theories and phenomenological perspectives for its overall approach to understanding and analysing the development, dynamics and maintenance of identity. Its *pièce de résistance* is that it fuses qualitative and quantitative data to produce ‘measures’ of people’s identity structures and identity development (for the most recent full explication of the approach, see Weinreich and Saunderson, 2002). ISA provides a highly sensitive and powerful ‘tool’ to analyse identity at the individual and/or group level, cross-sectionally or longitudinally, and has been used widely, inter- and intra-nationally, in cross-cultural, social and clinical contexts (and extensively by this author, e.g. Saunderson, 1997a, 1997b, 1999a, 1999b, 2001b, 2002; Saunderson and McGarry, 1999; Saunderson and O’Kane, 1998, 1999, 2002). Through using ISA, this paper builds on, and takes forward, existing approaches to researching women, identity and academia. It does this in several ways:

1. It quantifies the qualitative data via a custom-designed ‘Identity Instrument’ (see Appendix 1 for the identity parameters assessed by the IDEX (Identity Exploration) software.
2. It is situated and grounded within a fully developed, open-ended, metatheoretical framework of identity, which conceptualises, theorises and defines ‘identity’, its structure and development.
3. It works with concepts of both ‘empathetic’ (de facto) identification and role model identification.
4. It eschews the imposition of researcher-imposed standards and value judgements, by collecting and analysing data that is anchored in each respondent’s own value system.

The use of ISA facilitates the researcher with the means to explore and analyse identity in terms of:

- Continuity – tracing and mapping identity change and development from the past to the present and in terms of aspirations for the future. This allows the analysis of both structures of identity and processes of identity development and change over time. It also suggests how currently close (or distant) one is to (or from) one's aspirations;
- Context – situating identity in particular self-contexts, e.g. gender, or various other social, personal and professional contexts. In other words, the women in this study may be academics, but they may also be mothers, single parents, widows, wives, lesbians, local politicians, etc.;
- Metaperspectives – people have a certain 'image' of themselves. If how we see ourselves is a direct perspective of self, then how we believe other people see us forms a metaperspective of self. These 'reflected appraisals' of self (however in/accurately perceived) are important in reinforcing (or not, as the case may be) our identities, and in managing our presentation of self in everyday life;
- Global classifications – an overall 'macro' categorisation of identity is enabled, as a function of the level of self-regard (high, moderate or low) juxtaposed with the level of conflicts in identification with self and the social world (diffused, 'healthy' or foreclosed identity);
- Individuals and/or Groups – identity dynamics and differences may be analysed within and between individuals and/or groups. Individual 'idiographic' analyses, as presented in this paper, use IDEXIDIO software; group 'nomothetic' analyses use the IDEXNOMO software. IDEXPHASE software facilitates phased longitudinal research design, either idiographically or nomothetically.

This paper presents selected idiographic analyses of a small number of case studies as preliminary findings of a larger-scale, ongoing study of the juxtaposition of academic women's (and men's) personal, professional and gender identity. Findings presented here attempt to show how the institutional structures and processes of academia impact upon the identity structures and processes of academic women. More precisely, they concern the 'fit' between the personally-held values of academic women and those of the 'new managerialism' currently permeating and characterising UK university life. The specific focus of the paper is on academic women, due to the specificity of their relationship to the university sector. Such specificity is amply evidenced by the statistics on gender pay differentials; women's minority status in universities, both numerically and in senior positions, not to mention the gendered academic division of labour; as well as the wider domestic

division of labour and women's role as the primary carers in this society.

The cases presented here have been selected specifically to demonstrate and illustrate 'vulnerable' identity profiles of women working in academia. Of course, all academic women do not possess vulnerable identities, just as all academic men do not possess non-vulnerable identities. Hence, 'vulnerability' appears to be attributable neither to gender alone, nor simply to being an academic in today's UK university sector. (The gender analysis of the larger study, however, suggests that more female than male academics possess 'diffuse' and conflicted identities, have lower self-evaluation, and see equal opportunities and equal treatment as problematic issues.) The nature and extent of vulnerability in some academic women's identities clearly signal certain problematic issues in their academic lives. Problematic issues are necessarily policy issues, which necessitate policy solutions. It is to policy solutions, particularly concerning equal opportunities, that this paper is committed.

The methodology for this study entailed the construction of a custom-designed 'Identity Instrument', on the basis of extensive sensitising procedures (mostly informal discussions), to elicit qualitative data on academic women's (and men's) associations, thoughts, feelings, values and beliefs in relation to their academic lives. These were 'distilled' into a standardised instrument (for 'quantification') containing 19 entities (salient aspects and 'elements' of academic life; see Appendix 2) and 13 constructs (personally-held values and beliefs, and personal constructions of academia; see Appendix 3). The four women presented here (see Box 1) completed the Identity Instrument face-to-face with the author. Processing of the data by the IDEX (Identity Exploration) software provided quantified 'measures' of identity, grounded in the qualitative data. Tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim quotations are included to lend psychobiographical detail and consolidation to the quantified results.

### **Academic women: Identity structures and processes**

Results show that all four women academics display vulnerable identities, but in two very different ways. Claire and Katie experience academic life in a similarly 'diffused' identity state, whereas Diane and Emma display 'foreclosed' identities. The two very distinct types of vulnerability may be equally undetectable from day-to-day meetings and dealings with the women, but both can be psychologically 'unhealthy' and

**Box 1 Case Vignettes\***

**Claire** is a senior lecturer in her mid-40s, married, with two teenage children. She came into academia 'many years ago' from a 'great job' in the commercial sector, which she loved and says there are many aspects of it that she now misses. She presents as a very pleasant, confident and 'discerning' individual and describes herself as being quite family-orientated and as 'a very successful mother'. She holds a full-time permanent post, plays an active part within her faculty, and was not entered in the last RAE. Claire intimated that she sometimes feels a bit inferior about not being in the RAE (but then contradicted herself), and often feels aggrieved that her heavy teaching and admin load denies her the opportunity to research.

**Katie** is a lecturer in her late-30s, married, with no children. She entered academia 'pretty much straight from school', attaining her BSc and MSc, followed by a succession of part-time and full-time short-term teaching and research posts at several UK universities, before securing her current 'rolling' fixed-term post. She presents as a very caring, sincere and 'concerned' individual and describes herself as working very hard, being dedicated to her work at the university, and as 'actually caring about the students'. She says she carries a heavy admin and teaching load, just keeps her 'head down', and was entered in the most recent RAE. Katie admits that her academic profile 'looks pretty good on paper', but says she lacks the confidence to put herself forward for promotion.

**Diane** is a lecturer in her late-30s, married, with two pre-school children. She came into academia from a 'really dead-end job' as a young mature student, and just went from strength to strength. She presents as an extremely confident, self-assured and slightly intimidating individual and describes herself as 'always busy' and just wanting to 'get on with it'. She holds a full-time permanent post and was entered (with a 'very strong contribution') in the recent RAE. Diane believes (somewhat defensively) that equal opportunities 'abound' in her institution and that 'promotion is there if you go for it'.

**Emma** is a lecturer in her mid-30s, not married, but in a long-term relationship (with an academic), and has no children. She came into academia after 'a short spell in a failed marriage' and swiftly took the BSc, MSc, PhD route to part-time teaching posts followed by a full-time fixed-term post, and currently holds a full-time permanent post. She presents as a confident, responsible and somewhat 'regulated' individual and describes herself as taking her work very seriously and as feeling proud to be part of academia and working in a university. She was included in the last RAE. Emma, like Diane, sees 'absolutely no problem' with equal opportunities and promotion prospects at her university.

\*Pseudonyms are used and some details altered to protect anonymity

‘uncomfortable’ identity states. A small, salient selection of the extensive idiographic results is presented here in three sections:

1. a brief overview of the women’s strongest identifications, including conflicted identifications, with aspects of their academic lives;
2. the women’s value systems, within which these conflicted identifications are couched; and
3. developmental progression of their identity ‘as women’ and ‘as academics’, and a global classification of the women’s identity variants.

In this ISA study of identity, women’s ‘academic identity’ is defined thus:

Academic women’s identity is defined as the totality of their self-construal, in which how they construe themselves in the present expresses the continuity between how academic women construe themselves as they were in the past and how they construe themselves as they aspire to be in the future.

### **Vulnerable academic identities – ‘diffused’ and conflicted**

#### *Evaluations, role models and heightened conflicts in identification*

Claire’s and Katie’s evaluations and identifications show that institutional structures and processes impact negatively on their identity structures and processes, not in their female self-context, but in their academic self-context.

For both Claire and Katie, their highest evaluations (apart from ‘ideal self’) are of their past self, *before* becoming academics, and their ‘female’ self (in their lives *outside* the university). This immediately signals problems with their academic identity. Claire’s strongest conflicts in identification are with colleagues not in the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), and with (most) female academics. The source of these conflicts is that these individuals represent very negative role models for her, but she also feels total empathy with them (she is, of course, a female herself and she was not included in her unit of assessment). Also, colleagues with strong RAE submissions are very strong positive role models for her. She insisted during interview that her RAE exclusion didn’t make her feel inferior: ‘I wouldn’t have time to research anyway, with all the admin. I do’, but the strong conflicts suggest otherwise. As for (most) female academics, she asserted,

‘In the ‘new order’ a lot of women in here [university] are like men! – tunnel-visioned and ruthless – I work hard, but I won’t compromise my beliefs by ‘selling out’ to the system.’

**TABLE 1**  
Identification with selected aspects of academic self and others

	Claire	Katie
Evaluation (-1.00 to +1.00)	Past self: before academia* (1.00) Me as a woman, outside Uni (0.62) Me as an academic (-0.13)	Past self: before academia (1.00) Me as a woman, outside Uni (0.31) Me as an academic (-0.13)
Idealistic Identification (Positive role models) (0.00 to 1.00)	Lay people, outside Uni. (0.77) Colleagues strong in RAE (0.62)	Students (0.62) Lay people, outside Uni. (0.62)
Contra-Identification (Negative role models) (0.00 to 1.00)	(Most) Female academics (0.62) Colleagues not in RAE (0.62)	(Most) Female academics (0.54) Students (0.38)
Empathetic Idfn. (0.00 to 1.00)	(Most) Female academics (1.00) Colleagues not in RAE (1.00)	(Most) Female academics (1.00) Students (0.69)
Conflicts in Idfn. (0.00 to 1.00)	(Most) Female academics (0.79) Colleagues not in RAE (0.79)	(Most) Female academics (0.73) Students (0.51)

\*See Appendix 2 for full Entity titles

Claire demonstrates considerable resistance to the 'new managerialism'. Further, her strongest idealistic identification is not with some aspect of university life, but with (lay) people, *outside* the university sector.

Similarly, Katie's strongest conflicts in identification are with most female academics (for similar reasons), but also notable are her conflicts with students. She talked a lot about 'the students' during interview, about how:

'an excessive emphasis is now being put on the RAE – largely at the expense of the students . . . we're being asked to treat them as paying 'customers' who seem to be constantly *evaluating* the product instead of consuming it!'

She spoke several times about her 'unfair teaching load' compared to her (male) colleagues' and submitted:

'morale is low – it's a case of being undervalued, underpaid and overworked . . . but I just try to keep going'.

The next question is, within what value systems are these strong and widely dispersed conflicts created and located?

*'Negated' and 'conflicted' value systems?*

The core evaluative dimensions of Claire's and Katie's identities primarily comprise constructs reflecting personal factors (see Appendix

*TABLE 2*  
Academic women's core (and conflicted) values

Claire	Katie
Core evaluative dimensions of Identity* (Aspired-to, consistently-used, values for Self)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feels generally very satisfied with how things are (No.13) (SP**=79.55)</li> <li>• Rarely feels in any way inferior (No.12) (SP=71.54)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feels appreciated and values (No.9) (SP=88.75)</li> <li>• Feels generally very satisfied with how things are (No.13) (SP=64.07)</li> </ul>
Conflicted evaluative dimensions of Identity* (Aspired-to, but inconsistently-used, values for self)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes much has been sadly lost/sacrificed through the new management approaches in the university sector (No.1) (SP=-12.80)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes universities today should be primarily about teaching – academics have a duty to properly support students' intellectual development (No.4) (SP=6.23)</li> </ul>

\*See Appendix 3 for opposite non-endorsed poles of these constructs

\*\*SP = Structural Pressure on constructs, (-100 to +100), (see Appendix 1 for definition)

3). In other words, their core, most aspired-to and consistently-used values in appraising the self and their social/academic worlds, give precedence to the values of feeling appreciated (construct 9), feeling generally satisfied with how things are (construct 13), and rarely feeling in any way inferior (construct 12). These 'non-institutional' values are perhaps unsurprising, given Claire's and Katie's high evaluation (above) of themselves 'as women' (outside the university setting). We also evidence the strength of Claire's aspired-to value of not feeling inferior and of Katie's aspiration towards feeling appreciated and valued.

However, these values are differently reflected in Claire's and Katie's identities: as women, these values are endorsed moderately for Katie and quite strongly for Claire, but as academics, these aspired-to values are virtually negated. In fact, because their 'academic' self-evaluation is so low, the bi-polar opposites of the endorsed poles of the constructs are the actual values at play. In other words, as an academic, Claire does not feel very satisfied, and sometimes feels a bit inferior; and Katie feels unappreciated and undervalued, and often feels very dissatisfied with how things are (see Appendix 3). Moreover, they both use certain other of their aspired-to values in an inconsistent and conflicted manner (see Table 2). Particularly, Claire is conflicted about her belief that much has been sadly lost or sacrificed through the new management

approaches in the university sector (construct 1). Unlike their confident female self-context, where their core values are endorsed and supported, it is Claire's and Katie's low self-evaluations in their academic self-context, coupled with their many strong conflicts in identification, that render their academic identities 'vulnerable'.

Diane and Emma also have 'vulnerable' identities but, as shown below, this is for very different reasons based on very different orientations to their academic lives.

### Vulnerable academic identities – 'foreclosed' and defensive

#### *Evaluations, role models and minimised conflicts in identification*

Diane's and Emma's evaluations and identifications suggest a positive impact and a near-perfect 'fit' between the institutional structures and processes and their own identity structures and processes, both in their female selves and particularly in their academic self-contexts. However, findings reveal that their patterns of identification are so rigidly and defensively experienced that they result in 'vulnerable' identity states.

TABLE 3  
Identifications with selected aspects of academic self and others

	Diane	Emma
Evaluation (-1.00 to +1.00)	My Dean/HoS* (1.00) Me as management sees me (0.98)	My Dean/HoS (0.94) Current UK university sector (0.86)
Idealistic Identification (Positive role models) (0.00 to 1.00)	Colleagues strong in RAE (1.00) Current UK Uni. sector (1.00) My Dean/HOS (1.00) (Most) Male academics (1.00) Me as management sees me (1.00)	Colleague strong in RAE (1.00) My Dean/HoS (1.00) Current UK Uni. sector (1.00)
Contra-Identification (Negative role models) (0.00 to 1.00)	Colleagues not in RAE (0.46)	Colleagues not in RAE (0.54)
Empathetic Idfn. (0.00 to 1.00)	Colleagues strong in RAE (1.00) Current UK Uni. sector (1.00) My Dean/HOS (1.00) Current UK Uni. sector (1.00) (Most) Male academics (1.00) Me as management sees me (1.00) Colleagues not in RAE (0.54)	Colleagues strong in RAE (1.00) My Dean/HoS (1.00) Current UK University sector (1.00) Colleagues not in RAE (0.46)
Conflicts in Idfn. (0.00 to 1.00)	Colleagues not in RAE (0.54)	Colleagues not in RAE (0.50)

\*See Appendix 2 for full Entity titles

Immediately notable is the lack of differentiation in Diane's and Emma's identifications; and that their highest evaluations – apart from ideal self – are firmly focused within their academic lives and experiences. For both women, 'totally' positive role models are represented by their Dean/Head of School (HoS), colleagues with strong RAE submissions, and the current UK university sector. Further, and somewhat unrealistically, they have no conflicts in identification with their positive role models. Diane asserted:

'You've just got to go for it – there are a lot of people up there [in senior management] just trying to do their job. It's just a matter of understanding their aims and planning your objectives to suit – it's simply sink or swim . . . And the sooner I can get a chair, the better – that's my aim!'

It is worth noting that Diane also has 'total' idealistic and empathetic identification, both with (most) male academics and with her metaperspective, 'me as management sees me'. Rather than resistance to the new managerialism, these women display a defensive championing of it. They appear to be coping with potential conflicts by simply denying them. Overall, Diane's and Emma's identification conflicts with aspects of their academic/social worlds are extremely (unrealistically) low.

#### *'Endorsed' and 'supported' value systems?*

The most 'core' evaluative dimensions of Diane's and Emma's identities concern constructs of institutional culture and organisational practices, systems and management – none of their most core constructs reflect personal factors. Neither Diane nor Emma has a single conflicted dimension in their value and belief system.

The core evaluative dimensions of Diane's identity are the very four in the Identity Instrument pertaining to organisational practice (see Appendix 3 for full discourse and opposing poles of constructs). Emma's core values concern two of the three constructs about institutional culture and, like Diane's, perfectly parallel and support the values and approach of the 'new managerialism'. These aspired-to values are strongly endorsed in both women's very positive construal of self as 'a woman' and, particularly, of self as 'an academic'. The 'vulnerability' in Diane's and Emma's identities is their apparent defensive denial of the existence of any conflicts – and their defensive appraisal of their academic lives; i.e., their rigid and unquestioning belief in the excellence of the new managerialism, and in the transparency of promotions, and in the full incorporation of equal opportunities practice in their universities.

*TABLE 4*  
Academic women's core (and conflicted) values<sup>#</sup>

Diane	Emma
Core evaluative dimensions of Identity* (Aspired-to, consistently-used, values for Self)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes EO policy and practice are taken very seriously and are now a core part of university structures and processes – at every level (No.8) (SP**=98.42)</li> <li>• Thinks administration and 'red tape' are just there to be 'got through' – academics need to be all-rounders just like in any business! (No.7) (SP=96.20)</li> <li>• Feels fixed-term employment contracts 'keep people on their toes' and, hence, increase efficient and effective productivity (No.6) (SP=93.14)</li> <li>• Believes there's transparency, consistency and fairness in promotion procedures and outcomes in universities (No.5) (SP=92.45)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the new regime of economy, efficiency and effectiveness is an excellent and desirable way forward (No.1) (SP=96.53)</li> <li>• Believes that ultimate power &amp; control in an organisation's decision-making should lie with a small, highly experienced team at the top (No.2) (SP=90.14)</li> <li>• Believes there's transparency, consistency and fairness in promotion procedures and outcomes in universities (No.5) (SP=89.54)</li> <li>• Feels generally very satisfied with how things are (No.13) (SP=86.13)</li> </ul>

\*See Appendix 3 for opposite non-endorsed poles of these constructs

\*\*SP = Structural Pressure on constructs, (-100 to +100), (see Appendix 1 for definition)

<sup>#</sup>N.B. Diane and Emma have no conflicted dimensions to their identities

### **Vulnerable academic identities – past, present and future: anti-developmental or 'progressive' ?**

*Self-evaluations as 'an academic' and as 'a woman'*

Table 5 shows how the women evaluate themselves in their female context ('as a woman') and their academic context ('as an academic') in relation to their evaluations of past selves and their future aspirations for self.

Basically, Claire and Katie demonstrate a diminished notion of themselves as women from the past to the present, but a hugely diminished – indeed negating – evaluation of themselves as academics. Both women are experiencing an anti-developmental trend in their identity, i.e., their past self-evaluations are greater than their current self-evaluations. This suggests they hold an image of a more congenial past self (i.e., before becoming academics), and means that they are regressing

TABLE 5  
The academic women's identity development

	Self-Evaluation (−1.00 to +1.00)			
	Past Self (before academia)	As 'an academic' (in my university setting)	As 'a woman' (in my life outside academia)	Ideal Self (Me as I'd like to be)
Claire	1.00	−0.13	0.62	1.00
Katie	0.37	−0.13	0.31	1.00
Diane	−0.21	0.94	0.70	1.00
Emma	−0.18	0.66	0.60	1.00

in terms of currently fulfilling their identity aspirations (which are primarily, for Claire, not feeling in any way inferior; and for Katie, feeling appreciated and valued). But Claire's identity is in a precarious place. She is 'suspended', in conflict, between a highly (over)idealised past before she became an academic and her high aspirations for her ideal self. Her current identity as an academic is very negative and conflicted. She evidently feels a bit inferior about not being in the RAE, is dissatisfied about not having the opportunity to research, and is conflicted about what has been sacrificed through the new management approach. She is therefore much closer to fulfilling her identity aspirations as a woman than as an academic. Sound and accessible EO practice could do much to strengthen Claire's self-confidence and academic identity.

Diane and Emma are experiencing a very different identity dynamic. Both have made a 'leap' from a very negatively evaluated past self to, in Diane's case, an extremely high (unsustainable?) current self-evaluation as 'a woman' (0.70), and especially as 'an academic' (0.94). In fact she appears unrealistically close to reaching/realising her aspired-to self. Certainly, this dynamic shows progressive development towards fulfilling identity aspirations, but also begs the question of how realistic and sustainable such an elevated self-evaluation could be. Table 6, below, shows how the four women's self-evaluations are fused with their conflicts in identification to translate into the ISA global classification of identity.

#### *Classification of academic women's 'vulnerable' identities*

The ISA global classification of identity variants is achieved by 'matrixing'

TABLE 6

Classification of identity variants for the academic women for past self (before academia), 'female' self and 'academic' self

	Identity 'Diffusion'		Identity 'Foreclosure'
Self-Evaluation			
High	DIFFUSE HIGH SELF-REGARD <i>Claire, past self</i>	CONFIDENT	DEFENSIVE HIGH SELF-REGARD <i>Diane, as 'academic'</i>
Moderate	DIFFUSION <i>Claire, as 'woman'</i> <i>Katie, past self</i> <i>Katie, as 'woman'</i>	INDETERMINATE	DEFENSIVE <i>Diane, as 'woman'</i> <i>Emma, as 'academic'</i> <i>Emma, as 'woman'</i>
Low	CRISIS  <i>Claire, as 'academic'</i> <i>Katie, as 'academic'</i>	NEGATIVE  <i>Diane, past self</i> <i>Emma, past self</i>	DEFENSIVE NEGATIVE

the strength and dispersal of the women's conflicts in identification (with self and others in their social/academic worlds) with how they evaluate themselves in the identity contexts of past self (before becoming academics) and current selves, as 'women' and as 'academics'.

The left column of Table 6 denotes 'diffusion' (strong and widely dispersed conflicts in identification) and the right column denotes 'foreclosure' (a rigid and defensive denial of conflicts in identification). Both denote 'vulnerable' identities. The three rows in the table show high, moderate and low levels of self-evaluation. The categories at the centre of the table, i.e. 'indeterminate' – or 'confident' – are deemed to be 'healthy', well-balanced identity states, to which most people would belong, in at least one identity context. Claire and Katie display deeply 'diffused' identity states. Claire's self-evaluation decreases from past self (before becoming an academic) to current female self, to academic self, leaving her academic self – with its attendant conflicts – in a 'crisis' identity state, as in Katie's case. These women have not managed to resolve their identification conflicts over time, and have experienced decreasing notions of self which, together, denote 'diffuse', vulnerable identities. Their aspirations towards effective EOs and transparent promotion procedures are not supported in their negative and conflicted appraisal of themselves and their experiences as academic women.

Diane and Emma have shifted their identity states from negatively evaluated past selves with 'normal' levels of conflicts in identification, to hugely inflated current self-evaluations as women and especially as academics. And, rather than maintain 'normal' levels of conflicts in identification, they have effected a concomitant defensive denial of the existence of such conflicts. Their academic selves and lives, including equal opportunities and career progression prospects in their universities, are construed as being close to 'perfect'. This rigid, 'foreclosed' self-positioning is defensive in orientation and is highly resistant to change and development (there is 'nowhere to go'). It is a 'foreclosed', vulnerable identity state. So, as 'women' and as 'academics', all four women are experiencing 'vulnerable' identity states, but in two quite different ways – with two sets of quite different identity structures and underlying psychological processes of development.

### **Academic women and identity: some implications, conclusions and ways forward**

#### *Summary, implications and idiography*

It would be indefensible to suggest that there have not been considerable gains for women in academia. Academic women are experiencing a lessening minority status, an improved career progression and a narrowing, albeit slowly, of the gender pay gap. But even in the face of these improvements, the analyses of the identity structures and identity processes of the four academic women presented in this paper demonstrate the existence of two distinct types of vulnerable identities in academic life.

As asserted earlier, these findings are not suggesting that all academic women have vulnerable identities, neither are they implying that all academic men have non-vulnerable identities. These cases have been selected to demonstrate the nature and extent of vulnerable identities, where they exist in academic women. Such vulnerability appears to be linked to issues of the new management practices and performance expectations and, by implication, to issues of equal opportunities and equal treatment. An apparent 'two-track' effect of the 'new managerialism' appears to have created or facilitated two distinct types of vulnerable academic identities. It has driven Claire and Katie to the 'outside track' of feeling outside the system of new corporatist values, and a lack of confidence in reaching or sustaining new performance targets and demands. Diane and Emma are clearly on the 'inside track', adopting

and exemplifying the new corporatist values (but in a defensive rigidity that renders their identities vulnerable and problematic). Problem issues are necessarily policy issues, which demand policy solutions. There is much that can be done to address these issues, and simultaneously fortify academic women's identities, by strong and effective EO policy and practice.

The findings presented here are not claiming to be representative of anything but themselves; but nor can they be discounted – for two reasons. Firstly, these identity profiles appear in women who, by all standards, would be considered by their institutions to be more or less 'productive' and 'successful' in research output, teaching quality and grant acquisition (and therefore presumed motivated, 'successful', and hence 'satisfied'). But these are *vulnerable* identities (albeit for two quite different psychosocial 'strategies' of making sense of their academic [juxta]positions, and with different underlying psychological processes sustaining them). Such vulnerable identity states imply psychologically 'uncomfortable' and often stressful states. This carries potentially serious implications for universities' (now statutory) responsibility and duty to uphold and protect the psychosocial wellbeing of their employees.

The second reason that these findings should not be discounted on the basis of their 'representativeness' is because of the value, richness and potential insights to be gained from detailed idiographic case-study research. 'Generalisability' of findings is not the be-all and end-all of powerful or useful social research. Certainly, the interpretations made and claims drawn from the idiographic analysis of the four academic women's identities are, 'typically, cautious, highly detailed and grounded in the data' (Smith, 1995, p. 63). However, as argued elsewhere (Saunderson and O'Kane, 2002), Smith further draws together the argument that if 'the particular eternally underlies the general, the general eternally has to comply with the particular' (Goethe, in Hermans, 1988, p. 785). Therefore, there is value to an idiographic study that taps something not only rich and unique, but also relatively universal or shared (Smith, 1995, p. 61). Further, these findings about academic women's identity certainly represent, as Harré (1979, p. 137) puts it, 'a cautious climb up the ladder of generality.'

#### *Academia, EOs and the future*

It has been established that, in terms of 'where we have come from', there have indeed been considerable gains for women in academia. In terms of 'where we are going', there appears to be an exciting mush-

r o o m i n g  
and recent proliferation of initiatives which, if fully implemented and assimilated, will ensure a hastened and shortened journey towards gender parity and equality of opportunity, esteem and treatment in the academy. These initiatives followed in the wake of a raft of late-1990s official commitments to equal opportunities policies in universities (e.g., CUCO, 1997; DfEE, 1997; Powney, 1997), and gained momentum in the light of the Hay Report (1997), the Dearing Report (1997) and, particularly, the Bett Report (1999). Most notably, at the turn of the millennium, an extensive consultation secured an initial £2.5 million over five years to establish an Equality Challenge Unit (ECU).

Subsuming and building upon the valuable work of the CUCO (established in 1994), the remit of the ECU (launched in 2001) is to support directly the work of the UK HEIs and to provide a sector-level view of progress in improving equal opportunities in its employment practices. Towards this end, the ECU will work closely with heads of institutions, governing bodies, the nine HE-recognised trade unions, and personnel and equality practitioners. The unit will be supported by the representative bodies (Universities UK, SCOP) and by the funding bodies (HEFCE, HEFCW, SHEFC, DEL) for higher education in the UK. The ECU incorporates three initiatives: 'The Institutional Equal Opportunities Advisory Service' provides direct support in integrating equal opportunities into institutions at a strategic level; 'The Athena Project' disseminates good practice in the advancement of women in science, engineering and technology; and 'The Women in Higher Education Register' is open to all academic women and offers information, opportunities for networking and support for career and personal development.

Furthermore, NATFHE (2002a) has recently made an impressive submission arguing for increased government funding to be earmarked for HE in the next Comprehensive Spending Review for the three years 2003–04 to 2005–06. One of the submission's five strongly evidenced key objectives is 'Equal Pay and Opportunities for Women Academics' – this should serve to add further impetus to current initiatives.

However, laudable as these initiatives are, unless they become an integral and intrinsic component – a part of the institutional culture of UK universities – then on-the-ground EO practice and experience will remain a nebulous and toothless concept for academic women. A vigilant guard must be mounted against such initiatives being loudly applauded as excellent 'ideas' of good EO practice, and then framed and presented

in Vice Chancellors' offices around the country as self-certification and self-congratulatory portraits of 'sound EO policy' or, worse still, venerated and eulogized, then simply shelved and sidelined. An obvious concern is cost. However, on the basis that the UK is witnessing the longest period of sustained low inflation since the 1960s (and, according to the Treasury, since the end of 1999 it is the lowest in the EU), the overall state of the economy is believed to be sound, and the cost of addressing such discrimination and the gender pay gap can be met without placing undue strain on public expenditure (NATHFE, 2002a, p. 15).

In final summary, the findings presented in this paper suggest that, despite considerable recent gains and several excellent current EO initiatives, some academic women's identities are compromised, challenged and made 'vulnerable', through varying feelings of being undervalued, overlooked, overburdened, and often the subjects of unequal treatment in the sometimes alienating current climate of 'new managerialism' permeating university life. Other women appear to mount a defensive response to the 'fear' of such feelings and alienation – adopting, absorbing and championing the 'new managerialism' in their defensive and vulnerable identity states. The empirical findings of this study are afforded irrefutable reinforcement and consolidation from the 'facts' of the existing and persisting gender pay gap, academic women's numerical minority vis-à-vis men, their under-representation in senior positions, and their over-representation in part-time and fixed-term posts. All such 'facts' glaringly question more than 30 years of the Equal Pay Act and almost 30 years of the Sex Discrimination Act. Does this suggest a kind of 'academic nemesis' for women with university careers?

My conclusions therefore warn against continued valorization of EO policy without its full assimilation into the underlying core institutional culture. This would surely sanction the abandonment of any tangible or effective progress in higher education's ability to produce more robust academic identities and more satisfying daily working lives for academic women. In so far as such assimilation is not achieved, then the policy, practice and rhetoric of equal opportunities and equal treatment in the UK university sector will, indeed, remain little more than 'lipstick on the gorilla'.

### **Appendix 1** **Identity parameters assessed by IDEX**

- ego-involvement with oneself and with others, institutions, etc., as

relevant.

- evaluation of oneself and others, institutions, etc.
- idealistic-identification with others, institutions, etc., (i.e. positive role models).
- contra-identification with others, institutions, etc., (i.e. negative role models).
- empathetic identification with others, institutions, etc., (i.e. identifying shared characteristics with others), assessed with respect to designated past and current contexts.
- conflicted identification with others, institutions, etc., (i.e. a function of simultaneous empathetic and contra-identification with others), assessed with respect to designated past and current contexts.
- identity diffusion assessed with respect to designated past and current contexts.
- polarity of constructs (designating the person's evaluative connotations of discourses).
- SP: structural pressure on constructs (assessing evaluative compatibilities and incompatibilities in the individual's appraisal of the social world in respect of the individual's use of discourses).

In addition, a 'global classification' – the individual identity state or variant according to designated past and current contexts – is ascertained, such as confident, crisis, diffusion, defensive, negative, etc.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Entities in the 'Academic Women' identity instrument**

#### **'Self' entities**

Me as 'an academic' (in my university setting)  
Me as 'a woman' (in my life outside academia)  
Me as I used to be (before becoming an academic)  
Me as I would like to be

#### **'Social (/academic) World' entities**

Faculty/Line management (my Dean or HoS)  
The current UK university sector, in general  
Colleagues with strong submissions in last RAE  
University (undergrad) Students  
My family and closest friends  
(Most) Male academics  
(Most) Female academics  
(Lay) People outside the university sector

Colleagues not included in last RAE  
 The current Labour Government, in general  
 A person I really admire (nominate)  
 A person I really dislike (nominate)

### Metaperspectives of Self

Me as the Students see me  
 Me as Management sees me  
 Me as my Family & closest friends see me

## Appendix 3 Constructs (opposing poles) in the 'Academic Women' identity instrument

### *Institutional Culture (values, attitudes, behaviour of academic institutions)*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (1) Believe/s much has been sadly lost/sacrificed through the new management approaches in the university sector  | Believe/s the new regime of economy, efficiency & effectiveness is an excellent and desirable way forward  |
| (2) Believe/s in 'flat management' of a horizontal nature, where power & control in decision-making are devolved across many smaller sub-level structures | Believe/s that ultimate power & control in an organisation's decision-making should lie with a small, highly experienced team at the top         |
| (4) Believe/s UK universities today should be primarily about teaching – academics have a duty properly to support students' intellectual development     | Believe/s students 'are always going to be there' – they can come quietly second to producing quality research and securing good research grants |

### *Organisational Practices (systems, practices, management, arrangements)*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (5) Believe/s there's transparency, consistency and fairness in promotion procedures and outcomes in universities  | Believe/s there's often a lack of clarity, consistency and fairness in promotion procedures and outcomes in universities                         |
| (6) Feel/s fixed-term employment contracts thwart forward-planning, confidence and, hence, productivity  | Feel/s fixed-term employment contracts 'keep people on their toes' and, hence, increase efficient and effective productivity                     |
| (7) Think/s the new management approaches in universities involve an excessive amount of administration and 'red tape' – academics did not train to be administrators! | Think/s administration and 'red tape' are just there to be 'got through' – academics need to be all-rounders just like in any business!          |
| (8) Believe/s EO policy and practice are taken very seriously and are now a core part of university structures and processes – at every level                          | Believe/s EO policy is <i>not</i> translated into practice at many levels in university structures and processes – in often the most subtle ways |

*Personal Factors (shaping or constraining women's career choices & outcomes)*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(3) Is/Are given to self-analysis and reflection (internal position, i.e. a THINKING &amp; 'covert' style of planning and working)</p> <p>(9) Often feel/s unappreciated, undervalued and a bit taken for granted</p> <p>(10) Friendly, approachable and willingly helpful</p> <p>(11) Often feel/s very responsible, in a personal sense, for the well-being of others</p> <p>(12) Sometimes feel/s a bit inferior</p> <p>(13) Feel/s generally very satisfied with how things are</p> | <p>Is/Are non-reflective and not self-analysing (external position, i.e. a DOING and 'overt' style of planning and working)</p> <p>Feel/s appreciated and valued</p> <p>A bit distant, unwelcoming and not openly helpful</p> <p>Do/Does not feel at all personally responsible for other people's well-being: that's their problem</p> <p>Rarely feel/s in any way inferior</p> <p>Often feels very dissatisfied with how things are</p> |
|--|---|

**References**

Anderson, P. and Williams, J. (eds.) (2001) *Identity and Difference in Higher Education: 'Outsiders Within'*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

AUT (1992) *Sex Discrimination in Universities*. Report of an academic pay audit carried out by the AUT research department. Association of University Teachers.

AUT (1999) 'New Figures on University Staff Contracts: The Reason Behind the Action on Admissions'. (page updated: 20th Aug 1999; Web Editor: Julia Lones). <http://www.aut.org.uk/news/press99/pr99042.htm>.

AUT (2000) 'Pay and Pay Review: Campaigning for Fair Pay'. (page updated: 18th Jan 2000; Section Editor: Jonathan Whitehead). <http://www.aut.org.uk/campaigns/pay.htm>.

Bagilhole, B. (1993) 'Survivors in a male preserve: A study of British women academics' experiences and perceptions of discrimination in a UK university'. *Higher Education*, 26(4), pp. 431–447.

Bagilhole, B. (1994) 'Being different is a very difficult row to hoe: Survival strategies of women academics'. In S. Davies, C. Lubelska and J. Quinn (eds.) *Changing the Subject: Women in Higher Education*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Bailey, L. (2000) 'Bridging home and work in the transition to motherhood: A discursive study'. *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, 7 (1), pp. 53–70.

Ball, S. (1994) *Education Reform – A Critical and Post-Structural Approach*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Bett, M. (1999) *Independent Review of Higher Education Pay and Conditions: Report of a Committee Chaired by Sir Michael Bett*. London: The Stationery Office.

Bird, E. (2000) 'Between the margins and the mainstream: Women's studies and academic feminism'. Extended Review. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21 (4), pp. 649–654.

Blackmore, J. and Sachs, J. (2001) 'Women leaders in the restructured university'. In A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon (eds.) *Gender and the Restructured University*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Brooks, A. (1997) *Academic Women*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Brooks, A. (2001) 'Restructuring bodies of knowledge'. In A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon

- (eds.) *Gender and the Restructured University*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Brown, R. (2000) 'Personal and professional development programmes for women: paradigm and paradoxes'. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 5 (1), pp. 68–75.
- Casey, C. (1995) *Work, Self and Society After Industrialism*. London: Routledge.
- Clarke, H., Chandler, J. and Barry, J. (2000) 'Gender and managerialism in the organisation of UK university life'. In P. Fogelberg, J. Hearn, L. Husu and T. Mankinen (eds.) *Hard Work in the Academy: Research Interventions on Gender Inequalities in Higher Education*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Clarke, J. and Hoggett, P. (2000) 'Regressive modernisation? The changing patterns of social services delivery in the UK'. In H. Wollmann and E. Schroter (eds.) *Comparing Public Sector Reform in Britain and Germany: Key Traditions and Trends of Modernisation*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Clarke, J. and Newman, J. (1993) 'The right to manage: A second managerial revolution'. *Cultural Studies*, 7 (3), pp. 427–444.
- Cotterill, P. and Waterhouse, R. L. (1998) 'Women in higher education: The gap between corporate reality and the rhetoric of experience'. In D. Malina and S. Maslin-Prothero (eds.) *Surviving the Academy: Feminist Perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- CUCO (1997) *A Report on Policies and Practices on Equal Opportunities in Employment in Universities, Colleges and Higher Education*. London: CVCP.
- Cutler, T. and Waine, B. (2000) 'Managerialism reformed? New Labour and public sector management'. *Social Policy and Administration*, 34 (3), pp. 318–332.
- CVCP (2000) 'Academic staff of UK HEIs'. *Higher Education in Facts and Figures*. Autumn 2000. London: CVCP.
- David, M., Weiner, G. and Arnot, M. (2000) 'Gender equality and schooling, education policy-making and feminist research in England and Wales in the 1990s'. In J. Salisbury and S. Riddell (eds.) *Gender, Policy and Educational Change: Shifting Agenda in the UK and Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Deem, R. (2000) 'Gendered governance: Education reform and lay involvement in the local management of schools'. In J. Salisbury and S. Riddell (eds.) *Gender, Policy and Educational Change: Shifting Agenda in the UK and Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Dillabough, J. (1999) 'Gender politics and conceptions of the modern teacher: women, identity and professionalism'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20 (3), pp. 373–394.
- DfEE (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society*. (The Dearing Report). London: HMSO.
- Goode, J. and Bagilhole, B. (1998) 'The social construction of gendered equal opportunities in UK universities: a case study of women technicians'. *Critical Social Policy*, 18 (2), pp. 175–192.
- Halvorsen, E. (2002) 'Gender audit'. In G. Howie and A. Tauchert (eds.) *Gender, Teaching and Research in Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hansard Society Commission (1990) *Women at the Top*. London: The Hansard Society for Parliamentary Government.
- Harré, R. (1979) *Social Being*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harris, P., Thiele, B. and Currie, J. (1998) 'Success, gender and academic voices: Consuming passion or selling the soul?'. *Gender and Education*, 10 (2), pp. 133–148.
- Hearn, J. (2000) 'Men, masculinities, management and gender equality in UK universities'. In P. Fogelberg, J. Hearn, L. Husu and T. Mankinen (eds.) *Hard Work in the Academy: Research Interventions on Gender Inequalities in Higher Education*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Henkel, M. (2001) *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hermans, H. J. (1988) 'On the integration of nomothetic and idiographic research methods

- in the study of personal meaning'. *Journal of Personality*, 56, pp. 785–812.
- HESA (2001) *Resources of Higher Education Institutions 2000/01*. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency.
- Howie, G. and Tauchert, A. (2002) 'Institutional discrimination and the "cloistered" academic ideal'. In G. Howie and A. Tauchert (eds.) *Gender, Teaching and Research in Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ledwith, S. and Manfredi, S. (2000) 'Balancing gender in higher education: A study of the experience of senior women in a "new" UK university'. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 7 (1), pp. 7–33.
- Letherby, G. and Shiels, J. (2001) 'Isn't he good, but can we take her seriously?: Gendered expectations in higher education'. In P. Anderson and J. Williams (eds.) *Identity and Difference in Higher Education: 'Outsiders Within'*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mackinnon, A. and Brooks, A. (2001) 'Introduction: Globalisation, academia and change'. In A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon (eds.) *Gender and the Restructured University*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Marginson, S. (2000) 'Research as a managed economy: The costs'. In T. Coady (ed.) *Why Universities Matter: A Conversation about Values, Means and Directions*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Morley, L. (1999) *Organising Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Morley, L. (2002) 'Lifelong yearning: feminist pedagogy in the learning society'. In G. Howie and A. Tauchert (eds.) *Gender, Teaching and Research in Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Morley, L. and Walsh, V. (eds.) (1996) *Breaking Boundaries: Women in Higher Education*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- NATFHE (2002a) *The Price of Equality: Comprehensive Spending Review 2003/4 – 2005/6*, Higher Education Submission, Jan 2002. London: NATFHE.
- NATFHE (2002b) 'UK academics "poor relations" in world pay league tables'. Press Release, 15 Jan 2002. <http://www.natfhe.org.uk/says/rels2002/2002pr01.shtml>.
- Powney, J., Hamilton, S. and Weiner, G. (1997) *Higher Education and Equality: A Guide*. London: EOC/CRE/CUCO.
- Profili, O. (1999) Women of Europe. Report No. 87, Information for Women: DG X of the EUC. <http://www.sozialarbeit.de/europa/2000-01en.shtml>.
- Rendel, M. (1980) 'How many women academics: 1912–1976?' In R. Deem (ed.) *Schooling for Women's Work*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Salisbury, J. and Riddell, S. (eds.) (2000) *Gender, Policy and Educational Change: Shifting Agenda in the UK and Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Saunderson, W. (1997a) 'Women, cities and identity: The production and consumption of gendered urban space in Belfast'. In A. Byrne and M. Leonard (eds.) *Women and Irish Society: A Sociological Reader*. Belfast: Beyond the Pale Publications.
- Saunderson, W. (1997b) 'Sociopsychological aspects of voluntary action: constructions of a "volunteer identity" and the volunteering self in Northern Ireland'. Presented at 'Voluntary Action in Ireland North and South: A Research Symposium', Trinity College Dublin, 16 May, 1997.
- Saunderson, W. (1999a) 'City, self and identity at the millennium: The town planners and architects of Belfast'. *Proceedings of the British Psychological Society*, 7 (2), p.137.
- Saunderson, W. (1999b) *The University of Youth Initiative: An Evaluation*. Report commissioned by the Community Relations Section of the Western Education and Library Board, NI, into the 1998–99 Accelerated Literacy/Community Relations initiative funded by DENI and the EU Special Support Programme for peace and reconciliation: Social Inclusion – SP4, Measures 3 & 6. DENI (Nov, 1999).
- Saunderson, W. (2001a) 'Review: H. Wollmann and E. Schroter (eds.) *Comparing Public Sector Reform in Britain and Germany: Key Traditions and Trends of Modernisation*. Aldershot: Ashgate'. *Journal of Social Policy*, 30 (4), pp. 760–762.

- Saunderson, W. (2001b) 'Issues of women's fear in urban space: The case of Belfast'. *Women and Environments International*, 50/51, pp. 28–31.
- Saunderson, W. (2002) 'Women, cities and identity'. In P. Weinreich and W. Saunderson (eds.) *Analysing Identity: Cross-cultural, Societal and Clinical contexts*. London: Routledge.
- Saunderson, W. and McGarry, M. (1999) 'Lone mothers and identity'. Presented at the Social Policy Association Annual Conference, Southlands College, Roehampton Institute, London, 20–22 July, 1999.
- Saunderson, W. and O'Kane (1998) 'Anorexia Nervosa and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder: Analysing Identity for Links'. *Proceedings of the British Psychological Society*, 6 (2), p. 43.
- Saunderson, W. and O'Kane (1999) 'Self, identity and developmental perspectives in young women with anorexia nervosa'. *Proceedings of the British Psychological Society*, 7 (2), p. 137.
- Saunderson, W. and O'Kane (2002) 'Anorexia nervosa: Analysing identity for predisposing, precipitating and perpetuating factors'. In P. Weinreich and W. Saunderson (eds.) *Analysing Identity: Cross-cultural, Societal and Clinical Contexts*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, J. A., Harré, R. and van Langenhove, L. (1995) 'Idiography and the case-study'. In J. A. Smith, R. Harré and L. van Langenhove (eds.) *Rethinking Psychology*. London: Sage.
- THES (2001) 'Short-term and short-changed?' E. Canovan, *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 27th April, 2001, pp. 6–7.
- Universities UK (2001a) *Charter for Higher Education: Speaking Out for Our Universities* (General Election 2001). London: Universities UK.
- Universities UK (2001b) 'Universities UK statement on widening participation'. June 2001. <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/insight>.
- Wager, M. (1994) *Constructions of Fertility in Academic Women: Continuity Between Private and Professional Identity*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia.
- Wager, M. (1998) 'Women or researchers? The identities of academic women'. *Feminism and Psychology*, 8 (2), pp. 236–244.
- Walsh, V. (2002) 'Equal opportunities without 'equality': Redeeming the irredeemable'. In G. Howie and A. Tauchert (eds.) *Gender, Teaching and Research in Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Weiler, K. (1993) 'Feminism and the struggle for a democratic education: a view from the United States'. In M. Arnot and K. Weiler (eds.) *Feminism and Social Justice*. London: Falmer Press.
- Weinreich, P. (1986) *Manual for Identity Exploration using Personal Constructs*. Coventry: University of Warwick/ESRC.
- Weinreich, P. and Saunderson, W. (eds.) (2002) *Analysing Identity: Cross-cultural, Societal and Clinical Contexts*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, E. (1999) 'Lipstick and white collars'. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, July 28th 1999, pp. 18–19.
- Williams, N. (2000) 'Modernising government: Policy networks, competition and the quest for efficiency'. *Political Quarterly*, 71 (4), pp. 412–421.
- Women and Equality Unit, Cabinet Office (2002) 'The Gender Pay Gap'. (page updated: 8th March 2002). <http://www.womenandequalityunit.gov.uk>.
- Woodward, D. (2000) 'Gender: Academic staff'. In D. Woodward and K. Ross (eds.) *Managing Equal Opportunities in Higher Education: A Guide to Understanding and Action*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.