least 15% lower than elsewhere and it is doubtful if the extra amenities are fully offsetting. The use of more competitive rates of pay carries with it an implication that rates of pay for Professors in different cities will differ not only because of the 'content' of staff but because of location. This has funding implications for universities and for their claims on central apportioning bodies for shares of the total grant.

Conclusion

Tenure is an integral part of any system of employment. It has long since become part of the accepted package of emoluments in relation to career, occupation and job choice. To lower it inevitably involves costs both on employer and employee and especially bears on the attractions of employment for new employees. There is nothing sacrosanct about any conditions of employment in perpetuity but both the benefits and costs of change must be fully assessed. Easing costs in one area increases them elsewhere.

Changes should be made for good and enduring reasons, most advantageously with cooperation of employers and staff, because goodwill should not be dismissed as irrelevant. As the academic standing of institutions is of critical international concern both for school and for students, due attention must be paid to the international mobility implications of proposed changes as the quantum and quality of university staff are indelibly interwoven with the whole social fabric and industrial system of the nation.

The implications of educational reform are essentially long-run — hence they must be well thought through. In such a review political expediency should have no place.

Footnotes

1. There is another factor that may serve to ease access to tenure, one that has applied since 1975 is the United Kingdom, and is presumably a point the retiring Vic-Chancellor of Cambridge was referring to. In his record report address (The Australian, October 23, 1981). The Equal Pay Production Act of 1975 made it very difficult, and extremely costly, for employers to dismiss workers after a comparatively short period of employment, somewhere about two years. The costs imposed upon firms rendered labour costs more like capital costs and made bankruptcy rather than a phased rundown of enterprise more likely when trade turned sour. Universities were by inference, rather than so far test, to be an industry within the limits of the Act.

2. The Statutes of Cambridge University provide for two categories of lecturer grade. The lower, Assistant Lecturer or Demonstrator, is for a maximum term of five years; three years in the first instance and renewable for a further two. With the passage of the Act the university has tightened the terms of appointment so as to ensure that the job offer is not restricted to a fixed term and therefore oxylate the requirements of the Act. Since I left in 1977 it may be that there has been increased difficulty in claiming that such appointments do not fall within the terms of the Act, hence the Vice-Chancellor's comment. I do not know if the Lecturer grade (there are no Senior Lecturers or equivalent) to which appointment can only be gained through open advertisement competition the Statutes provide for appointment for three years in the first instance, with the possibility of a further three before appointment runs to the retiring age of 67. Such terms may be regarded as in contradiction of the 1975 Act and doubts as to the place appointing bodies in a dilemma with their own protection being the more rigorous equalising of potential staff before appointment. This, whilst it imposes costs, is more necessary as would-be employees for whom security in the job tends to outweigh pay considerations are now more likely to seek such posts. One must present such hypotheses that would be those whose alternative job opportunities are more restricted be that as it may, one cannot overlook the fact that it was legislative provision that led in part to the phenomenon now being decried.

3. Though many universities have recently called affirmative action programmes to recruit women, this has rarely been accompanied by a substantial increase in the numbers of women employed, they have not brought about a change in attitude.

4. His action may be identified by her as an act of ill-will. If, for example, a male discriminator fails to employ a young woman who is better qualified than in terms of deliberated motives and recognisably discriminatory beliefs. They are, nonetheless, related to a set of understandings about the nature of the world, the effect of which is a discriminatory pattern of outcomes for women. It has taken longer to understand these more complex forms of discrimination and for the courts to acknowledge discrimination in the absence of intended discriminatory acts.

5. Many universities have recently called affirmative action programmes to recruit women, this has rarely been accompanied by a substantial increase in the numbers of women employed, they have not brought about a change in attitude.

6. His action may be identified by her as an act of ill-will. If, for example, a male discriminator fails to employ a young woman who is better qualified than in terms of deliberated motives and recognisably discriminatory beliefs. They are, nonetheless, related to a set of understandings about the nature of the world, the effect of which is a discriminatory pattern of outcomes for women. It has taken longer to understand these more complex forms of discrimination and for the courts to acknowledge discrimination in the absence of intended discriminatory acts.

7. Direct intended discrimination This first form has been called "motivation" discrimination, and occurs when the discriminator knowingly acts on the basis of a belief which discriminates against women. The act of discrimination can be identified by all parties as "a set of isolated and distinguishable events..." which have the effect of preventing a particular woman from gaining access to work or to promotion. It has also been called "ill-will" discrimination though it may not be experienced by the discriminator as motivated by ill-will. It, for example, a male discriminator fails to employ a young woman who is better qualified than in terms of deliberated motives and recognisably discriminatory beliefs. They are, nonetheless, related to a set of understandings about the nature of the world, the effect of which is a discriminatory pattern of outcomes for women. It has taken longer to understand these more complex forms of discrimination and for the courts to acknowledge discrimination in the absence of intended discriminatory acts.
The women's examination (its assumed inferiority perhaps lead­
ance of his underlying assumptions or motivations.

Another invalid assumption, often openly admitted,
has assumed that her work is inferior without close
existence of discrimination.

In "anyone see", (or so he believes) the
male is superior. An example of an invalid assump­
tion made in this kind of case is that age combined
with productivity is a true indicator of worth. A
young male who has published the same amount as
the worker". Another example of a different kind
would be where the woman is perceived as having
levels of credentials which are not related to sex.

Indirect discrimination is also indicated where dif­
ferences between men and women are not taken
into account, thereby harming women's opportuni­
ties. An example of this is the absence of child
minding facilities on campus.

This is indirect discrimination by omission... The
university is not attempting to provide childminding
facilities for working mothers and female students.

Systemic Discrimination

Systemic discrimination is all of the above forms of
discrimination; it is the combination of discrimina­
tory attitudes and practices which directly and indi­
rectly decrease employment and promotion oppor­
tunities for women. Further, it includes the
inevitable negative attitudes women develop to­
wards themselves and their careers as a result of these
reduced opportunities.

Each of the first three levels of discrimination influ­
ences the other and feeds into the final out­
come, that is a systemic discriminatory pattern of
employment and promotion for women.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Rural Science</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1982: U.N.E. Calendar)

Art: (a) includes women in Art departments of the Univer­
sity of New England. (b) Women who are in a female
major within each Sex.

Science: (a) Includes women in Science departments of the
University of New England. (b) Women who are in a
female major within each Sex.

Education: (a) Includes women in Education departments of the
University of New England. (b) Women who are in a
female major within each Sex.

Rural Science: (a) Includes women in Rural Science departments of the
University of New England. (b) Women who are in a
female major within each Sex.

Economics: (a) Includes women in Economics departments of the
University of New England. (b) Women who are in a
female major within each Sex.

Nursing: (a) Includes women in Nursing departments of the
University of New England. (b) Women who are in a
female major within each Sex.

Management: (a) Includes women in Management departments of the
University of New England. (b) Women who are in a
female major within each Sex.

Total: (a) Includes women in all departments of the University of New
England. (b) Women who are in a female major within each Sex.

Table 1 Numbers and Percentages of Academic Women and Men Employed at each Level by Faculty in 1982 at U.N.E.
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Though similar imbalances occur in other universities, the U.N.E. balance is, in general, weighted more heavily against women than in other universities. (See Table 2).

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Women Promoted</th>
<th>Men Promoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Management</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


If we look at the promotion patterns we can see a similar discriminatory pattern emerging. The percentage of women who gain promotion to senior lecturerships, for example, is consistently lower than the percentage of men who gain promotion.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


We can assume that these women entered academe with at least the same ability and enthusiasm as their male colleagues. The task in front of us is to discover what happens to these women to depress their productivity and their subsequent progress through the university. Three equally pressing questions which also emerge from this material and which need answering as part of any affirmative action programme are:

1. Why are women given fewer jobs?
2. Why, when they do get jobs are they more usually untended?
3. Why when they gain tenured lectureships is the next step (promotion) so rare?

In order to get at the experiences of these women, a questionnaire was sent to all women on campus asking them about their experiences of discrimination at U.N.E. One hundred and ninety women replied, fifty-seven of these being academics. Twenty of the respondents agreed to a follow-up, in-depth interview. Of the academic women who returned the questionnaire thirty-three percent said they had experienced direct discrimination. Forty-four percent believed there to be discrimination either on the basis of their own or others' experiences of direct discrimination, or on the basis of the systemic discrimination evidenced by the lack of academic women at higher levels throughout the university.

These figures are surprising for those of us who wish to think of the university as a place of higher learning and enlightenment. But the reality is that the very presence of the women is experienced by many of the men as a threat to their (male) values, practices, and conceptual frameworks perhaps especially where they are seen to have an equal chance, along with the men, of success — as in Arts and Education. Part of this conceptual framework, of course, relates to women's roles and to what constitutes acceptable "womanly behaviour". Many of the comments on the questionnaire centred on this issue. The attitudes encountered by the academic women can be divided into (i) personal attitudes relating to everyday interaction and (ii) political/economic attitudes relating to decision making on employment and promotion issues. These attitudes are irrelevant to direct and indirect, intended and unintended discrimination, i.e. they are part of the total pattern of systemic discrimination.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. Personal Attitudes
   - (a) Inability to treat women as persons
   - (b) Discomfort at working with equal or higher status women
   - (c) Exclusion of women from informal "mateship networks"
   - (d) Blocking of serious academic discussion by continuous talking into sexual "fun" talk, or
• modifying talk to silted politeness because “there are ladies present”.
• insistence on traditional female role
• women disallowed from taking responsibility in the department
• assumption that women will carry out menial tasks
• assignment of domestic and secretarial functions to female academic
• women not encouraged to pursue higher degrees or to publish
• sexual passions made which emphasize the male/female dimension of the relationship and de-emphasize the colleagues/collage relationship
• women regarded as somehow unnatural and unpleasant if they assert themselves with their male colleagues.
(c) Linguistic traditions maintained which assume an all-male university
• academic staff and students referred to as “he” in formal discussion and documentation.

2. Political - economic attitudes
(a) Not taking women seriously or at face value
• Women’s competence is doubted until “proofs” have been provided (e.g. tenure being made conditional on completion of Ph.D.).
• Proofs themselves doubted (e.g. a male was heard to say of her female colleague “how do I know she has published all these papers?”)
• Proofs are assumed to be less weight than equivalent male proofs (e.g. a female lecturer resigned when she failed to gain promotion while her male colleague had similar qualifications yet was appointed reader). I have set up a model of four ideal-types of academic women (using “ideal-types” in Weber’s sense of the term). Very few women will fit neatly into one or other of these categories or types — rather the individual will serve to clarify our thinking about the variety of strategies women develop within a discriminatory workplace. Negative attitudes to self and self-derogation are an integral part of systemic discrimination. These attitudes, along with the discriminatory attitudes detailed above must be understood if affirmative action programmes are to be successful.

Idealist
The idealist voluntarily takes on heavy teaching loads because of her compassion (or perfectionism) she believes she should publish even if she has something really worth saying. She may be slow to start but will eventually publish material. The idealist is not aware of herself as a female academic. She sees herself as a person first, whose own personal flaws (e.g. perfectionism) prevent her from getting on.

Pragmatist
The pragmatist enjoys teaching, and is unwilling to buy into a competitive model. The quality of life is of prime importance and so she will write and publish if she enjoys it. She tends to enjoy aspects of life outside the academy (e.g. children, creative art, sport, etc.) She may occasionally publish. Pragmatism is combined with timidity and lack of self-confidence, and therefore a realistic assessment that publications will not get her anywhere anyway.

Conflicted
The conflicted type experiences a great deal of tension between teaching and publishing. She has much of the leadership potential and does not therefore, as is often the case, experience role conflict re children and husband or partner. She is aware of the fact that she is not encouraged to publish. She feels uncertain about her work and therefore, doesn’t publish because she believes she has nothing worth saying. She may eventually publish, at great personal cost.

Competitive
The competitive type enters into the publishing/professional game with enthusiasm. She resists heavy teaching loads and adminstrivia. She observes any barriers that are placed in front of her at whatever level and tries to work around or bypass them. Along with the women in each of the above categories, may or may not gain tenure and/or promotion.

The women least susceptible to the prevailing male attitudes are the pragmatists. Unfortunately they are often in temporary positions and so pass out of the system. The idealists survive, but being slow to publish are also slow to seek promotion and so tend to stay at Lecturer level. The conflictive type and the competitive type are very much aware of and threatened by the prevailing attitudes. The conflictive type will find a great deal of tension involved in trying to publish and often cease doing research in order to survive. The competitive type often succeeds and finds the success exhilarating, though long term the woman may be sacrificed on the way. They often find it difficult to identify with other women because the other women are demonstrably more successful. The conflictive type is often classified as the type who has to make to “succeed” they often lose touch with other women and can’t quite see why other women are not prepared to put in the same efforts to succeed as they have. With the development of strong women’s groups on campuses this type is more likely to receive support and also more likely to understand the problems faced by the other women.

Affirmative Action
The report of the A.U.S.A. working party on affirmative action states that affirmative action is “a critical review of appointment and promotion criteria to ensure that they (universities) do not inadvertently foreclose consideration of the actions of the best qualified persons by unlisted pre-suppositions which operate to exclude women”.

It goes on to say that affirmative action is the taking of positive steps, by means of non-discriminatory programmes, to achieve demonstrable progress towards equal employment opportunity.

It is unfortunately the case that institutions charged with the discriminatory practices in question to specific individuals are unable to engage in constructive discussions about discriminatory practices involved. It has been found that in every case the institutions deny that they have engaged in any form of unlawful or improper discrimination. Abramson says in her introduction to Old Boys New Women, The Politics of Sex Discrimination that she was to a number of superiors, employers and university administrators who didn’t have to see me at all but were willing to share with me their reasons for believing that, in the particular case I asked about, there was (almost) absolutely no discrimination involved.
She claims that employers, supervisors and managers are disadvantaging women because they do not encourage them to engage in constructive or meaningful discussions about discriminatory practices involved. She refers to the effect of affirmative action programmes to remove the burden of proof from individual women and the burden of guilt from individuals within the institution. Once it is recognised that systemic discrimination does in fact exist (as illustrated above) then remedial steps can be taken to ensure that universities are not inadvertently based on merit, and that women, once appointed, are not caught up in a system whose very nature makes success an extraordinary event rather than a straightforward, relatively predictable progression.

References
5. P. Robertson, “A report of the committee on affirmative action at the A.U.S.A.”
8. Abramson, J, The Employment of Social Blackwell, Oxford, 1972. In this case the interpretation or reinterpretation of an action as a discriminatory act may become the task of, say, an Equal Opportunity Tribunal, rather than, as is usually the case, the task of the actors involved in the action.
WOMEN IN ACADEMIC LIFE: IMPLICATIONS OF THE STEADY STATE

Introduction

In these days of economic and political conservatism, the "steady state" of Australian universities has become increasingly shaky. Reductions in federal funding and attempts to reduce university enrolments through re-imposition of fees for post-graduate and second degree students have forced administrators to take unpleasant and unpopular steps to reduce expenditures. The Vice-Chancellor of Macquarie University, Professor E.A. Webb has described the major loss of teaching staff resulting from funding cut-backs as affecting "the people at the bottom": those who are appointed on short-term tenure.1 Such a policy will not only have adverse long-term effects on student education and on postgraduate research, but will also act regressively to reduce recent improvements in the employment status of academic women, who form a relatively high proportion of tutorial staff. This paper considers the distribution of women in university teaching positions, offers tentative explanations of that distribution and explores its implications.

The Distribution of Women in University Teaching Positions

The position of women in academic life is an important indicator of the possibilities for women in other occupations. As Madge Dawson has said in a taped interview:

"The university teaching occupation is a sort of test of the limits really — how far can a woman go — she can't go too far."

That is, even in an environment where women should have the best chance to develop their potential, given the high value placed in universities on academic merit and on a vanguard role in social change, women still face career problems.

The position of academic women in Australian universities is of course not unique to Australian universities; several recent international studies indicate similar characteristics elsewhere.2 Overall, women occupy lower positions than men and at lower levels in the academic hierarchy than men.

Study of the distribution of women academics in the three Sydney universities illustrates the uneven representation of women and the complexity of a situation where women fare better in some universities and faculties than others, and where some women fare very well instead.
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9. A. Bissell, Affirmative Action Handbook, pp. 17-18, 1980. Many academic women in the United States dislike not to have children. See R. Simon, S. Clark and K. Galway, "The Women Ph.D. A recent Profile", Social Problems, 15, 3, 1967, pp. 221-238. They have shown that the women who marry "but not to have children are more productive than their male colleagues. It is nevertheless a high price to pay and a path that many women may not, if ever, have to contemplate.
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TABLE 1

The Distribution of Women in Full-Time Teaching Posts, according to Grade Held in University, 1979.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>N.S.W</th>
<th>Macquarie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Tutor</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows, women in Australian universities in 1979 occupied 39% of tutoring positions, 18% of lecturerships and 2% of professional positions. In total, women occupied 16% of full-time teaching posts, compared with 13.8% in 1971.4 In Sydney, women occupied 24% of full-time teaching posts at Macquarie University, 19.5% at the University of Sydney and 12.6% at the University of New South Wales.

The facts that emerge from these figures are: first that women are under-represented at ranks above Lecturer level, with 16% of total staff yielding 2% of Professors; second, that women are over-represented at ranks below Lecturer level, with 18% of total staff yielding 39% of tutorials; and third, that the situation has shown some improvement, from 13.8% to 16% of total staff, a 15% increase in the 8 years between 1971 and 1979.4 This considerable variation amongst universities is evident.

The distribution of women in both full and part-time teaching posts at the Sydney universities in 1980 is shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

The Distribution of Women in Full and Part-Time Teaching Posts, according to Grade Held in University, 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>N.S.W</th>
<th>Macquarie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the trend noted in Table 1, that women appear to fare best overall at Macquarie University (24% of total staff in 1980) then at the University of Sydney (19%) and worst at the University of New South Wales (14%). They represented 5% of Professors and 10% of Associate Professors at Macquarie University, 3% and 7% respectively at the University of Sydney and 1.4% and 4% respectively at the University of New South Wales. Full-time female tutors represented 58% of tutorial staff at Macquarie University, 42% at the University of New South Wales and 37% at the University of Sydney.

When the position of women according to faculty was investigated, the distribution shown in Table 3 appeared.