"Demi-nationalism" in higher education: Women in Canadian and Australian Universities[1]

Peta Tancred-Sheriff
McMaster University
Hamilton, Canada

This article is particularly concerned with Canadian universities since the 1960s and with the contrast between the limited change effected with respect to women's position within them and the much more considerable modification achieved in 'Canadianizing' university faculty. Given that there are many parallels between the universities of Canada and of Australia with respect to both women's situation and the national issue, I will underline certain resemblances and contrasts at various points within the paper.

Let me lay out my thesis in very bald terms at this point — terms which will be developed throughout the body of the paper. Briefly, I consider that Canadian universities are 'alien' to their supporting population in a dual and interconnected fashion:

1. they are 'alien' to women in the sense that they have been and continue to be 'male spaces', remote to 50% of the population; and
2. they have been very largely 'alien' in terms of nationality through including a large element of foreign (particularly American) influence, for as recently as 1971-72, 37% of faculty members were not Canadian citizens.[2]

In correcting the situation in national terms, Canadian universities are heading for what I call a 'demi-nationalism', for they continue to under-utilize the talents of the female half of the Canadian nation.

Canadian Universities: alien to half their population?

Women in Canada had some distance to cover from the time when they first wrenched admission to higher education from unwilling male controllers in the final quarter of the 19th century. However, in 1981, for the first time, they obtained just over 50% of the Bachelors and first professional degrees granted by Canadian universities. The speed with which they had travelled this distance is suggested by one further statistic — that in 1961, female students obtained only 25% of such degrees.[3] Thus, in a short two decades, Canadian women had doubled their representation in first degrees obtained to parallel their proportion in the adult population.

As for graduate degrees, Canadian women had made considerable progress — but not to the dizzy heights attained at the undergraduate level. Over approximately the same two decades, they had increased their representation at the Masters level to 37% (from 16%) and at the Doctoral level to 23% (from 9%).[4] Admirable as such progress appears, there is still some way to go before women occupy their proportionate place in higher degree programs.

However, over the same two decades that the growth in the proportion of female students was noteworthy, the proportion of female faculty moved a limited distance, from 11% to 15% of total full-time faculty.[5] The lack of parallel with student progress is very marked. It appears that the male space of the student sector has ceded more easily to female pressures than has the maleness of the teaching sector. Clearly, I am not the first person to underline this phenomenon. In effect, we are talking of the contrast between an employment sector and the relatively transitory status of the student sector, and there are factors which operate in the former that have only a transitory effect on the latter (though I do not deny their importance for our female students).

For example, a number of authors[6] have argued that feminist knowledge would not only differ methodologically, but in terms of substantive content from the masculinist version that pervades our universities. I do not have the time to explore this area in detail; however, I would strongly support the comment that women have participated marginally in '. . . producing the forms of thought and the images and symbols in which thought is expressed and ordered.[7] It follows from this argument that female students might feel increasingly alien within the university as they progress in their studies and they may well choose not to spend a lifetime of employment in an alien mental space.

At the social level, many have argued[8] that universities are very isolated spaces for women faculty. In a domain that is difficult to describe, let alone quantify or prove, Kaplan, for example, refers to small gestures such as the '. . . tactics of expressing non-verbal hostility . . . of turning shoulders away from the intruder or . . . of forming a tight circle which cannot easily be broken'[9] as a means of isolating female faculty. She also cites an informal count by one of her students where corridor encounters among faculty included a minimum of contacts with female faculty (4%); when these took place, they were confined to '. . . professional and absolutely inevitable contacts'.[10] She is not at all surprised that:

> *young women, having poked their noses into tertiary institutions, are likely to acquire the knowledge of some of their less palatable social conventions and may thus decide not to continue to further degrees and/or not to consider a tertiary institution as a possible place for career advancement.*[11]

While recognizing the validity of these and other explanations, I want to add a particular slant on the topic of women's limited university participation, which arises out of my general work on the Sociology of Organizations and my specific work on the organization of universities. The hypothesis can be expressed very briefly as follows: the predominant bureaucratic model of organization within capitalist society, expressed empirically to varying degrees, is a masculine form of organization. It is one in which male strengths are congruent with the demands of the organization and in which female strengths are given minimal importance. Masculinity is embedded in the procedures, assumptions, processes and formal rules of contemporary organizations, mainly because it has always been considered to be men's inevitably destiny to integrate themselves into this organizational reality. They are trained for the travails of bureaucratic life, they are assumed to need skills for the public sphere and they are directed towards modes of behaviour which would be in

keeping with the main thrust of organizational reality.

As to women, the contrast between the nature of bureaucracy and women's modal socialization can best be expressed by a comparison between the predominant bureaucratic model and the organization of domestic labour:

bureaucratic form of control in a wider range of situations. And this means inevitably that the impetus to integrate a higher proportion of women into the faculty complement has paralleled a period when the university has become increasingly alien to women's mental, social and organizational processes.

TABLE 1

Public sphere Bureaucratic model*	Private sphere Organization of domestic labour
1. Task specialization	1. Minimal task specialization
2. Coordination through the hierarchy	2. Coordination is part of the task
3. Precise definition of rights and duties	3. Very little precise definition of rights and duties
4. Commitment to responsibilities	4. General commitment to the overall purpose
5. Hierarchical control	5. No rigid hierarchy
6. Predominance of orders and vertical communication	6. Predominance of advice and lateral communication

*Based on Burns, Tom and Stalker, G.M., *The Management of Innovation*, London, Tavistock Publications, 1961, pp.119-122.

In effect, if men are trained for work in the public sphere and women for work in the private, then it is no great surprise, given the contrast outlined above, that women find the requirements of the former to be alien to them. And while one might argue that a great deal of recent child socialization is more gender-neutral than this argument would suggest, I have to underline that much of contemporary socialization is undertaken outside the family and any parental efforts, which are assisted to some degree by certain enlightened efforts in the educational sector, cannot overcome the enormous weight of traditional socialization that still pervades the gender-specific messages that we all receive throughout the life cycle.

With respect to university organizations, it is worrying to note that current pressures in Canada are pushing towards an even more bureaucratic organizational form. If my analysis of university organizations is correct,[12] then the apparent autonomy of a craft-like type of organization is giving way to a much more bureaucratic mode, as State funding becomes even more important in communicating with the State bureaucracy and in justifying financial need. We talk informally of this bureaucratic tendency, but more analytically, if the university uses multiple systems of control with varying emphasis on each as I consider that it does, then it is reasonable that the increasing proportion of State financing over the post-war period (now up to 80% for Canadian universities)[13] has been accompanied by a growing tendency, within the university, to employ the

I would like to give some detailed empirical information on the organizational distance between women and the university context in which they are located. These data come from my broader university study of decision-making in two Ontario and two Quebec universities. My general interest was to trace university-wide decisions through various forums in an attempt to grasp the specific nature of university functioning. One of these decisions concerned the appointment of an all-female Committee to study the status of women within one university situation, which led to the nomination of a 'Coordinator' for the status of women, to oversee the implementation of the recommendations during a three-year period. In the account of the research,[14] we emphasize that certain systemic mechanisms came into play to isolate the whole issue of women's status within the university. First of all, the mechanism of privatization ensured that the question of women's organizational status became a private matter. The Committee was appointed directly by the Rector, the executive head of the university, and reported directly to him and his associates instead of passing through the usual democratic university channels, on the basis that this was an 'unusual matter' which did not need to be treated in the same manner as other issues. The explanation given was:[15]

> *. . . it [the status of women] doesn't affect the academic side, it doesn't touch the administration, strictly speaking. (Male, Administrator)*

However, there is at least the suggestion

". . . Canadian universities are heading for what I call a demi-nationalism, for they continue to under-utilise the talents of the female staff of the Canadian nation."

of a possible containment of the issue through this means:

> *In addition, the way of approaching it, of putting it there at the Rector's level, that was in order to try to have a bit of coherence . . . the Rector wanted, and we on the executive wanted, to keep a lid on things, and that everything be coordinated, especially that it not become biased . . . (Male, Administrator)*

In the same manner, the appointment of the 'Coordinator' for the status of women bypassed the main decision-making forum and was processed through the Executive, a body which was generally charged with the appointment of committee secretaries and directors of support services, rather than going through the channels thought pertinent for even the most junior academic appointment. Once again, the appointment was 'hived off' from the main business of the university and made into a special issue, set apart from the others.

The second mechanism, that of paternalism, was supported by both the male administrators and the women who worked on the pertinent committee. The women defined the issue of women's status as requiring the protection of a powerful male within the organization. He would lend his personal protection to the exercise and support the women in their difficult endeavour. His presence would be necessary to ensure the success of the project:

> *. . . we were anxious that it should be a Rectoral committee . . . because we thought that if we were under the auspices of the Rector, the Rector is the power . . . we said to ourselves that if we were directly attached to the Rector, then it would be certain that we could operate. (Female, Professor)*

As already suggested, the male administrators strongly supported the idea of a rectoral umbrella over the exercise, in effect the personal link which the women interpreted somewhat differently from their perspective.

The third mechanism of ridicule was brought into play in order to ensure that the recommendations brought forward by the women should not get too out-of-

hand or be too 'scatterbrained'. Both through a public attitude of ridicule and private encouragement towards sober recommendations, the women were very much aware that there were sceptics, if only by the 'little hidden smiles' that greeted their appointment:

> *. . . there were even people who laughed . . . really, they did not find it serious . . . they thought that we . . . would run around the campus, waving our arms shouting about the status of women and that it would become something very aggressive . . . we were very conscious that this would be totally negative as an approach . . . (Female, Support Staff)*

Next, the women were accorded an illusion of autonomy through a mechanism of para-independence, which gave them the impression that they had complete control over the recommendations developed in their report. Once again, both the male administrators and the women committee members collaborated in underlining their degree of independence:

> *. . . of course, I was in contact with the Chairperson who came periodically to report to me on the functioning of the committee. But beyond [that], I never intervened in the functioning of the committee [which had] complete freedom to produce a report . . . (Male, Administrator)*

However, it was also clear that the Committee members were very conscious that they would need to appeal to male priorities in order to get their recommendations implemented; they took a number of items out of the report in order to project a moderate orientation. Generally, they were appealing to male discourse, even within their ostensibly private discussions.

The final mechanism, which we term diachronic tokenism, pervaded the whole decision-making process. In effect, the gendered division of labour meant that an almost completely male group of administrators[16] appointed an all-female committee, asking the members to report back to the same group of male administrators. In contrast to the usual form of tokenism, where a very limited number of females take part in a preponderantly male decision-making forum, in this instance the tokenism was divided over time, or diachronically. Despite the all-female committee in the second phase of the decision-making process, it was quite clear that the male forum dominated the decision. In effect as is the case with the usual synchronic form of tokenism, the arrangement guaranteed that the male perspective would dominate in the final decisions that were formulated, while simultaneously giving the impression that women had not only been consulted, but had played a significant part in the decision-making process.

I would argue that the brief account of this particular decision illustrates the distance between the mode of operation espoused by the male administrators in contrast to their female colleagues. The women constantly spoke of the male decision-making forum as if it were an alien (and even opposing) culture:

> *. . . we said to ourselves: we must be unassailable . . . everyone is going to be waiting for us with a flashlight and bricks to attack us from a methodological and theoretical point of view . . . (Female, Administrator)*
>
> *I know that we were careful . . . we told ourselves that if we wanted it [the Report] to be accepted, we shouldn't get carried away. There were a lot of things that we took out. We told ourselves that we would start in a moderate manner. (Female, Professor)*

This toning-down, this arrangement of the report permeates the Committee members' discussion of their task; this was not the report they would have liked to produce, it was the report that they felt obliged to produce, because it would communicate with the administrative subculture. Accordingly, it was all the more disappointing that the results of their work were minimal. The Coordinator, in her final report after a three-year mandate, indicates that 19% of the Committee's recommendations have been implemented and 36% partially implemented. However, this quantitative image is overly optimistic, she states, for even those recommendations which have been implemented have received attention in an experimental or temporary fashion, the necessary funds having been allocated on an ad hoc basis.

It is obviously impossible to generalize from one case study to the over 70 universities of the current Canadian context. However, while the actual mechanism cannot be proved to characterize all Canadian university situations, the results are certainly common to most universities. The final volume of the Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies, which includes a chapter on the status of women, comments:

> *Universities and colleges have very nearly buried the real injustices concerning their treatment of women beneath an avalanche of well-meaning reports. Having salved their collective conscience with this plethora of documents, they are now tending to return the issue to the bottom of their agenda.*[17]

The research delineated illustrates the mechanisms, used in one instance, that led to inaction. But I would like to differ slightly in the interpretation of the situation from the Commission. It is not so much universities' 'treatment of women' that is at issue, but rather universities' resounding silence on women's issues that is in question. What university authorities in Canada appear not to have grasped, and what the brief organizational analysis suggests, is that in the absence of deliberate and massive efforts to the contrary, universities will always be sexist institutions. In effect, universities participate in, and share with, other organizations in society, the alien context for women that I have delineated in connection with the bureaucratic model. In the absence of a massive coherent effort, women will continue to feel alien in this context and sexism will permeate the university. Such sexism is not the result of university policies; rather it is a consequence of the lack of university policies to correct the general organizational principles which are also present in the university context. I will return to this issue at the end of the paper.

As for Australian universities, the overall pattern of female representation is similar, though not identical. Female students obtained 41% of first degrees in 1980 (the closest date to the comparable Canadian period) having increased their proportion by 19% since 1960.[18] It will be remembered that this is a slightly smaller increase than in the Canadian case, and it appears that even by 1985, the proportion still hovered around 46%,[19] not quite attaining the parallel proportion to women's presence in the total population.

In graduate work, as Table 2 indicates,[20] women obtained 26% of the Masters degrees in 1980 (up from 19% in 1960) and 19% of the doctorates in the same year (up from 9% in 1960). In the case of both graduate degrees, the proportion of women students is lower than in the Canadian context — significantly lower in the case of Masters degrees, and slightly lower for doctoral students.

The most striking resemblance between the two countries is in the proportion of female faculty over the same period. In Australia, the proportion rose to 16% in 1980, having moved, as in Canada, an identical limited distance of 4% over the two decades. The contrast between the position of women students and women faculty is less marked in Australia than in the Canadian context — both countries having almost an identical proportion of faculty, although Australia has a smaller proportion of women at the graduate level.

This is clearly not the appropriate opportunity for a discussion of detailed statistical differences between our two countries. However, I am interested that, despite quite important differences in our two university sectors, the proportion of

TABLE 2

Women as a percentage of Full-time Academic Staff in Australian and Canadian universities and as a percentage of Doctorates and Masters degrees conferred 1960s-1980s*

	Academic Staff %		Doctorates Conferred %		Masters Conferred %	
1960s	12	11	10	09	09	16
1980s	16	15	19	23	26	37

*Australian data taken from Castle, Josie and Jones, Jennifer. 'Women in Higher Education: A Comparative Analysis of Women in Universities: Australia and UK, 1950-80' in Burns, Robin and Sheehan, Barry. *Women and Education*. Australia and New Zealand Comparative and International Education Society. Conference Proceedings, 1984: Table 7. Data are for 1960-61 and 1979-80. Canadian data taken from Symons, Thomas H.B. and Page, James E. *Some Questions of Balance: Human Resources, Higher Education and Canadian Studies*. Volume III of the Report of the Commission on Higher Education. Ottawa: AUCC, 1984:192-193. Data are for 1960-61 and 1980 (students) 1979-80 (staff).

women faculty should be so similar over a period of two decades. In terms of contrasts between our university sectors, I am thinking of the very important differences in the percentage of the population which attains a university education. Jones mentions that during the general development of our universities (as of 1939): 'Australia had a lower proportion of students to inhabitants than any other English-speaking country outside Britain itself[21] and he goes on to mention that Canada had twice as high a percentage as Australia. This contrast continues in the contemporary situation, for about 12% of the Canadian population of the appropriate age attend university on a full-time basis[22] while the proportion in Australia is 6%.[23] This contrast is, of course, linked to the differing influences to which our university sectors were subjected over the past century — in Canada's case, while we shared in the British influence within Australia, this was overlaid by a strong across-the-border model from the United States. And the final contrast comes out in the size of the university sectors — in Canada, 71 degree-granting institutions enrolled about 400,000 undergraduate students and 50,000 graduates as of 1983-84[24] whereas Australian universities enrolled some 133,000 undergraduates and 24,000 graduates in 20 universities as of the same date,[25] considerably under half the number enrolled in Canada though the total population is about 60% that of Canada.

Despite these quite striking contrasts in the extent of the population drawn into the university sector, in the differing influences over its development and in the actual size and number of university institutions, the proportion of women in full-time teaching positions in the two countries is almost identical. Furthermore, given the contrast between the proportion of women in the graduate sector in each country, the percentage of women faculty is not tightly linked to the percentage of female graduate students. This suggests that the organizational arguments that I have outlined may have some influence on the situation in both countries, given that a similar bureaucratic model guides our organizational structures. The data also suggest that the frequent approach to the proportion of female graduate students as an available pool for the proportion of faculty[26] might not be a totally intelligent comparison, given that intermediary factors appear to influence the situation. The comparison might be inappropriate for yet another reason — that both Canada and Australia have relied on recruitment from abroad to some extent, particularly over the last two decades, and it is to a discussion of this practice that I now turn.

Canadian universities: alien to their total population?

Commencing in the late 1960s, Canadians started to object to the hiring of faculty from abroad to staff their university sector. Led by two Carleton University professors, Robin Mathews and James Steele, there was a roar of outrage that Canadian universities were subject to such extensive foreign, and particularly American, influence. Clearly, what had happened during the tremendous growth period of the 1960s was that university authorities, desperate to staff their expanding classes, hired where they could — and this often meant the United States. The net effect, as I mentioned earlier, was that by 1971-72, non-Canadian citizens occupied 37%[27] of the total teaching posts in Canada. Possibly more worrying was the fact that the proportions were even higher in the Humanities and Related Disciplines (42%) and in the Social Sciences and Education (43%). The proportions were highest in the Western provinces and lowest in Quebec, and the vast majority of non-Canadians came from the United States (for example, about one-fifth of all those hired between 1961 and 1972).[28] The hiring of American citizens was facilitated by a Reciprocal Tax Convention which provided a tax exemption for '. . . U.S. professors and teachers who temporarily visit Canada . . . for a period of two years or less'.[29] There is the suggestion that this provided an economic incentive for universities to hire in the United States where they might encounter greater success with lower salary rates;[30] it is also probable that U.S. citizens were encouraged to accept Canadian teaching posts because of the incentive offered by the tax exemption.

". . . the percentage of women faculty is not tightly linked to the percentage of female graduate students."

Clearly, this situation could not be permitted to last through the 1970s, as academic posts became more limited in number and the uproar from the Canadian academic community reached State authorities. Propelled by guiding principles formulated by various academic associations and by public discussion of the issue, the pattern started to change. In contrast to the 37% of non-Canadian citizens of 1971-2, 24% of faculty came from abroad as of 1980-81.[31] Immigration laws changed slowly to propel the situation forward. As of 1977, Canadian universities could still hire foreign faculty, provided they had advertised the post within Canada.[32] It was not until 1981 that the more stringent regulation came into effect requiring '. . . universities to advertise for Canadian candidates to evaluate their suitability before seeking foreign academics to fill post-secondary teaching positions in Canada'.[33]

This is a brief account of a battle that raged through Canadian academia in the 1970s. The Commission on Canadian Studies, set up by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and chaired by Professor Thomas Symons of Trent University, was partially established in response to this problem, but with a mandate to look more generally at the teaching of Canadian studies. The Commission produced an extremely influential report entitled 'To Know Ourselves', of which the first two volumes appeared in 1976 and the final volume in 1984. It is this Commission that makes the link between a report on Canadian studies and the status of women in Canadian

academic life. In response to the query as to why the two issues should be linked the Report states:

> *The most obvious answer is that the current underrepresentation and sometimes near-exclusion of women from so many academic and professional fields is an immense negative factor which injects unreality and imbalance into teaching and research about Canada itself.*[34]

While the Commission can grasp that the 'Canadianization' of our universities involves the full use of all available talents, whether male or female, this principle has encountered some difficulties in penetrating the walls of academe. Over the same decade of the 1970s that the presence of non-Canadian citizens was reduced by 13%, the proportion of women faculty increased by a mere 3%.[35] While these data demonstrate the potential for change with respect to one principle of Canadianization, both in terms of umbrella legislation and actual results, they also demonstrate the weakness of the second principle i.e. that Canadian women should be included together with Canadian men. As the Commission concludes:

> *In the Commission's view, the underutilization of the talents of the educated female population, and the discrimination against women in universities, whether practised consciously or unconsciously, is a national disgrace.*[36]

In the Australian context, the link between the 'Australianization' of universities and the hiring of women faculty has been made in a rather different manner. Gale, who is widely cited on this subject, points out that Australian universities have tended to rely heavily on overseas degrees for, as of 1977,[37] 50% of those at the level of lecturer and above, who listed second degrees, had obtained these abroad.[38] She ties the penchant for overseas degrees to the disadvantage that females experience in the academic labour market. Given that females are usually less mobile, '. . . females are doubly disadvantaged, that is they are female and lack overseas qualifications'.[39]

Gale goes on to link overseas qualifications to the possibility of publishing in prestigious overseas journals, for networks can count in ensuring acceptance of work generated, and this may be a factor in the slower promotion of females.[40] Finally, she underlines that women academics are even further disadvantaged, given that varying faculties differ in their preference for overseas qualifications, for women generally try to obtain positions in just those faculties which have the strongest preference for overseas degrees.[41]

Gale's argument is an interesting one which is not usually brought out in the literature on the gendered division of labour in Australian academia. In effect, the argument would suggest that, as the preference for overseas qualifications diminishes, women might have a better chance of appointment to Australian universities. In practice, the situation is rather similar to that which obtains in Canada; assuming that the most recent decade of 1974-84 might be the most likely period to bear witness to a diminishing emphasis on overseas qualifications, the increase in the proportion of women over this period is a limited 3.6%,[42] perhaps a slight improvement on the rate of 2% per decade already noted for the overall period 1960-80, but not sufficient to raise hopes to any dizzy heights. Yet, Australians may wish to note the remarks of the Symons Commission; in effect, one aims at a mere 'demi-nationalism' if the participation of women faculty is not encouraged along with that of males.

". . . if university authorities take no action, the pervasive sexism which filters in from the environing context will not be modified."

Conclusion

I have argued throughout the body of this paper that the university context is alien to women, largely because of its internal organizational characteristics which are linked to the social conventions and the nature of the knowledge created in the university setting. In talking of a different type of distance between the Canadian university and its supporting population — a distance which emerged from the hiring of a high proportion of non-Canadians over the 1960s and early 1970s in particular — it has been clear that massive pressure from academics and the public has led to significant modifications. On the other hand, women's alien status continues, modified only at the margins over succeeding decades. I have suggested that without the integration of women into the Canadian university context, we are headed for a 'demi-nationalism' or a truncated form of the Canadianization of our intellectual institutions that many of us desire.

It is also clear that if university authorities take no action, the pervasive sexism which filters in from the environing context will not be modified. Instead, it takes a massive will to lead rather than to follow societal practices in order to assist women's university condition. This will involves a readiness to examine, in great detail, any and every university procedure and practice which affects the entry of recruits and their career trajectory during their working lives. It involves a readiness to acknowledge that an apparently equitable rule or procedure might have hidden beneath it an implicit inequality for women's situation. While I have spoken exclusively of women faculty and students, for data on support staff are almost impossible to locate at the national level in Canada, the same principles apply for all women. Procedures formulated by and for men may not necessarily be relevant to the situation of women.

References

1. An initial version of this article was given as a public lecture while I was Canadian Visiting Fellow at Macquarie University from July to November, 1986, and was published by Macquarie in a limited edition under the title "A Century of Women in Higher Education: Canadian Data and Australian Comments". The current version has been shortened, but the argument remains essentially the same. I am grateful to Bob Connell for commenting on an earlier version of the text.
2. Cottam, Jean. *Canadian Universities: American Takeover of the Mind?*, Toronto: Gall Publications, 1974, p.9.
3. Symons, Thomas H.B. and Page, James E. *Some questions of Balance: Human Resources, Higher Education and Canadian Studies*, Vol. III of The Report of the Commission on Higher Education, Ottawa: AUCC, 1984, p.192.
4. Ibid.
5. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.193.
6. See: Spender, Dale. *Invisible Women: The Schooling Scandal*. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative Society Ltd., 1982; *Man Made Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980; *Men's Studies Modified*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981. Daly, Mary. *Gyn'Ecology*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978. O'Brien, Mary. 'Reproducing Marxist Man', pp.99-116 in L. Clark and L. Lange (eds) *The Sexism of Social and Political Theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
7. Smith, Dorothy E. 'An Analysis of Ideological Structures and How Women are Excluded: Considerations for Academic Women', *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 12, 4(1), p.354.
8. For example, Smith, op. cit.; Kaplan, Gisela T. 'Coming Up with Bright Ideas: Women in Academia', *Vestes*, 28, 2, 1985, pp.19-22.
9. Op. cit., p.20.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Tancred-Sheriff, Peta. 'Craft, Hierarchy and Bureaucracy: Modes of Control of the Academic Labour Process', *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 10, 4, 1985, pp.369-389.

13. *Canada Year Book 1980-81*. Ottawa, Publications Division, Statistics, Canada 1981, p.216.
14. I would like to thank my Research Associate, Somer Brodribb, who worked with me on the interpretation of these data. The ensuing section is based on: Tancred-Sheriff, Peta. *Craft to Bureaucracy in the University Setting*. In preparation, Chapter 9.
15. Authors' translations from the original French for all quotations.
16. There was one female assistant at this level.
17. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.209.
18. Based on Australian Bureau of Statistics. *University Statistics 1960*. Catalogue 4207.0 and *Tertiary Education Australia*. Catalogue 4218.0.
19. Kaplan, op. cit., p.19.
20. It has proved impossible, based in one country with data for the other relatively inaccessible, to update all categories of this table to the mid-1980s. Available data suggest a certain levelling of women's academic presence, with some Canadian universities noting, if anything, a slight decrease in such participation as short-term appointments, the ghetto of university women, come to an end.
21. Jones, David. "A Century of Exoticism: Australian Universities 1850-1950", *History of Education Review*, 14, 1, 1985, p.14.
22. *Canada Year Book*, op. cit., p.216.
23. Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Social Indicators*, No. 4, 1984, Table 4.17. Catalogue 4101.0.
24. *Directory of Canadian Universities 1984-1985*. Ottawa: AUCC, 1984, p.1.
25. ABS, Catalogue 4101, Table 4.21.
26. See Over, R. "Women academics in Australian Universities", *Australian Journal of Education*, 25, 1981, pp. 166-176; Castle, Josie and Jones, Jennifer. "Women in Higher Education: A Comparative Analysis of Women in Universities: Australia and UK, 1950-80" **in** Burns, Robin and Sheehan, Barry. *Women and Education*. Australia and New Zealand Comparative International Education Society. Conference Proceedings, 1984, pp. 171-188.
27. The 16.8% of faculty who did not give their citizenship are estimated to be citizens of the country of their first degree.
28. Based on Statistics Canada *Service Bulletin* as reported in Cottam, op. cit., 9-12.
29. Revenue Minister Herb Gray, quoted in Cottam, op. cit., p.33.
30. Cottam, op. cit., p.34.
31. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.57.
32. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.41.
33. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.52.
34. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.188; my underlining.
35. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.193.
36. Symons and Page, op. cit., p.201.
37. Gale is only covering 16 of 20 universities, omitting Deakin (just founded at the time) from all tables and Queensland, Western Australia and Wollongong from all tables related to gender, since the necessary information was not available. Gale, G. 'Academic Staffing: The Search for Excellence', *Vestes*, 23, 1980, pp.3-8.
38. Gale, op. cit., p.4.
39. Ibid.
40. Gale, op. cit., p.5.
41. Gale, op. cit., p.8.
42. Comparing Cass, B. 'Women in Academic Institutions', *Australian Frontier Consultations Report*, 1975, no.3, p.29 with Bowen, M. 'Still on the Threshold: a Century of Women's Access to Australian Universities'. ANZAAS Congress, 1984, Papers (Microform) 44/672:1-28.

Real salaries in Australia and Britain: the case of academic staff 1976-1988

Kenneth Hilton

Department of Economics
University of New South Wales
Department of Accounting and Management
University of Southampton

Introduction

International comparisons of real wages for a particular occupation are frequently made to sustain an argument that members of that profession in country A are under-paid or over-paid relative to members of the corresponding profession in country B. Such comparisons — often in the context of salary negotiations — are fraught with difficulties. The structure of professions differs between countries and it is always difficult to find 'like' jobs for comparison purposes; there are different expectations of promotion and of long-term salary prospects in different countries — it is not merely the starting salary nor the salary of the highest grade that are important but the subjective distribution of expected salary levels for each individual.

The translation of incomes from one currency to another cannot readily be made by use of market exchange rates for these reflect many factors other than relative prices especially in the short run. The tax and the social security payment and benefit system will affect the take-home pay of the individual and these too will vary from country to country. Finally, in the partial but daunting list there are the non-financial factors; only in Mr Micawber's world are financial matters omnipotent. Life is more than money. In general terms, climates, both physical and intellectual, matter for individuals; in particular professions, conditions of service — leave allowance, hours of work, 'freedom' — may all be important.

One of the few sensible comparisons that may be made is that between academic salaries in Australia and those in Britain. For this comparison many of the above objections either do not apply or can be overcome. The structures of the academic professions in Australia and the UK are sufficiently similar as to make comparisons meaningful; and as one concern here is with a time series analysis over a period of twelve years during which factors such as physical climate has changed little, many of the non-financial factors may be discounted in this context.

There is a real sense in making such comparisons. Although at any one time, a large proportion of the individuals in a particular country do not contemplate migration, the academic profession is a relatively mobile one. This is not to say that there is perfect 'mobility of labour' — such perfection does not exist within Australia nor within Britain; being on the spot may be critical to appointment, especially given the small numbers of vacant positions relative to the number of applications in most academic disciplines in both countries. For Australians the comparison has a particular relevance. Traditionally the migration of academics has been from the UK but two new factors have reduced the absolute and relative size of the flow from the UK. First the asymmetrical impact of the (similar) work permit rules in the two countries has meant that while the majority of Australian academics have a right to work in Britain,