CHAPTER 8

Conclusions: Gendered Academic Citizenship as a Promising Research Agenda

Sevil Sümer, Pat O’Connor, and Nicky Le Feuvre

INTRODUCTION

This book has identified and developed the concept of academic citizenship, locating it in the context of Higher Education and Research Institutions (HERIs) affected by neo-liberalism and managerialism, and with the hyper-competition, auditing and individualisation that has come to characterise academic institutions in the developed world. The book
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has an overall focus on the processes of inclusion and exclusion, recognition and denigration, privilege and discrimination and their consequences for women’s membership, recognition and belonging in such HERIs.

Just after we started writing this concluding chapter, the world was hit by the COVID-19 pandemic. Almost overnight, universities and research institutions were closed down, students and staff were asked to study and work from home. Like many of our colleagues, we had to adapt, practically overnight, to the mass digitalisation of teaching and research activities, whilst also dealing with home-schooling and securing complex, often trans-national, care solutions for our loved ones. These gendered consequences of academic lock-down attracted rapid media and research attention (e.g. Minello 2020; Utoft 2020; Craig 2020). And rightly so: early analyses of available data and initial reports from journal editors showed a rapid decline in the number and share of journal articles submitted by women since the pandemic hit (Murdie 2020; Viglione 2020). The concept of gendered academic citizenship appears particularly relevant in this context, as consequences of COVID-19 measures seem likely to exacerbate existing inequalities within—and outside—academia. As we have argued elsewhere (e.g. Le Feuvre et al. 2012; Sümer 2014), any account of citizenship as related to participation in the public sphere, also needs to consider divisions of care work in the private sphere. Although we still need more research on the medium and long-term consequences of the pandemic and of the economic crisis that is likely to ensue, our multidimensional definition of academic citizenship suggests that these will vary by gender, class, race, age and physical ability and be experienced differently within HERIs in different societal contexts.

In Chapter 1, we identified four ideal-types of academic citizenship (i.e. full citizenship, limited citizenship, transitional/probationary citizenship and non-citizenship): each involving different configurations of membership, recognition and belonging. We also highlighted the existence of internal hierarchies within each of these ideal-types of citizenship, based on gender or other intersectional characteristics. Overall, the book makes a significant contribution to existing knowledge, by resisting the tendency to focus on particular aspects of the gendered academy, at the risk of losing the ‘whole picture’. Our framework enables us to develop:
A broad-ranging analysis of academic citizenship, encompassing both permanent and precarious positions, and the multiple places in-between, and including those located ‘beyond the margins’ (Aaron and Walby 1991) of any type of formal citizenship.

An integrated analysis of the systemic, organisational, interactional and individual (biographical) factors that contribute to the gendering of academic citizenship.

An exploration of how these factors combine and operate in particular national and institutional contexts.

Furthermore, the contributions to this book shed new light on a number of issues that are at the forefront of contemporary contributions to the “women & science” debate. These include:

- Undermining the myths of meritocracy in order to understand how the multiple and shifting criteria of ‘excellence’ are used to restrict women’s access to full academic citizenship, and to legitimate their exclusion.
- Examining societal, institutional and even disciplinary variation in the framing of motherhood and care responsibilities as a barrier to full academic citizenship, and the influences of gendered expectations, practices and the concrete divisions of tasks in academia.
- Better understanding how hyper-competitive, male dominated working environments (with stable or precarious employment contacts), influence the acceptability of social, sexual and psychological harassment and those micropolitical practices (O’Connor et al. 2017) that constitute gender violence and create a more or less ‘chilly climate’ for most women academics.

**Gendered Repercussions: Key Findings on Gendered Academic Citizenship**

The gender issues related to the ideal-types of citizenship in HERIs were explored in Chapters 2–7, either through single-country case studies or

---

1 The term ‘chilly climate’ was originally coined by Roberta Hall and Bernice Sandler in the 1980s in the US context to “describe patterns of inequitable treatment that, as they accumulate, inhibit women’s confidence, self-esteem and accomplishment” (Britton 2017: 7).
through cross-national comparison. They have each demonstrated that the multidimensional concept of Gendered Academic Citizenship (GAC) offers a useful, integrated analytical lens through which to analyse the structural, organisational and/or interpersonal processes at work within academic institutions that work to the detriment of women and other disadvantaged groups who fall outside the conventional definitions of the ‘ideal academic’ (male, white, middle-class and ‘care-free’). It is to a discussion of these that we now turn.

**Full Academic Citizenship**

In Chapter 1 it was suggested that full academic citizenship is granted to a core of tenured academics who are usually employed on a permanent and full-time basis, paid relatively well compared to other members of the academic community, endowed with a range of social protection measures (e.g. pension plans) and empowered with a sense of recognition and personal autonomy. Full academic citizens thus score high with respect to membership, recognition and belonging. Although they experience first-hand some of the structural changes currently sweeping across HERIs, they have the power and resources to insulate themselves from most of the negative consequences. In some cases, they are even able to shape the institutional responses to such external pressures. These academics often have a linear career path and are able to define, to a certain extent, the core values of the academic community and the nature of valued knowledge. They participate in decision-making fora and experience recognition and a sense of belonging, within the institution and within the wider scientific community.

Chapters 2 and 4 explored the impact of what are effectively micropolitical practices, involving the use of informal power relationships which influence the gendered patterns of access to academic positions and full academic citizenship. Chapter 2 focused on the translation of informal power into practices (such as devaluation and stereotyping) during evaluation and recruitment procedures and demonstrated their impact on women’s access to full academic citizenship. It found major ambiguities in the constructions of ‘excellence’ criteria across different national contexts, combined with a lack of transparency and homosociability within these male dominated structures. Chapter 2 also underlined the fact that academic citizens are not de-gendered automatons that exist
outside of informal power relations, but agents with identities and interests who engage in everyday practices to advance their own or others ‘agendas’, with consequences as regards access to academic citizenship.

With its empirical focus on woman academics at different career stages, Chapter 4 laid bare the potential for gender hierarchy and inequality within every citizenship status (Steinthorsdóttir et al. 2018). Thus, even those women who reached the pinnacle of the academic hierarchy (tenured/full professorships) can experience gendered exclusions and various forms of marginalisation. Chapter 4 illustrated this through an analysis of the Medusa-effect observed in Norwegian HERIs. The most frequently mentioned indicators of this involve micropolitical practices that combine to devalue women, and that can be observed in many other national contexts too, including: being overlooked or ignored in meetings; being excluded from professional networks; not receiving strategic information or receiving an unfair allocation of resources. All of these seemingly ‘anecdotal’ experiences have a huge impact on the recognition and belonging experienced by women—even those who formally have secured full academic citizenship—creating feelings of lacking power, voice and respect. Thus, for women, holding a permanent position does not automatically imply access to all the advantages of full academic citizenship, even in a country like Norway, renowned for having institutionalised gender equality policies for many decades.

**Limited Academic Citizenship**

This form of citizenship is associated with institutional positions that are generally less prestigious and rewarding than those of the full academic citizens, with lower salaries and associated benefits, poorer promotion prospects and less voice in institutional decision-making processes. It implies reduced recognition and sense of belonging, limited influence on the professional ethos of the academic community, with a disproportionate share of less valued activities, such as teaching and pastoral care. Women are more likely than men to get ‘stuck’ in these intermediary positions, which offer a parallel and partial form of belonging to the academic community.

There are various multi-level factors leading to this situation and several of these factors were explored in the previous chapters. For example, Chapter 2 focused on the kind of assumptions and practices that impose this intermediary status as the highest ‘appropriate’ position for women.
to reach on the academic career ladder, revealing the prevalence of gendered stereotypes and selective gender blindness. Lack of informal relationships with power holders also contribute to limiting women’s academic citizenship, as was also demonstrated in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 discussed the stereotypically gendered construction of the ‘full academic citizen’ as someone free of care obligations, with unlimited time resources and unconstrained mobility, thus effectively discouraging women’s identification as academic leaders. In Chapter 6, the authors showed the systematic steps taken to eradicate gender equality policies and their institutional guarantees in HERIs in the Hungarian context. This chapter also referred to state pressure to reproduce and sustain traditional gendered expectations, reflected in the effective banning of Gender Studies, thus hampering institutional recognition of gender-related issues. Chapters 3 and 5 also demonstrated the prevalence of conservative societal-level gender arrangements and traditional assumptions about women’s care duties. In the national contexts studied here, reconciling paid work and caring responsibilities were seen as individual (i.e. women’s) problem with very few attempts to question the structural and cultural factors that impact on this challenge.

In Chapter 3, the in-depth analyses of the Swiss context showed that, during the early career stage, the men who succeed in moving on to full academic citizenship usually benefit from the informal support of a ‘flexible’ spouse, whose own career prospects are tailored to the needs of the internationally mobile male career path.

Chapter 7 discussed another major factor limiting women’s academic citizenship, namely sexual harassment. Based on research from the Turkish academic context, the authors showed how male monopoly over top academic positions and increasing conservatism interact, ultimately limiting women’s membership, recognition and belonging in the academic environment, through the enactment of power as reflected in harassment.

*Transitional/Probationary Academic Citizenship*

This form of citizenship is usually experienced by those early career academics who aspire to full or even limited citizenship, but who are currently located on the periphery of academic institutions. Due to the numerical expansion in postdoc positions and the imbalance between PhD holders and the availability of permanent academic positions, all
aspiring academics are now expected to pass through an early academic career stage following their PhD defence. This postdoc period provides transient membership of the academic community and limited opportunities for recognition or belonging. Typically, it coincides with women’s childbearing and rearing period. Their suitability for an academic career is assessed by male dominated structures, procedures and criteria at this critical stage.

Chapter 3 provided a detailed analysis of how women experience this type of academic citizenship, which is increasingly widespread throughout Europe. Focusing on the Swiss context, the authors showed how probationary citizenship is associated with particular forms of subordination, both to individual academics or university departments and to managerial indicators of academic performance. Transitional academic citizenship is also fraught with internal hierarchies, often along gendered lines. It is a period that is characterised by structural uncertainty and embodied anxiety. The duration of the probationary period and the chances of a favourable outcome are affected by the structural and organisational characteristics of HERIs and by the broader gender culture of the societal context in which they are embedded.

**Non-Citizenship**

This is the fourth and final form of academic citizenship identified in the research. Those who experience non-citizenship lack even basic entitlements and social protection. The sheer numbers of non-citizens with extremely insecure work conditions became highly visible in some countries during the COVID-19 crisis (e.g. Collini 2020). Non-citizens are called upon and encouraged to work in academic institutions, but are effectively treated as disposable ‘hands and minds’. Their contribution to undervalued work such as teaching is critical, but individually they are considered marginal and transient (O’Keefe and Courtois 2019). Non-citizens are often in casual hourly paid work or on precarious short-term contracts, with relatively low wages, little social protection or employment rights (Murgia and Poggio 2019). They have only scant career prospects and almost no voice in decision-making structures. Non-Citizenship is also fraught with its’ own internal hierarchies, often ordered along gender lines.
Chapter 6 illustrated the societal pressures that consign female academics or aspiring academics to non-citizenship status in a specific national and historical context, characterised by a violent anti-gender ‘backlash’. Many of those who have achieved probationary citizenship have come from the ranks of non-citizens and are acutely aware of the possibility of slipping back into that highly marginal status.

Non-citizens are structurally most vulnerable to abuses of power. Chapter 7 focused on one manifestation of this: sexual harassment. Conceptualisation of sexual harassment as an attack to bodily integrity and violation of rights and consequently as an impairment of both recognition and belonging shows its intrinsic ties to academic citizenship. Although this can occur at all levels, it is particularly difficult for it to be named and reported by those with little power.

The personal and financial cost of continuing as a non-citizen indefinitely, and experiencing the consequent lack of recognition and belonging is considerable and many eventually give up the dream of an academic career (Le Feuvre et al. 2019)

**Similarities and Differences Across the National Contexts**

Women are becoming more and more visible within HERIs across the globe, both as students and staff. There is now widespread recognition of the ‘leaky pipeline’ or ‘glass ceiling’ effects that prevent them from reaching the top of the academic hierarchy. The piecemeal elaboration and patchy implementation of a wide range of ‘equal opportunity’ measures aimed at redressing this imbalance has created, for some, the illusion that gender equality is now a reality. But a closer look at the relative positions of men and women in relation to each ideal-type of academic citizenship, along with a careful analysis of the division of academic tasks, resources and power, reveal that this is far from true, and that new forms of gendered inequalities may even be taking shape.

Even where broadly similar patterns exist (as measured by the proportion of women in different academic positions, for example), there may be different processes at work within particular national contexts. This is because the relative share of full-time, stable or tenured positions within the academic labour market varies considerably between countries, and because the proportion of women to reach such positions is generally lower than the proportion of their male counterparts (Le Feuvre et al. 2019).
We detect a general ‘backlash’ throughout Europe against equal opportunity measures designed to redress the persistent gender imbalance in the academic labour market, associated with the promotion of a meritocratic ideology under the guise of ‘academic excellence’ which purports to be ‘universal’ and ‘fair’, but is loaded with gendered expectations and priorities (see Chapter 2).

The chapters that are based on single-country case studies (e.g. Chapter 3 Switzerland; Chapter 4 Norway; Chapter 6 Hungary; Chapter 7 Turkey) offer striking support for the gender-backlash theory.

Chapter 3 showed how the very conservative societal-level gender regime in Switzerland clashes with the normative requirements for several periods of international mobility during the years following a successful PhD defence. The authors also note that becoming a full (and recognised) professor in this context requires taking on a very ‘managerial’ role, a prospect that may be unattractive to those women who aspire to pursue a personal research agenda whilst maintaining ‘egalitarian’ relationships with their peers and colleagues.

In Norway, the beacon of institutionalized gender-equality, one can detect media (and even some academic) hostility towards gender equality measures, claiming that feminism has gone too far and that men are the real losers now (e.g. NRK 2019). These are signs of ‘gender equality fatigue’ and an embracement of neoliberal, post-feminist ideals that ignore the persistent gendered patterns in the labour market.

Chapter 6 showed that the concept of gender in itself is under attack in Hungary, with growing anti-feminist and anti-gender measures. Within the academy, the effective closure of many Gender Studies courses and Centres has de facto limited the academic career opportunities of those women who had invested in the institutionalisation of this interdisciplinary and globalized field of academic enquiry.

Chapter 7 discussed the parallel and yet contradictory developments in Turkey: increasing conservatism together with an increase in awareness of gender violence and sexual harassment in the society. Women’s relatively large share of professorships does not automatically imply a gender egalitarian environment, since ‘numerical diversity does not automatically present a challenge to power, influence, and domination of the elite’ (Özbilgin 2009: 114).

Thus, although HERIs are going through similar transformations of academic capitalism, specific national and societal contexts, with their
differing welfare and gender regimes, need to be considered whilst analysing practices of gendered academic citizenship.

**Strengths of the Gendered Academic Citizenship Perspective**

The specific strengths of the *Gendered Academic Citizenship* (GAC) perspective can be summarised as follows:

1. The concept of gendered academic citizenship enables us to focus—simultaneously or successively—on the experiences of women located at different stages of the academic career; to analyse the disproportionate share of precarious academic jobs that are falling to women, whilst also recognising that their share of full/tenured professorships has never been so high, and is still rising in most countries and disciplines. These are not alternative realities; they are both part of the complex process of institutional gendering and need to be analysed as such.

2. With the systematic use of the GAC framework, we are able to fully recognise the potential for hierarchy, marginalisation and inequality that exists, even for those who have ostensibly achieved the employment status associated with full academic citizenship rights (Steinthorsdóttir et al. 2018). The identification of membership, recognition and belonging as key dimensions of academic citizenship provides a tool for understanding internal hierarchies within and across all types of academic citizenship.

3. The GAC framework enables us to develop a subtle analysis of women’s experiences of working in HERIs, without necessarily presuming that all women always share the same experiences, all the time. In other words, the framework is particularly suited to an intersectional approach, and enables us to recognise the multiple faces of inequalities in academic careers today.

4. The framework developed in this book also provides an important tool for fine-tuning existing cross-national comparisons of women’s academic careers. For example, it is helpful in establishing the degree to which ‘full academic citizenship’, albeit in slightly different forms, continues to remain the dominant form of academic employment in
different national contexts and at different historical periods. Likewise, it is useful to compare the duration and precise employment conditions associated with ‘probationary academic citizenship’ in different countries, or historical periods.

5. The GAC typology enables us to recognise that a specific title (e.g. Associate Professor) or employment contract (e.g. non-tenured) may not correspond to exactly the same degree of membership, recognition and sense of belonging in all national contexts, in all disciplinary fields, or at all times. We can thus put some degree of historicity and contextualisation back into the comparative study of the gendering of academic careers.

6. The framework enables (and presupposes) a multidimensional approach to gender inequalities with a simultaneous attention to the factors at systemic, organisational and interactional levels that shape it in particular contexts. It thus permits an analysis of crucially important (but informal and mostly invisible) micropolitical practices in the overall context of academic capitalism.

7. Finally, the GAC framework enables us to study more explicitly the degree to which the expectations associated with specific types of academic citizenship are—or are normatively framed to be—more or less ‘compatible’ with other forms or dimensions of citizenship (e.g. political, economic, social) and particularly those which are limited by unpaid domestic labour and emotional care work inside and outside the paid employment context.

**SETTING A GENDERED ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP RESEARCH AGENDA FOR THE FUTURE**

The book has laid the groundwork for what we hope will prove to be a promising research agenda. Our suggestions for future research include:

- More international/comparative research on links between gender regimes (family and gender equality policies) and academic capitalism.

It has long been recognised that systemic factors have an impact on gender equality. These have been variously conceptualised, most recently as involving gender regimes and academic capitalism (O’Hagan et al.
There is a need for further research on how these interact and their effects on academic citizenship in HERIs in particular national contexts.

- More comparative research on academic evaluation and recruitment processes: how does reference to a particular definition of ‘academic excellence’ dominate (or not) recruitment and promotion procedures in different national contexts?

A discourse of excellence, which purports to be objective and gender neutral has been widely used to legitimate women’s exclusion from various types of academic citizenship. However, in some contexts, such as Spanish HERIs, a competing and alternative discourse revolving around loyalty and familiarity exists: with implications for the value of geographical mobility for access to academic citizenship (Cruz-Castro and Sanz-Menendez 2010; Montes Lopez and O’Connor 2019). Research is needed on the conditions associated with the existence of such alternative discourses and their implications for women.

- Contribution to citizenship literature through more research on academic citizenship and micropolitical practices and how these interact with other structural and cultural factors.

It is increasingly recognised that gender inequality is perpetuated by micropolitical practices i.e. by the exercise of informal power. More research is needed on the relationship between such practices and wider structural and cultural conditions, and in particular on the conditions under which the gendering of such micropolitical practices can be reduced.

- Practices constructing the ‘ideal academic’ as predominantly male, middle-class, white, heterosexual, able-bodied (or disembodied) subject (free of care obligations).

It is widely recognised that the male, white, ‘monastic’ (White 2014) stereotype of the scientist is unhelpful in terms of increasing diversity, particularly in STEM fields. This stereotype impacts on the evaluations of those outside this stereotype and hence influences their recognition and
belonging. Research is needed on the practices that create and maintain this stereotype and the extent to which these vary cross-nationally.

- More intersectional focus in research: how does gender interact with race, ethnicity, class, age, sexual orientation and physical ability in influencing academic citizenship?

Although intersectionality has long been recognised in feminist circles, more research is needed on how gender interacts with other characteristics in shaping access to the four types of academic citizenship and on membership, recognition and belonging within each of these types.

- More empirical research on the practices reflecting a masculinist sense of entitlement and/or collusion with the reproduction of gender inequalities.

There is evidence that men in academic environments vary in terms of their attitudes towards gender issues, as well as their work and relational commitments (O’Connor et al. 2015) but in general they are less likely than their female counterparts to think that gender inequalities exist in HERIs (HEA 2016). The relationships between such attitudes and access to various types of citizenship and gendered differences in sense of entitlement within HERIs need to be explored further.

- More empirical research on the extent and consequences of sexual harassment within all types of academic citizenship.

With the #MeToo movement there is an increasing awareness of gender violence in general, and sexual harassment in particular as the overt face of power in keeping women ‘in their place’ (Bondestam and Lundqvist 2020). This seems likely to be a particular problem in STEM, where laboratory-based relationships between probationary citizens and PIs are extremely dependent and potentially exploitative (the so-called ‘relationships of vassalage’, Etzkowitz et al. 2007: 405) generating a reluctance to report such behaviour. In these instances, institutional action is highly unlikely, particularly if the PI is a research ‘star’ on whom the institution depends for its global ranking performance. However, sexual harassment
is not peculiar to those contexts. Research is needed both on the prevalence of such harassment within all types of citizenship and on national variation in the extent and nature of the attempts to tackle it.

- Access routes and the extent and implications of precarity for women starting an academic career.

National systems of higher education vary in the extent to which they rely on non-permanent academic staff, with the share of those on fixed-term contracts varying from 70% in the US (Zheng 2018) to 20% in the Irish context (HEA 2019). Research is needed on the implications of such variation for the academic career trajectories of women who start out as non-citizens or probationary citizens.

- More research on women in leadership positions, particularly in HERIs that fail to recognise the existence of gender inequalities, and on the consequences of this denial.

Former research has shown that not all women who are successful in reaching the pinnacle of the academic citizenship hierarchy are necessarily supportive of their junior, female counterparts: the so-called ‘Queen bee’ attitude of some female academic leaders (Faniko et al. 2017), who identify with the meritocratic discourse of academic ‘excellence’ that enabled them to ‘succeed’. Some women faculty deny the salience of gender and are also critical of gender equality measures (Britton 2017). These practices should be seen as yet another sign of the structural and cultural disadvantages faced by academic women and need to be the subject of more in-depth and comparative research.

- Implications of national variation in organisational structures for access to various types of citizenship.

Even where broadly similar patterns exist (e.g. as regards the proportion of women at full professorial level) the organisational structures in academia vary widely, notably in terms of the number of ‘steps’ on the academic ladder and the procedures used for accessing each step (Bozzon et al. 2019; Le Feuvre et al. 2019). Further research is needed on the gendered implications of this variation.
- National versus organisational procedures for accessing different types of citizenship.

Countries vary in the extent to which criteria and procedures for accessing different types of academic citizenship are laid down at national level or alternatively defined by individual HERIs. More comparative research on the implications of these alternatives for women accessing each type of citizenship is needed. Thus, for example, to what extent does Turkey’s relatively high proportion of women at professorial level reflect the existence of such a national procedure? Does this national recruitment procedure have implications at local level for women’s recognition and belonging? Have similar patterns emerged in other countries which use national recruitment procedures?

- Assessing the impact of gender equality interventions, including such measures as Athena SWAN and Gender Equality Plans (GEPs).

In the past fifteen years, there have been a very large number of intervention projects aimed at tackling gender equality in HERIs. The most cross-national of these has been Athena SWAN, which originated in the UK, but has now been extended (in a slightly modified form) to Canada, Australia and Ireland. Research by Graves et al. (2019) on the UK case suggested that, although Athena SWAN creates a context for discussing gender equality and reduces male anxiety about its existence, it does not actually increase the proportion of women at full professorial level, nor is it associated with change in key micropolitical practices, other than in departments with Gold awards. In these latter cases it seems probable that other factors, such as strong leadership committed to gender equality, is the crucial factor. Elsewhere, Gender Action Plans (GEPs) have been implemented in a wide range of HERIs, often with financial support from the EU. Further comparative research is needed to assess the impact of Athena Swan and other GEPs, in different national contexts and across all types of academic citizenship.

The overall advantage of the Gendered Academic Citizenship perspective developed in this book is that it provides a framework to understand experiences in various academic settings and national contexts and illuminates a wide range of issues impacting on women and other disadvantaged groups in a range of HERIs. Although we focus mostly on the experiences
of women in this book, we know that many men also suffer from and are critical of the hegemonic masculine structures of academic capitalism. For women navigating the labyrinth of academic institutions and wishing to make them more inclusive, these men are potential allies. We are also well aware that many academic women deny the salience of gender and focus on the individual ‘choices’ that women make to explain the gender imbalances. One of our aims in this book was to make visible the structural constraints and inequal power relations under which those individual ‘choices’ are made, so as to promote solidarity and collective resistance to the individualising forces of academic capitalism.
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