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Abstract
The fair treatment of women in the workplace, where they experience both opportunities and constraints, has been on and off higher education agendas for decades. Yet, institutionalised gendered constraints still shape the careers of female academics, including those in the marketing academy, resulting in disrupted or obstacle-heavy career journeys and the underrepresentation of women in senior positions. Furthermore, progress towards gender equity is hampered by institutional resistance to change, favouring performative rather than genuine and transformational institutional allyship. We draw upon personal experiences, recollections and anecdotes garnered over the years — synthesised with literature — to examine systemic gendered constraints within our collective career span. We propose institutional allyship as the intentional efforts needed by the marketing academy to address systemic and structural gender inequities and achieve second-order change by integrating gender equity outcomes throughout organisational decision-making. Specifically, we suggest nominated actions within a Gender Equity and Inclusion Charter for the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy (ANZMAC) and its member universities as a first step.

Keywords
gender equity, gender equality, academia, marketing, organisational allyship, inclusion

Date received: 14 March 2021; accepted: 8 November 2021

Introduction
Gender inequity in academia is systematic, systemic and structural (Prothero & Tadajewski, 2021; Zietsma, 2021), with efforts to improve it respectively called ‘performative allyship’ (Green & Barbara, 1997). This performance, in which non-marginalised groups profess ‘support and solidarity with a marginalized group, but in a way that is not helpful’ (Kalina, 2020, p. 478), is ‘more talk than action’ (Khan et al., 2019, p. 594), or reduced to a ‘box that needs to be checked’ (Dobscha & Ostberg, 2021, p. 181). Defined as equal opportunities and equal constraints experienced by people of all genders (Bailyn, 2003), gender equity remains elusive in the marketing academy, despite a significant body of research and a mountain of good intentions (Prothero & McDonagh, 2021). Women in academia still experience a myriad of gendered institutional constraints that impact upon all stages of their careers, from early development and progression, including workload allocation, through to later stages of seniority and leadership positions.

In the Global North, even with increased participation in higher education, representation at senior levels in the academy has not changed (Parker et al., 2018). Women earn places at the academic table, but their representation is still disproportionate (Strachan et al., 2016). Men outnumber women three to one among the most senior positions in Australian universities (Devlin, 2021), with female academics in Australia more likely to be ranked at lower levels (Department of Education, 2020). Similarly, in New Zealand, the odds of a male researcher becoming an associate professor or professor are more than double that of women with similar ages and research records (Brower & James, 2020).

Lipton (2017) asserts ‘to maintain the fiction that gender plays no role in academic career progression or ability to succeed in the higher education market, ignores the material and affective inequalities experienced by academic women in the neoliberal university’ (p. 486). It is these material and affective informal and formal work practices in the marketing academy where systematic, systemic and structural inequities are experienced. Prothero and Tadajewski (2021) suggest that ‘change is likely to require substantive reorientation within and among institutions’ in marketing academia (p. 3). Traditionally, higher education has collectively focussed on changing social and cultural biases by reporting or taking action against discrimination; undertaking professional development to become more confident or assertive; and attempting to navigate sticky floors, avoid glass cliffs and break glass ceilings. However, this strategy firmly places the emphasis for change on the shoulders of the individual female academic and does not address the structural and systemic nature of gender inequity. Thus, the higher education industry attempts to ‘fix women’ rather than fixing the practices that enable...
and empower institutionalised constraints to persist (Burkinshaw & White, 2019, p. 2).

Institutional constraints are myriad. Recruitment and promotion opportunities are negatively affected by homosociability (Shepherd, 2017); negative gender bias in student evaluations of teaching (Heffernan, 2021); gendered networking practices (van Den Brink & Benschop, 2014); gendered workload allocations (Dobele & Rundle-Thiele, 2015; Santos & Dang Van Phu, 2019) and differentiated pay – as particularly noted within Australian business schools (Strachan et al., 2016). Female marketing academics have described such multifaceted constraints as a ‘death by a thousand cuts’ (Gurrieri et al., 2020). It is thus unsurprising that female marketing academics feel less valued and less satisfied when compared to their male colleagues (Galak & Kahn, 2021), unsupported by their academic institutions (Gurrieri et al., 2017) and ‘experience an unfavourable organizational climate’ (Keller et al., 2021, p. 325). To elucidate this issue, we address the institutional constraints experienced by women throughout their academic careers that lead to this lack of inclusion and representation in leadership roles.

Our specific contribution thus centres on our call for institutional allyship to progress gender equity and enact social change within the marketing academy. For this commentary, we consider a praxis approach to transforming our marketing community into a more equitable place for women to work and advance their careers. To this end, we contribute by (1) providing a succinct summary of the gendered institutional constraints in the academic career journey informed by our own experiences, anecdotes and recollections, in addition to those noted in the relevant literature, and (2) proposing institutional allyship as a transformative way forward and suggest that relevant marketing academies (such as the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy [ANZMAC] in our region and global academies including the American Marketing Association [AMA], the Korean Scholars of Marketing Science [KSMS] and the European Marketing Academy [EMAC], take the lead by adopting a Gender Equity and Inclusion Charter [GEIC]). Our call is pertinent to the COVID-19 pandemic in which academic institutions have shifted their focus primarily to economic survival, consequently de-prioritising equity initiatives leading to ‘equalities in freefall’ (Wright et al., 2021, p. 163).

It is important to note that in this commentary, we focus on the gender binary of male/female sex categories but recognise that ‘conceptual blind spots’ can occur when framing gender in limited ways (Dobbscha & Ostberg, 2021, p. 183). Therefore, we acknowledge that as a team of white, cisgender, heterosexual women, albeit of different nationalities and work–life experiences and at differing points in our academic careers, our experiences and observations reflect a particular perspective. Moreover, we acknowledge that there are many forms of intersecting identities that add further complexity to the institutional constraints experienced by women. For example, while ‘women represent only 22% of full professors in business schools – only 3% of full professors are female and Asian in all of academia’ (Chaplin, 2021a, para. 5). Therefore, further work from scholars inclusive of other intersectional experiences is needed (e.g. indigeneity, race, ethnicity, socio-economic background, migration status, age, disability, religion, gender identity and sexuality).

**Gendered constraints in the academic career journey**

We take this opportunity to highlight the gendered constraints many staff experience during the three major stages in the academic career: (1) as PhD students and early career academics (ECA), (2) when building an academic career and (3) during promotion and in senior leadership. These examples are based on a mixture of personal experiences, recollections and anecdotes garnered over the years. We present a holistic view of the inequitable gendered terrain of academia (see Figure 1) in support of a better working environment and career journey experience for women. By recounting the bad and the ugly here, we take intentional steps towards manifesting a better reality for us all.

**Doctoral and early career academic experiences**

Research demonstrates how the perceptions and experiences of PhD graduates and early career academics (ECAs) differ markedly based on sex categories. Hegemonic masculinity experienced within higher education contributes to a perceived lack of prestige associated with PhD qualifications of female graduates (Johnson, 2020). Further, isolation and discrimination bred from these unsupportive interpersonal environments negatively affects the well-being of female PhD students and graduates (Heffron et al., 2021).

While ever hopeful that the doctoral experience is improving and having acknowledged the positives in our co-author discussions, we note the distressing anecdotes that provide a window into some of the misogynist, myopic and sexist experiences that persist. For example, one colleague noted the preferential treatment given to male PhD students in their department during candidature and into the first years of employment post-PhD. Male students were more often given career-building breaks (e.g. hired as research assistants or subject coordinators), while female PhD students were consistently relegated to teaching support positions (e.g. TA’s and tutors).

Further, we have heard both male and female senior academics explicitly express their annoyance at female PhD students who have had babies during their candidature because it wasted the time and effort they invested in their students — describing the whole process as a ‘write off’ — irrespective of whether the student returned and finished their studies. Similarly, advice is often repeated to female students at doctoral colloquia, warning them to ‘appropriately time’ having children around their careers, implying no provision or support would be available for those wishing to combine childbearing or raising children with their studies or early career.

Finally, academic conferences are microcosms of academic culture in which inappropriate comments and behaviours proliferate. For example, we have witnessed presumptions about relationships between male professors and female doctoral students circulate freely, permanently damaging the reputation of female doctoral students. We have overheard conversations where colleagues rank women in terms of ‘hotness’ or ‘sex appeal’; and witnessed a female colleague being described in glowing professional terms concluding with a comment about also having ‘great tits’. Moreover, in conference presentations, the trial by interrogative questioning remains a rite of passage for many doctoral candidates. Despite recognising this behaviour as bullying, the dismissal of a candidate’s emotional response is often gendered. For example, if a woman cries as a response to aggressive questioning, it has been framed as though it’s an indication of her unsuitability for an academic career.

In summary, the key gendered constraints experienced in the early and beginning stages of an academic journey identify the absence of reflexivity around power, including systemic power imbalances, privilege and positionality. The consequences illustrated within these anecdotes not only affect the beginning of entry into academia but also flow-on to building an academic career, as discussed next.

**Building an academic career**

Our identification of gendered constraints encompasses day-to-day experiences faced by women and whether they ‘encourage and
In this section, we outline how gendered constraints influence female academic work and how it is valued by the academy.

First, academic workload differences play a crucial role in career progression. A typical academic workload comprises a balance between teaching, service and research—with promotion highly valuing research success and service leadership. Yet, the institutionalised distribution of workloads is gendered (Dobele et al., 2014). Academic women are more likely to be heavily involved in teaching and its corresponding quality assurance and audit processes, in addition to committee work (Morley, 2011). A female colleague once queried her proportionally higher teaching load and was told it was how her teaching competence had been ‘recognised’. Many of our female colleagues carry greater teaching hours than their male peers and are asked to organise and manage social events such as Open Day and student orientation because they are ‘nicer or more approachable’. These gendered expectations of female academics’ pastoral care endure in both student and institutional eyes (Ashencaen Crabtree & Shiel, 2019; Tuck, 2018). Thus, female academics experience ‘obscured service burdens’ (Docka-Filipek & Stone, 2021) since academic housework jobs are unequally distributed to women over male colleagues (Heijstra et al., 2017). In other words, women take on the work that holds departments together, yet the labour does not count for promotion (Prothero & McDonagh, 2021). Moreover, how teaching and service work is valued is also gendered. In teaching, for instance, significant research highlights the gender bias in student evaluations (Heffernan, 2021). Female academics are rated more on their interpersonal qualities (Rivera & Tilcsik, 2019) and often receive comments about their appearance and sexual attractiveness. One female colleague noted that student expectations of her centred on her personality rather than her competency: she should be nice and caring to students, rather than possess expertise and qualifications. This structure of a rating system shapes ‘the evaluation of women’s and men’s relative performances and alter the magnitude of gender inequalities in organizations’ (Rivera & Tilcsik, 2019, p. 267). Notable examples of this treatment are in the lack of honorifics and titles for how female academic’s achievements and leadership or rank are routinely dismissed, most commonly observed by the removal of their surname or simply by being addressed as ‘Miss’, while male colleagues are Dr or Professor (sometimes irrespective of whether they have the qualification or academic rank). For example, in a panel presentation to junior staff on career progression, the MC introduced the male speakers by title and included a brief biography of their professional achievements, but introduced the one female speaker by her first name only. She responded by introducing herself with her academic rank and professional achievements. Such treatment differences routinely occur.

The toll of carrying additional teaching responsibilities and performing academic housework roles are a ‘trap’ (Macfarlane & Burg, 2019, p. 262) that reduce research productivity. Keller et al., 2021 note the underrepresentation of female scholars in academic marketing journals. Female researchers, on average, produce less research than their male colleagues (e.g. Barbezat, 2006), are less frequently first authors (Andersen et al., 2020), publish fewer articles throughout their career and acquire fewer citations than their male counterparts (Huang et al., 2020). This is problematic given research publications are understood to separate the ‘men from the boys . . . and the females’ (McCormack & Pamphilon, 2000, p. 192). Moreover, Australasian academia increasingly values citations as a score of worth, which is dubious because male academics cite their
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male peers more often, even pre-COVID-19 (Beaudry & Lariviére, 2016). Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated this difference in research productivity owing to additional private and professional labour often undertaken by women (Pereira, 2021). For example, the experience of a male colleague noted that he now had more time to write papers with the transition to online teaching, contrasting starkly with the experiences of female academics in the conversation who were also home-schooling their children in addition to teaching.

Female academics face the additional challenge of negotiating work and family (Maphalala & Mpofu, 2017), with academia shown to be particularly inhospitable to mothers (De Welde & Stepnick, 2015). We know of women with children who were overlooked for inclusion on competitive grant proposals because of assumptions about their time availability or capacity. We have witnessed how work undertaken outside of family-friendly hours is promoted as ‘real commitment’ and an aspirational work ethic, rather than how work undertaken outside of family-friendly hours is promoted as ‘real commitment’ and an aspirational work ethic, rather than how work undertaken outside of family-friendly hours is promoted as. As another point, conference attendance and associated networking significantly support publication success (Haynes, 2018). However, academic staff with caring responsibilities are often unable to attend conferences and realise these benefits. Within our sphere of experience, the ‘one size fits all’ funding model for conference travel is insensitive to caregiving status.

The key constraints experienced in building a career may be summarised as the gendered distribution of workload and the resultant impact on performance indicators, such as the number of publications at 8 am. As another point, conference attendance and associated networking significantly support publication success (Haynes & Fearfull, 2008). However, academic staff with caring responsibilities are often unable to attend conferences and realise these benefits. Within our sphere of experience, the ‘one size fits all’ funding model for conference travel is insensitive to caregiving status.

The key constraints experienced in building a career may be summarised as the gendered distribution of workload and the resultant impact on performance indicators, such as the number of publications used in academic promotion. Next, we consider promotion and leadership roles.

Promotion and senior leadership roles

Women are metaphorically described as being stuck between glass ceilings and sticky floors (Ryan & Haslam, 2005). Glass ceilings imply gendered institutional constraints are more substantial at higher than lower levels within the hierarchy (Cotter et al., 2001), while sticky floors refer to the pattern wherein women, compared with men, are less likely to start to climb the career ladder (Baert et al., 2016). This pattern is evident in the marketing and broader academy. For example, at the time of writing, only 7 of the 28 ANZMAC higher education members, have a female head of section or department in the marketing discipline. More broadly, only 36% of those ‘above senior lecturer’ within academic organisations units in Australia were female in 2020 (Department of Education, 2020).

Female academics experience a vicious cycle of fewer promotional opportunities, underpinned by unequal research productivity, leading back to fewer promotional opportunities resulting in a much slower progression from associate lecturer through to professor (Cardel et al., 2020). Furthermore, examination of professorial recruitment strategies identifies gender inequities in networking and candidate selection (van Den Brink & Benschop, 2014) and gender pay inequity at higher levels (Brower & James, 2020). When a colleague in a higher education human resources department noted recruitment agencies put forward potential female and male candidates for senior academic positions with distinctly different salary starting points, we were not surprised. When this practice was queried, historical norms were offered by the recruitment agency as justification rather than candidate differences (e.g. experience, skill levels or qualifications).

Further to pay gaps and other institutional constraints previously discussed, leading female academics are not recognised and celebrated in the same way as male colleagues in other areas of academic work. For example, underrepresentation is ‘prominent’ among ‘invited speakers, moderators, and award recipients’ (Cordonnier et al., 2019, p. e149). Prothero and McDonagh (2021, p. 5) noted that ‘not all journals have awards, but for those who do they are either named after celebrated male marketing academics (47%) or not named at all (53%)’. Awards offered in the future should be named after female academics, to address the identified shortfall in recognising award representation currently in marketing academia (Prothero & McDonagh, 2021). Such discrepancies provide an opportunity to explore and rethink how work is valued and celebrated by shining a light on how merit is awarded.

One final point: even for women in leadership positions where they have a voice, and a platform to advocate for change, there is still significant reticence, even fear, that speaking out about the gendered constraints in academic journeys could negatively affect promotion opportunities or be a career-limiting move in other ways. However, in this commentary we have endeavoured to follow the example of Prothero and McDonagh (2021) by asking difficult questions, and more specifically, by exposing the difficult moments. To that end, we note our mixed feelings in this process: on the one hand, we hold a motivated commitment to gender equity, a passion for shining a spotlight where it is needed, and a desire to improve the future in our shared industry for incoming and existing academics. On the other, our worries have been to ensure our included observations and stories do not hurt, alienate or antagonise and for ourselves, that we need to tread carefully (i.e. should we have used author pseudonyms?). For example, colleagues and friends expressed concern around our writing on this topic, as they worried about the potential retribution on our careers. However, our feelings and our colleague’s responses further crystallised for us, the imperative need to elucidate gendered constraints in the careers of female marketing academics and call for institutional allyship to enact meaningful, lasting change.

In summary, the key institutional constraints for career progression and promotion are underpinned by biases that female academics face from the point when they commence their PhD and continuing through to when they apply for promotion and leadership positions. Gendered career constraints for women, and even more so for women of colour, means we have a system that fails us (Chaplin, 2021b).

Our proposition: Institutional allyship

Allyship is defined as members of structurally advantaged groups engaging in committed action to improve the treatment and status of disadvantaged groups (Brown, 2015) – even at the expense of their own privilege (Veer et al., 2021). In contrast to a focus on individual allies, institutional allyship focuses on the role of institutions, specifically organisational entities, in advancing the interests of the marginalised (Russell & Bohan, 2016). Institutional allyship pertains to a setting where individual and institutional dynamics are both in play (Russell & Bohan, 2016), for example, increases in individual allyship can be driven and supported by organisational values (Gates et al., 2021) or where efforts for change can be propelled by activists accessing multi-organisational contexts (DeJordy et al., 2020).

Different to individual allyship, which is problematic if shaped only by those who are structurally advantaged (Abdi, 2021), institutional allyship advances social change by integrating gender equity outcomes into all elements of decision-making, including key strategic agendas (Jolly et al., 2021). Likewise, the potential impact of institutional allyship varies depending on whether it encompasses first-order or second-order change (Russell & Bohan, 2016). First-order changes are typically superficial, in which voicing support for equity and inclusion programmes are considered no more effective.
than a performance (Kalina, 2020) or woke-washing (Dowell & Jackson, 2020) – leaving the overall status quo to remain unchallenged. In other words, advocacy can often be ‘lip service’ and only expressed in words, but not backed by deeds. Whereas second-order changes are supported by actions, denoting the potential for deeper change and includes the voice of disadvantaged groups in the strategic progression towards equity (Russell & Bohan, 2016). Moreover, institutional allyship can be transformational when enacted as a multi-organisational effort, in which organisations unite under a common goal, acting within an ‘inhabited ecosystem’ that ‘propels change efforts . . . between and through organizations’ (DeJordy et al., 2020, p. 931).

On this basis, we argue for an institutional allyship approach that is multi-organisational in nature, and therefore propels second-order change towards gender equity across the global marketing academy. Hence, we call on ANZMAC, but also other marketing academies such as the AMA, KSMS and EMAC, as well as similar marketing academies around the world, to enact institutional allyship with this approach. For example, in our region, the ANZMAC Executive and Fellows are situated both within the ANZMAC organisation and their own higher education contexts and are thus able to act as conduits for multi-organisational ‘transformative social change’ (DeJordy et al., 2020, p. 931). We propose ANZMAC take the first step by implementing the Gender Equity and Inclusion Charter (GEIC) proposed.

**Gender equity and inclusion charter**

A GEIC is a proactive response that holds institutions accountable for addressing the institutional level gendered constraints identified throughout a woman’s academic career. Formalising a charter places gender equity firmly on organisational agendas, regardless of economic, environmental, political or social changes. As the instigator of such a charter, ANZMAC would provide authentic role modelling to its higher education members and the necessary accountability to ensure focus, attention and commitment to such an undertaking. In this way, the marketing academy advances higher education institutions by linking practices that support gender equity, such as governing funding eligibility and offering recognition and rewards through award, education and research programmes.

Multiple marketing academies can work together to implement a GEIC as a global approach to progressing gender equity. Regional marketing academies, such as ANZMAC, would launch, enforce, maintain and manage a range of charter activities such as those identified in this commentary (see Table 1). The proposed charter and its activities form a solid foundation to initiate second-order change. We note the activities included in this commentary are intended to be a starting point, they are the ones that most resonated with us or we felt best illustrated our point, commensurate with our praxis approach. A funded research programme addressing inclusion of diverse groups of women would build evidence for the effectiveness of many nominated activities.

Gender Equity and Inclusion (GEI) audits could be used to identify imbalances, biases and other unintended consequences in the materials and programmes implemented by ANZMAC and its partner institutions. Applying a gender lens within a GEI audit supports a careful and deliberate process that ‘reveals the ways in which content and approaches are gendered – informed by, shaped by, or biased toward men’s or women’s perspectives or experiences’ (Rutgers, 2020). In fact, ‘gender analytics can be useful both in creating innovation insights that improve impact and in avoiding downside risks’ (Kaplan, 2021, n.p.). It is interesting to note, that specific diversity and inclusion strategies are absent from the current ANZMAC Future Directions Working Party Review (ANZMAC, 2017). Such a lack of diversity is exemplified in the composition of the current ANZMAC executive, which has just three females amongst its 12 members and only seven female fellows, among a total of 32. We suggest this GEIC approach be included in Priority 1 – adding value to ANZMAC’s offering for previously neglected and marginalised groups.

Specific GEIC activities aligned with developing second-order change include offering GEIC awards and restricting eligibility (e.g. funding or other resources) if award levels are not met. Such awards would be valid for a particular period of time and would focus on specific GEIC topics, thus formally recognising higher education institutions and departments who demonstrate progress and commitment towards gender equity, similar to the idea behind the Athena SWAN bronze, silver and gold awards.

For our next recommendation, we borrow from the University of Melbourne’s ‘Women are the Business’ campaign to increase awareness of ANZMAC’s female academics’ achievements. The ‘Women are the Business’ approach celebrates the stories of Melbourne leaders from researchers to alumni. While celebrating the achievements of women is not innovative, it is uncommon. Proactive campaigns such as this can increase the dissemination of research from female academics to peers and begin to disrupt existing biases around citation practices. Such a campaign should be disseminated through multiple channels including ANZMAC’s digital platforms, those of the institutional members and the annual conference.

Next, we suggest that ANZMAC develop emancipatory pathways for female academics within research structures to tackle current biases. Such pathways would include research reviews for publications and becoming future research leaders. A similar emancipatory programme could also be offered around other aspects of academic career, including teaching and leadership. We call for ANZMAC-led training workshops (around gender equity and allyship) and the appointment of GEI Change Champions, in partnership with higher education member organisations, to increase knowledge dissemination and develop training, reporting and accountability systems. Such positions would need to be incorporated into workload allocations or funded by ANZMAC to ‘buy out’ staff time and should be properly resourced and considered a leadership position (e.g. for promotion or awards applications).

Finally, we recommend an overall GEI research programme to coincide with calls for additional gender research in marketing more generally (Gurrieri et al., 2020; Peñaloza, 2021) and within the marketing academy more specifically (Fischer, 2019). ANZMAC and similar marketing academies are important hegemonic vehicles for the production and dissemination of marketing knowledge, occupying a unique position to progress gender scholarship. There is a great need for deeper understanding of gendered constraints, specifically in the Australasian marketing academy context where there is a dearth of research (see Gurrieri et al. (2017) for a notable exception). The research should adopt an intersectional approach. ANZMAC could begin by advocating a research programme with funding opportunities to examine gender (in)equity in marketing academia, considering issues such as: representation at both junior and senior levels, organisational or departmental climate, policies and practices, explicit discrimination and other barriers, implicit bias and social and sexual harassment or assault (Gurrieri et al., 2017). Part of this research agenda would also track the impact and consequences of all initiatives, including those mentioned above and map results onto existing evidence of gender equity and academic initiatives.
Table 1. Institutional Strategies to Improve Gender Equity in the Marketing Academy – The Gender Equity and Inclusion Charter.

| Charter activities                      | Method                                                                 | Examples                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GEI audits                              | Application of gender lens to identify and remove imbalances, biases and other unintended consequences | Review institutional practices, policies and artefacts considering the entire career journey of female academics, including:
• Recruitment policies and practice (including retention and promotion statistics)
• Salary scales and comparisons (including market loading, per diems and other remuneration forms)
• Teaching and other workload allocation
• Return from leave 're-entry' support (e.g. reigniting research)
• Membership of 'manels' (all-male panels)
• Corporate communications including mission and values statements and strategic plans
• Internet and intranet materials and departmental emails (e.g. language used)
• Gender and diversity statistics and gender, including diversity inclusion target metrics (e.g. from Government)
• Progression and Promotion panels and paths, including Achievement Relative to Opportunity (ARtO) provisions
• Leadership representation

| GEI awards                              | Offer awards for research on specific GEIC topics and academic organisations who demonstrate their progress towards gender equity | Consider whether there is missing policy that is constraining female academics, including policy concerning:
• Policies currently in place and new policy development (e.g. children on campus, caregiver policy including paternal leave)
• Scheduling work for times of the day that support inclusion
• Mentoring programmes to shorten application cycles and proactively increase female representation
• Zero tolerance and action for negative behaviour (e.g. assault, discrimination)

| Female academic achievements awareness campaign | Annual campaign promoting female academic publications and achievements (inspired by the University of Melbourne’s ‘Women are the Business’ programme) | Awards could be offered to:
• Academic organisations and departments who demonstrate their progress towards gender equity
• Could be expanded to include individual and group-based research, including research by early career researchers and higher degree students
• Restrictions around eligibility to apply for funding if GEI targets are not met

| GEI research agenda                     | Create and maintain research support structures                      | Programme of research mentoring concerning both conducting research and becoming research leaders
• Peer reviewers mentor authors to publishable standard through thoughtful, constructive critiques
• Trainee reviewer schemes from publishing houses (e.g. Journal of Consumer Research) to provide meaningful experiences around the review process to support academic career progression
• Expanded to include other aspects of academic career, including teaching and leadership

(Continued)
Charter activities Method Examples

Fund GEI research programme focusing on the Australasian marketing academy that adopts an intersectional approach

Funding opportunities to examine the gendered constraints in the Australasian marketing academy (see above for link to Awards). Research topics could include:
- Respect
- Organisational/department climate and culture
- Policies and practices
- Explicit discrimination and other barriers
- Implicit bias
- Social and sexual harassment/assault

Review and build evidence base for the effectiveness of activities included in the charter

Provide evidence of charter outcomes and impact

Funding opportunities to review existing evidence for activities included in charter and to build evidence base for these activities. Research topics could include:
- Effectiveness of institutional GEI awards
- Effectiveness of GEI activities from an intersectional perspective
- Effectiveness of GEI audits and gender lensing
- Impact of GEI training

Support GEI change champions to act as conduit between ANZMAC and HE institutions

GEI Change Campions could be responsible for:
- Dissemination of GEIC related materials
- Providing training
- Developing reporting and accountability systems

GEI training

Offer training on gender equity and allyship, upskilling both early career academics and academic leaders. Open to all, such training could include:
- Workshops at the marketing academy conferences (e.g. application of gender lensing, discrimination law, policy and practice, empowerment as a leader)
- Senior leadership training courses

Table 1. (Continued)
Delimitations

In this commentary, the authors wish to acknowledge that the opinions expressed are our own and do not express the views or opinions of our respective employers. The authors also note that our lived experiences are as four white women and thus, we have not focussed on intersectional identities. Finally, our focus in this piece has predominantly concerned academic staff and not professional staff, as per our experiences, recollections and anecdotes. Further work and consideration that is inclusive of alternative perspectives in the marketing academy are needed.

Conclusion

While the marketing academy has made some progress towards gender equity, career advancement for women remains hampered by long standing institutional resistance to change, a focus on performative allyship and an often misguided focus on the individual instead of the institution. Thus, important work remains to be done (Peñaloza, 2021) because gendered constraints still heavily permeate the careers of female academics, resulting in a negative impact on well-being and the underrepresentation of women in senior positions. The higher education sector has a moral imperative to actively pursue gender equity (Jorboe, 2013) because ‘everyone benefits from more women in power’ (Jarroud, 2015, n.p.). We recommend the marketing academy implement a Gender Equity and Inclusion Charter as a significant and transformative first step in institutional allyship, thereby enacting real change within and across universities.
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Notes

1. We note critiques of Galak and Kahn’s (2021) codification of discrimination, harassment and assault within the marketing academy, and agree this issue is underestimated (Dobscha & GENMAC (Gender, Markets, Consumers) Board, 2021; Pew et al., 2021).
2. We recognise the complexities of gender inequities with reference to academic labour in the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted by Pereira (2021) but share in this commentary our experiences and recollections.
3. Similar to British-based Athena SWAN (Scientific Women’s Academic Network), whose initiatives address the underrepresentation of women within STEM disciplines by recognising institutional commitment to advancing women’s careers (Ovseiko et al., 2017).
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