

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Women academics: tensions between the workplace and
the personal and professional selves**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education
in
Adult Education

Massey University, Palmerston North,
New Zealand.

Janet Webster

2010

ABSTRACT

This thesis critically examines issues associated with the individual/institutional nexus in the context of the New Zealand academic workplace from a female and narrative perspective. Tensions among the many cultures that form part of the personal and professional lived experiences of five academic women and their workplaces are investigated, drawing on some elements from feminist post-structuralist views in order to identify assumptions, ambiguities and contradictions. My interpretations are examined through narratives and critical discourse analysis of selected official texts relevant to the context of women in academia. Recommendations are made for ways for collectively researching, debating and challenging discourses that act to disempower women in the academic workplace.

Although the multiple realities of the lives of these women were diverse, in drawing together the tensions they experienced in the workplace and in their lives, there were some common threads that linked their narratives. Differences in expectations and values/world views between those embedded within the institutional discourses and those of the women constrained their freedom to make choices in their professional and personal lives, thereby creating conflict. The university is seen to be a gendered and hierarchical workplace and sources of conflict involved complex interweaving and overlapping of workplace and personal issues.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give special thanks to my supervisors, Dr marg gilling from Massey University and Dr Sandra Grey from Victoria University for their guidance and support throughout this research. I am also especially grateful to those women who participated through providing their stories. My thanks too for the patience of my son Ben, who has supported and encouraged me throughout this work. In particular, I am indebted to the inspirational teaching of the late Professor John Codd who developed my interest in this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Research question and context	1
1.3	Personal statement	6
1.4	Overview of thesis structure	7
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1	Overview	9
2.2	Feminist theory	9
2.3	Gender and culture in New Zealand – historical issues	11
2.4	New Zealand socio-political structure and the university	16
2.5	Implications for women of changes in the academic workplace	18
CHAPTER 3	APPROACH TO THE RESEARCH	22
3.1.	Introduction	22
3.2	Feminist methodologies	22
3.3	Critical discourse analysis	23
3.4	Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis	26
3.5	Critical reflection	27
3.6	Narratives	28
3.7	Methods	29
3.7.1	Critical discourse analysis	29
3.7.2	Narratives from academic women	31
3.7.3	Method for critical reflection	33
3.8	Who are they?	34

CHAPTER 4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	36
4.1	Scope of the discussion	36
4.2	Organisational culture and the professional self	37
4.3	Changing roles, expectations and contradictions	45
4.4	Communication practices, power and gender	53
4.5	Multiple roles, the individual and work/life balance	56
4.6	Summary	60
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSIONS	63
APPENDICES		68
APPENDIX 1: FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS OF TEXTS		69
APPENDIX 2: MASSEY UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT		70
APPENDIX 3: FRAMEWORK FOR CONVERSATION		71
REFERENCES		74

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

“It’s become much more intense in the last year, year and a half. It’s really noticeable. I’m a lot more stressed.”

“We just work long hours and we still never feel that we achieve. There’s always the sense of being not good enough.”

These statements made by two women I talked to on my research journey capture my reasons for choosing to study the university workplace and the experiences of women academics within it. I was feeling that my choices were becoming increasingly constrained – choices around work/family/leisure. As a lecturer, I needed to prioritise between teaching and research, as a single parent I needed to find time for my family, to choose between work and home, to juggle my hours so as to meet as many demands as possible. I was becoming more and more stressed, feeling that I was inadequate, looking for explanations and seeking to know to what extent my experiences were similar to, or different from, other women. Were there any ways of resolving these issues? If so, how?

This thesis investigates tensions between the many cultures that form part of the personal and professional lived experiences of academic women and their workplaces. My interpretations of women’s narratives are examined through personal reflections and critical discourse analysis of selected texts relevant to the context of women in academia. Elements of a feminist post-structuralist approach are drawn upon so as to identify, critique and challenge any ambiguities, assumptions and contradictions.

1.2 Research question and context

My research question is: How have recent organisational changes in the tertiary education sector shaped tensions for academic women in New Zealand?

This question is examined in the context of recent major political and economic restructuring that has taken place in this country. The underlying assumption being that the impact of this restructuring has changed relationships within the university workplace in such a way as to create, modify or transform tensions for women academics.

Tensions are defined for the purposes of this research as being those stresses created by conflicts between the personal and the professional ethos. The extent to which these changes contribute to the shaping of tensions – whether this be by creating, modifying or transforming them - through increasing or constraining freedom of choice for academic women is investigated. My interpretations are examined through personal

narratives of women and in the light of critical discourse analysis of selected texts relevant to the context of women in academia.

New Zealand has been widely cited as having implemented, through the 1980s and 1990s, one of the most extreme Neoliberal political reforms of any in the Western world (Lauder, 1990; O'Neill, 2005; Olssen, Codd and O'Neill, 2004; Whitty and Power, 2002). The primary goal of these reforms was promotion of economic growth through the operation of "free" markets (Cheyne, O'Brien and Belgrave, 2008), an approach that led to the privatisation and commercialisation of many New Zealand State Owned Enterprises (Rudd, 1997). State services were reformed along the lines of economic rationalism and monetarism; strategies for increased accountability and control such as charters, output specifications and flexible fixed-term employment contracts became common features of many institutions, including educational organisations (Cheyne et al., 2008; Codd and Gordon, 1991). It is beyond the scope of this study to review the political history of New Zealand as a whole; the focus of investigation is on changes made after the 1984 Labour government and through the 1990s to the present, since these have had the most effect on the current tertiary education environment. The Neoliberal period of the 1980s to 1990s is of particular importance because this is where government policy reforms were initially established that have had wide impact on the tertiary education sector, continuing to this day.

Under the Neoliberal political agenda of the 1980s and 1990s, government gave increased autonomy to individual educational institutes, but required them to become more businesslike, efficient and accountable "education providers" (Codd and Gordon, 1991). Following on the heels of the Neoliberal reforms, the Third Way policies of 1999 and beyond promoted a less extreme, more socially responsible alternative to classical Neoliberalism but retained a strong focus on free market education (Cheyne et al., 2008). A new political discourse, the "knowledge society" and "knowledge economy", embraced Neoliberal concepts such as individualism, lifelong learning, flexibility and economic freedom (Codd, 2005), and has remained pervasive through the first decade of the 21st century.

The Tertiary Education Strategy (Ministry of Education, 2002) signalled the separation of government funding for teaching and research, representing a move away from funding tertiary institutes wholly on the basis of EFTS (equivalent full-time students). This move, perhaps more than any other, had far-reaching impact on the work environment and culture of universities, the full effects of which are as yet not fully investigated or realised. Through changed management of funding, tertiary education institutes were made more accountable to government, and their activities monitored more closely. In line with policies throughout the public sector, institutes were encouraged to compete for external funding, as competition was thought to lead to improved quality and efficiency (Evans and Quigley, 2006). Funding of research was made subject to assessed

performance indicators, based in part on research quality in a way that has transformed both the nature of academic work and the value of knowledge itself (Boston, 2006; Codd, 2006). A system of peer review, the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF), was established to monitor and assess research performance and to provide information for allocation of resources to those institutions perceived to be best performing according to specified criteria. Academic staff were encouraged to produce research in directions that aligned with industry and the government's national goals (Ministry of Education, 2002). The process was similar to the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) implemented in the United Kingdom (Willmott, 2003) but with some important differences. For example, although both the RAE and the PBRF award funding on the overall quality of institutional research, the "mixed-model" adopted in New Zealand evaluates research produced by the individuals themselves (Adams, 2008). The policy of releasing individual scores back to the institution has created widespread unease and tensions among many researchers (Adams, 2008; Codd, 2006). The implications of these and other changes in funding and associated management strategies in the tertiary education sector extend beyond the 'political' arena in which they were established into wider contexts, creating ramifications and inequalities on the basis of issues such as ethnicity, class and gender (Briar, 2009; Codd, 2006; Mayer and Tikka, 2008; Ozkanli and White, 2008).

Internationally race, class and gender have long been identified as prime factors that influence an individual's lived experiences. Writing from the perspective of a black, woman academic living in the United States, hooks (2000) clearly identified all these factors as contributing to oppression of women in America, with race being predominant in limiting a woman's choices, experiences and destiny. While hook's own experiences were shaped by childhood in a Southern, black, patriarchal, working class household, there are a wide range of personal experiences and socio-political factors that can contribute to the marginalisation of women, some of which are specific to this country, so issues in New Zealand may differ from those of other countries. It is worth briefly looking at the broader issues of gender and society within New Zealand before focussing on the more specific effects of gender and higher education.

On the surface, New Zealand society might appear to have fewer issues with social divisions such as class and gender than with ethnicity, but closer reflection reveals that this is far from reality. James and Saville-Smith (1994, p.16) suggested that the importance of gender in shaping New Zealand society arose as a historical consequence of the colonial background of this country. Compelling evidence was presented (p. 72) of disparities between males and females in New Zealand in the early 1990s in terms of employment, income and living standards that clearly showed sole parent (predominantly female) families were disadvantaged socially and financially in terms of access to equal opportunities, with disparities for Maori women (p. 44) being by far the greatest, a finding that was confirmed by Labrum (2004, p169). The extent to

which these divisions are still applicable in this country will be examined in more depth in chapter two. However, gendered divisions have impacted on women's positions throughout the tertiary education sector, both within New Zealand and elsewhere, in many different ways.

Internationally, several studies have found that women academics face barriers to advancement in the university workplace. Gender discriminatory practices in management structures and conflict between multiple roles created by career and family issues were identified as obstacles to women's advancement in Australian universities (Ozkanli and White, 2008) and in the United States (Mayer and Tikka, 2008).

Blackmore and Sachs (2001, p. 63), Heward (1996, p.16) and Thomas (1998, p. 91) have also claimed that male management and networking practices disadvantage and exclude women, thus contributing to the predominance of women in lower paid, untenured positions in universities within the United Kingdom.

Negative effects of managerialism on the working lives of women in New Zealand academic institutions have also been identified, in line with these overseas trends. Curtis and Phibbs (2006, p. 412) found that New Zealand women academics were disadvantaged relative to their male colleagues through a number of social and cultural factors that included lower employment status, broken career trajectories and difficulties in accessing international networks, in agreement with claims made by Neale (2009) for senior women academics. The tendency for more women to be found in "feminine" disciplines (such as nursing, the social sciences and education) less favoured in promotional stakes and/or to be employed in non-university Tertiary Education Organisations (e.g. polytechnics, Wananga, teachers' colleges), was also cited by Curtis and Phibbs (p. 408) as contributing to the gender pay gap between academic men and women. Doyle, Wylie, Hogden and Else (2004) through their research conducted at Massey University found that fewer women than men were employed in higher level academic positions and suggested this was because women faced more work-related barriers such as higher teaching workloads, breaks for maternity leave, and lack of available childcare. Women may therefore be at a disadvantage in becoming eligible for promotion. However, the full extent to which gender and race/ethnicity divisions persist throughout the New Zealand tertiary education sector today, given the wide-ranging social, ethnic and economic changes of the past two decades remains unclear, and deserves further investigation.

It is often claimed that many women now have more opportunities and freedom than at any other time, yet several studies have suggested that for many women the pressures and stresses associated with balancing the demands of their personal and professional lives have increased throughout the developed world (Blackmore, 1999; Brair, 2009; Doyle et al., 2004; Weedon, 1997). The workplace has experienced wide reaching changes as a result of globalisation, driven by the forces of Western capitalism and

managerialism, with many women now juggling the multiple and often conflicting demands of family and career (e.g. Acker, 1991; Bradley, 1999; Briar, 2009; Mayer and Tikka, 2008). Evidence suggests that women in this country are disadvantaged in the workplace, both financially (Human Rights Commission, 2008; New Zealand Council of Trade Unions, 2010) and socially (Cheyne et al., 2008; James and Saville-Smith, 2004; Waitere and Johnston, 2009). For example, Holmes (2005, pp. 33-34) described how gendered power structures were manifest and maintained in the New Zealand workplace through the subtleties of language exchanged between men and women in government offices and in the conduct of corporate meetings.

In particular, the extent to which the New Zealand research assessment model may disadvantage women academics has not been fully examined, despite studies identifying ethical and equity issues with the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) that are of concern to women academics (Codd, 2006; Web Research Ltd, 2004). To date little information is available regarding the long-term moral, ethical and health issues (including the lack of privacy and workload stress) for individual academics and this issue is a cause for concern. The Tertiary Education Commission responsible for monitoring the effects of the PBRF has focused on the effectiveness of the assessment procedures rather than their effects on individuals themselves (Adams, 2008; Web Research Ltd, 2004). This raises a key question for this research of what the impact has been of the current research assessment procedures on women who may be less able to fulfil increasing expectations of management for workplace efficiency and accountability, because of family or other commitments?

While the literature described above clearly suggests that many women academics may be disadvantaged in the university, evidence of how women as individuals feel affected by these issues is not widely documented. Have recent organisational changes increased or constrained freedom of choice between the personal and professional lives of women who work in the tertiary educational sector in New Zealand, and how do women feel about this? Is there conflict between the demands of work and life that creates tension for these women? This is the starting point for the present research.

This thesis questions how changing management and academic cultural practices in this country have contributed to creating tensions and conflicting choices for academic women in New Zealand. The primary question asked of the background context for this research is: What is the social, cultural and political structure of New Zealand society from a feminist perspective? This question is evaluated in the light of published literature before examining more specific aspects of the tertiary education sector workplace environment and its culture. The effects of any changes in the workplace environment are then explored through the narratives of five women working in the sector. Personal reflections on multiple roles relating to social/cultural/political experiences are included where relevant.

While a full in-depth analysis is beyond the scope of a master's study, the broad contextual issues identified in the literature are used to develop specific questions for the narrative part of the study relating to three broad themes:

- **Organisational culture and the professional self**

The first theme examines tensions between the workplace culture and women's professional lives. It asks: What is the role of the university in the current political economy? How does this role impact on the academy's views of knowledge and understanding? How have economic decisions/norms/practices changed the university culture and the people who work within it? What are the implications of these changes for freedom of choice for women academics?

- **Changing roles, expectations and contradictions**

Tensions associated with the changing roles, expectations and contradictions in the workplace and the implications for women are examined. What are the issues associated with communication, power and gender in the workplace and how do these create tensions/conflicts in women's lives?

- **Multiple roles, the culture of the individual and work/life balance**

What tensions are created by conflict between the personal lives and work/life balance of women, and the corporate discourses of economic productivity and capitalism? To what extent is there an ambiguity of roles for women? How does the individual resolve any problems/conflicts arising from these issues?

These themes guide my interpretation of the narratives of women working in the tertiary sector. Issues, tensions and conflicts faced by these women are identified, and in particular any circumstances that may disadvantage them in the academic workplace are critiqued. In this way, I hope to raise the awareness of those in more powerful positions both within the institution and in the wider community, as well as raising awareness for those working women who may not have had time or opportunity to reflect on their experience, and whether or not it is a shared one. Increasing women's awareness of shared experiences may offer a sense of community empowerment that could help women to collectively raise the consciousness of the "powerful" others and perhaps lead to questioning, challenging and/or opposing practices that are discriminatory.

1.3 Personal statement

My own cultural background was shaped by the experiences of an early life spent growing up in a working class, patriarchal family in the North of England. My parents immigrated to New Zealand in 1967, when I was fifteen years old and my secondary education was completed in this country. I have experienced a varied personal and professional career; beginning with a bachelor's degree in Physics and an early career in environmental science, before becoming a high school teacher and now a university

lecturer with a doctorate in textile sciences. I have lived in many different parts of New Zealand and for the past sixteen years, I have been a single parent with one son, diagnosed with Asperger Syndrome. I would also describe myself as feminist, with a strong awareness of the need to acknowledge and to celebrate the diversities and differences among women that this affiliation represents, rather than emphasising any collective similarities among women that were traditionally associated with a claim to being feminist. In addition, I am increasingly aware of unresolved tensions between my own multiple selves - the personal, the professional and the cultural. As I approach the middle to later stages of my career, I find myself increasingly reflecting on the many experiences this path has given me and seeking to evaluate the extent to which the society that became my adopted home has shaped the person I am now, and whether my experiences are similar to, or different from, my women colleagues. Over the past sixteen years, while a parent, I have struggled with an awareness of conflict between the personal, family self and the professional. I have made choices (not always willingly) and with varying levels of success sought to resolve conflicting tensions that these choices created. Flexible work hours made it possible for me to continue as an academic, but sometimes I felt as though my career was hanging by a thread. Juggling the personal and the professional has been a constant part of my working life in the university, as I have tried, for example, to fathom how to blend school and university breaks so that I can use time for research and still spend quality time with my family. By sharing stories with other women can we unravel some of the many complex strands of our multiple lives? In doing so can we increase awareness of what it is like to be a teacher and researcher, a woman and a mother in the corporate university environment? Can we perhaps contribute to providing impetus for changing practices that contribute to the disempowerment of women in the university environment?

1.4 Overview of thesis structure

This thesis begins by reviewing the political and gendered structures of New Zealand society, with particular regard to the challenges that these structures may create for women. Critical attention is paid to how these issues impact on relationships between workplace and the other - family, cultural or personal issues - and which constrain women who must prioritise between them. Relevant feminist studies are explored in order to examine how ontological issues are incorporated in methodology and how these influence the approaches to research. My justification for the multi-method approach adopted, and the research methods themselves are discussed in chapter three. Chapter four explores academia through the tensions that most commonly emerge through the narratives of the five women who participated in this study. The diversity and complexity of experiences represented within these narratives, and the tensions and choices created by working within a modern academic institution are critiqued in the light of discourses identified through analysis of selected "official" narratives and personal reflections where they are relevant. All these complex strands

are woven together in chapter five. Recommendations are made for how further research could be developed in a way that empowers women, and how women could take steps that are needed to change the environment we work and live in.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview

The women whose narratives are interpreted in this research share a common thread through their participation in the environmental culture of the university workplace in New Zealand. However, as described in the preceding chapter, the tertiary workplace has undergone profound changes in response to the government's Neoliberal policies of the 1980s and 1990s. Because of the importance of these policies in determining the workplace environment, it is likely that they will be a significant feature in shaping the narratives of women's experiences at work. In this chapter therefore, the social and political structure of New Zealand society is discussed in more detail so as to identify issues that may be relevant to the marginalisation of women on the basis of gender, ethnicity or class. Literature relating to the gendered culture of the academic workplace, both within New Zealand and internationally is also examined and critiqued. Particular attention is given to the effects of the academic workplace culture on women's personal and professional lives, and how these are shaped by the broader political context, in ways that are not always of women's own choosing. Margins, interfaces, ambiguities and contradictions are identified. I begin by examining aspects of feminist theorising that are of particular relevance in driving my reading and in guiding my approach to the present research and my interpretation of the narratives. Since many workplace policies are underpinned by a discourse of "equal opportunity", feminist attitudes to equality between the sexes, and critique of this equality discourse are particularly relevant.

2.2 Feminist theory

Feminism and politics are closely intertwined, since traditionally feminism rests its foundations on moral opposition to patriarchal¹ structures of society. Many feminists see the subordination of women, in relation to men, as pervasive through all spheres of society.

"Yet women's inclusion in education, the franchise, public life and the labour market have been on terms designed to meet the needs of individual men, unfettered by ties of motherhood, childcare and domestic labour. Women seeking inclusion have had to negotiate the conflicting demands made upon them by their dual role as best they could on an individual basis."
(Weedon, 1997, p. 2).

Feminists often criticise contemporary society because of its failure to recognise that gender can be a barrier to social well-being and its role in reinforcing patriarchal assumptions about the role of women (and men); thus supporting the marginalisation of women in the family and the workplace (Cheyne et al., 2008; Lazar, 2005).

¹ Patriarchy is defined as the social power structures of society in which "women's interests are subordinated to the interests of men." Weedon, (1997, p. 2).

“From a feminist perspective, the prevailing conception of gender is understood as an ideological structure that divides people into two classes, men and women, based on a hierarchical relation of domination and subordination, respectively.” (Lazar, 2005, p. 6).

In New Zealand, as in many developed countries, studies have recognised the role of women as primary care-givers for young, sick and elderly in contributing to an imbalance in workload between the sexes, noting that many women, even when working full-time, still do more domestic labour than men (e.g. Bradley and Healey, 2008; Briar, Munford and Nash, 1992; Burns, Dwyer, Lambie and Lynch, 1999). Bradley and Healey (2008, p.19) reported that women in the United Kingdom were more likely than men to be found in part-time, seasonal or temporary employment that also tended to be poorly paid. To redress this imbalance, many feminists call for a more equal distribution of paid and unpaid work, and for equality of access to full employment and equal income.

There are many different forms of feminism but traditional definitions distinguish between liberal, radical and socialist/Marxist feminism, based essentially on their differing views of the causes of sexism in its different forms and on how to overcome gender-based injustices (Baxter, 2003; Reinhartz, 1992; Stanley, 1990). Key commonalities of traditional feminism (apart from recognition of its diverse and decentralised nature) include a belief that most women have some interests in common; that unjust/oppressive gender relations can be changed; that there are identifiable concepts of the boundaries of feminism that can be recognised (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002). A full review of the historical development of feminist thinking - from its roots in late 19th century female suffrage through the 1960s modernist feminism, including its protests against sex discrimination and struggles for equal opportunities for women, to the present day - is well beyond the scope of this thesis. My research and reading draws on selected elements of post-structuralist feminism and its recognition of the many identities women construct for themselves from their diverse experience. The university environment of the twenty-first century is a global institution, and it is likely that a wide range of experiences, roles and cultures may be represented in the participants of this study.

One aspect of post-structuralist feminism, and the associated methods of feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis (FPDA), is that of seeing women's identities as being continually negotiated and changed through social interactions (Baxter, 2003, p. 3). An important idea is that these interactions, meanings and identities change over time, as women's experiences of the social world and the languages used to construct meanings are themselves changing: *“Discourse constructs the social world in meaning, and that, owing to the fundamental instability of language, meaning can never be permanently fixed.” (Jorgensen and Philips, 2002, p. 6).*

Social interactions are closely intertwined with power structures in organizations, thus making some elements of the post-structuralist form of feminism particularly well suited to the analysis of discourses within organizations. Rather than making generalisations

about patriarchy and the collective subordination of women (as with older, more traditional forms of feminism), post- structuralist feminism stresses the importance of emphasising individual context-specific identities among women as a means through which to challenge the status quo and redress their disempowerment.

“Yet an FPDA perspective would suggest that the local meanings of talk always work within, represent and reconstitute broader discursive structures, relations and processes.” (Baxter, 2003, p. 12).

Some feminist researchers (e.g. Briar, 2009; Heward, 1996; Kettle, 1996) have drawn attention to the fact that many “equal-opportunity” policies in academic workplaces are not equal and may disadvantage women. Such policies they claim are often imbued with male-hegemonic criteria that many women may be unable or unwilling to adopt. Because discourses such as these that disadvantage women may potentially create tensions and frustrations for women as employees, they are of direct relevance to my research question. The extent to which this “equal-opportunity” discourse may disadvantage women in New Zealand universities thus needs to be examined, and feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis may prove a useful tool in this regard, because of its concerns not just with critiquing, but with redressing social injustices. The impact of post-colonialism may be one factor contributing to the power structures of New Zealand workplace relations that may cause them to differ from other countries. Hence before investigating the gendered nature of the New Zealand academy, some of the historical issues associated with New Zealand political culture and the development of gendered differences in this country are briefly examined in the next section.

2.3 Gender and culture in New Zealand – historical issues

The extent to which the factors of race, class and gender may dominate and marginalise women is likely to differ among different cultures throughout the world². In documenting the feminist movement as a key factor in the struggle for social justice, hooks (2000) notes that there are many women, for a variety of reasons, who are not in a position to make their voices heard through social and political organizations, and who are therefore marginalised. Other, more personal experiences can also be contributing

² I will use the term “culture” in a way that recognises both its holistic and fluid nature. Barker (2002, p. 67) defines culture as *“both a name for the domain in which contestation over value, meaning and practices takes place and a tool by which to intervene in social life. Thus the very debate over the meaning of the word ‘culture’ is itself a form of cultural politics. To talk about culture as a flow, as hybrid, as global, as constellations of temporary coherence, and so forth, is to celebrate difference and diversity.”* Culture is thus not necessarily the same as nationality, ethnicity or lifestyle, but includes less visible and more fundamental attributes such as attitudes, values, beliefs, behaviour and communication; and is subject to ongoing negotiation and change. This aspect of the fluidity and negotiation of culture is one that is most useful and relevant to the study of the changing cultures within a workplace context.

factors to marginalisation. There are a number of specific social, economic and cultural factors operating in New Zealand that make it seem likely that issues for women in this country may differ from those reported in other countries such as the United States, United Kingdom and Australia.

The impact of European colonialism is one major issue having unique and far reaching effects on women in New Zealand society extending from around 1840 to the present day. Cheyne et al. (2008) have documented how New Zealand's colonial history was characterised by high levels of migration from Europe and Britain in the late 1800s and early 1900s, contributing to the domination of an essentially European culture upon the indigenous Maori society. Partly because of this colonial history, class-based interests have never become entrenched in New Zealand politics to the extent that they have in the United Kingdom. Colonial New Zealand governments established a preference for ensuring community stability and well being through employment, rather than through provision of state welfare, and for developing social policies that focused on the traditional patriarchal family unit. The assumption made by successive colonial governments was that community stability could be improved by stable nuclear families and this led on to piecemeal welfare policies targeting particular sectors of the community perceived as in need, often to the detriment of other more disadvantaged groups – an approach that has persisted to this day.

“Far from being motivated by humanitarian concern, policy makers in the 1890s have been shown to have very mixed intent. Controlling the poor was much more important than improving their condition. Social services provided were handed out with a miserly concern for economy and with an underlying moral imperative that blamed poverty on personal failing.” (Cheyne et al., 2008, p. 17).

During the late 1930s and 1940s successive Labour governments increased their provision of welfare services, with priorities being given to improved housing (e.g. through the provision of state housing), health care and full employment, thus setting the foundations for the “welfare state” of the mid-twentieth century (Belgrave, 2004). By the late 1960s New Zealand's welfare services were recognised as world class; however, this did not necessarily mean equal quality or access for all citizens. The family with the male wage earner at its centre remained the basic unit around which the policies were developed. Belgrave (2004) writes:

“Work was gendered between the man's role as breadwinner and the woman's role as mother and manager of the family. Full employment catered for the needs of men, but the bulk of the services developed in the late 1930s and the 1940s were focused on the gendered and domestic roles of mother and carer. The state house created an enclosed environment which acknowledged the especial status of women within the home, while the free primary health system, family benefits and even the household wage supported women in their domestic roles.” (Belgrave, 2004, p. 40).

While effects of such policies may have benefited many middle class European New Zealanders, others who did not fit the model of the nuclear family (e.g. the unpropertied, single parents, Maori, unemployed or homosexual) were often disadvantaged by them (Belgrave, 2004; Cheyne et al., 2008). The criteria for provision of welfare services were

often closely or arbitrarily defined, but the central focus of policy makers remained the woman who stayed at home and was financially dependent on the man. The idea of women having a career, or being the principal wage earner was not usually consistent with such policies (Cheyne et al., 2008, p. 31). Dual parent households remained the most common family type in the New Zealand 2006 census (41% of all families), but most recent projections to 2031 forecast this figure to decline, with greater increases in couples without children (up to 51% of all families) and one-parent families (up to 20% of all families) (Statistics New Zealand, 2008, p.5). Despite these trends, the male wage earner model has remained firmly entrenched in the minds of many as a desirable cultural norm.

Although at times New Zealand social welfare policy was considered innovative and experimental (e.g. 1930s and 1980s), social policies in recent years have increasingly stagnated or lagged behind the rest of the world (Cheyne et al., 2008; James and Saville-Smith, 1994). The late 1960s and early 1970s signalled changes in government policy directions, as the beginning of the recession and the expense of retaining the provisions of the welfare state became apparent. New policies tended to focus on the rights of the individual and on addressing more specific requirements of individual rights, rather than on the family, partly in response to the changing social climate. As the 1970s progressed, there was an increasing shift towards the Right. Policies were directed towards reducing the power of the state, deregulation of the economy and the dismantling of the welfare system; a shift that intensified with the 4th Labour government in 1984 and continued through to the 1990s. Reduced spending on welfare was aimed towards encouraging individuals to take more responsibility for meeting their own and their families' needs (Belgrave, 2004; Labrum 2004). The 1980s and 1990s saw a dramatic increase in the proportion of women in the workforce. However, despite this trend, it was apparent that the increased participation of women in the workplace was not on terms equal to those of men; women were (and still are) disadvantaged financially and socially within the workplace and the next sections examine some of these issues in more depth.

One of the most obvious disparities that have persisted for women in the workplace is that of pay. As with most other Westernised countries, there is a gender pay gap in New Zealand that can be attributed as due largely to gender discrimination (Doyle et al, 2004; Dwyer, 2008; James and Saville-Smith, 2004). While there was an increase in women's earnings relative to that of men from 72% to 78% following the implementation of the Equal Pay Act 1972, this rate has stagnated in recent years (Dwyer, 2006, p. 6). Analysis of the gender pay gap as reported in the New Zealand Income survey for the June 2009 quarter revealed that the mean weekly income from wages and salaries for females was \$688 and for males was \$992 (Statistics New Zealand, 2009. pp. 3, 4). The mean hourly ratio of wages for females to males showed that women earned 88.7% of the average male, only a small increase from 86.4% in 2006 (Dwyer, 2008, p. 6).

Income from all sources is also little changed since the 2006 census. In the June quarter 2009 the weekly income (from all sources) was \$430 for females (63% of that of males), while the 2006 census data listed median annual income (from all sources) for females as \$19,100 and for males as \$31,500 (a ratio of 60%) (Statistics New Zealand, 2008). Men in 2006 were more likely to be in paid full time work and worked longer hours; 75% of those earning over \$70,000 were men and 63% of those earning less than \$5000 were women in that year, thus suggesting that more women than men were more frequently located in lower paying and part-time employment, or had no paid work (Statistics New Zealand, 2009).

Dwyer (2006) points out that this disparity in gendered pay, as well as causing disadvantages for women, is also a cost in terms of lost earnings to the country as a whole. This factor, rather than issues of discrimination or equity, explains in part why the government is interested in closing the pay gap, and a Treasury funded study (Callister, 2005) suggested that social factors such as cost of childcare, tax disincentives, and the earnings of the male partner (in two parent families) may influence decisions about whether, where and to what extent a women "chooses" to return to work after raising a family. However, reasons for women's choices are likely to be extremely complex, encompassing a mix of financial, social and personal issues. Women's experiences at work may also be important.

The gender pay gap has been attributed to differences in skills and experience due largely to the fact that many women, because of children and other family responsibilities spend less time in the workforce; they may have an interrupted career often returning after a career break to lower occupational status. Women also spend a higher proportion of time in part time jobs, with lower pay rates (Callister, 2005; Dwyer, 2006). In recognition of some of these difficulties women experience in returning to work after absence and in combining work and family responsibilities, the National Advisory Council for the Employment of Women has recommended that employers provide increased opportunities for flexible work contracts, increase options for further education and create more equitable career pathways for women (Dwyer, 2008, pp. 9, 10).

While unaffordable childcare and lower rates of pay (particularly for part time work) are identified as barriers to women seeking full time work (Callister, 2005, p. 7; Dwyer, 2008), women also do more unpaid work than men (Mayer and Tikka, 2008). The first National Time Use Survey (1998/99) found that while men and women on average spent the same amount of time working, women averaged two hours a day more than men on unpaid work such as housework, caring for children and the elderly, regardless of whether or not they had children. Mothers with children did the greatest amount of unpaid work, averaging 2.6 hours a day more than men with children on unpaid work (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). To alleviate this workload and enable women to participate in paid work on more equal terms with men, the National Advisory Council for

the Employment of Women has called for government policies to “support a more integrated work/life balance” and for a more equal share of unpaid caring roles to be adopted by men (Dwyer, 2008, p7).

Feminists have long argued that management policies based on equality of individuals contributes to the disempowerment of women in New Zealand society, since women, because of their biological roles as child bearers and their greater participation in domestic activity are not only most often at an economic disadvantage but their conflicting multiple roles mean that competing for promotion on an equal basis with men is not easy (Cheyne et al., 2008, p. 99; James and Saville-Smith, 1994, p. 56; Ozkanli and White, 2008). For example, merit-based promotion schemes can have criteria that link to male orientated management characteristics, or women may be disadvantaged in access to male networking systems. Cheyne et al. (2008, p.106) call for the emphasis for women in New Zealand to be on equity (i.e. based on principles of fairness and social justice) rather than equality, and for studies of the effects of gender in this country to take account not just of different experiences between men and women, but between different groups of women in terms of other cultural factors such as age, ethnicity and class, since many of these other issues have potential to interact with and exacerbate gender disadvantages in complex ways.

There is ample evidence to indicate that Maori have long been disadvantaged in New Zealand society as a whole, including the education system and employment (e.g. Dwyer, 2008; Fleras and Spoonley, 1999; O’Sullivan, 2001; Purnell, 1996). For example Dwyer (2006, p.3) noted that Maori women’s hourly earnings were only 77.7% of men’s, while for Pacific women the rate dropped to 68.1% of the men’s hourly rate, compared with 86.6% for Pakeha women. Dwyer (2008, p. 5) also noted that the percentage unemployment for Maori and Pacific women, at 8.6% and 8% respectively and were both higher than for European women (2.6%). Figures for women of Asian or other ethnicities were not mentioned in either of these studies. Larner as early as 1993 suggested that the combined effects of migration, globalisation and marketisation of the New Zealand economy had potential to create an increasingly complex, diverse and fluctuating population:

“The globalization of capitalism and associated changes in migration patterns will result in the increasing complexity of relations within and between the categories of race, ethnicity, colonial status, class and gender. As a result it will become difficult to sustain fixed notions of identity and coalitions built out of ‘summing and subsuming parts’” (Larner, 1993, p. 98).

The extent to which recent changes in the ethnicity of the population due to migration both into and out of New Zealand are impacting on gender and cultural relationships within the New Zealand workplace and the experiences of women working in it has not yet been fully investigated or understood. The remainder of this chapter concentrates more specifically on the gendered nature of the tertiary education sector and recent policy changes, which are likely to impact differently on men and women academics. In

particular, the ways in which effects of Neoliberal strategies that promote “merit-based” competition amongst employees intersect with existing disadvantages experienced by women in paid employment so as to exacerbate the disempowerment of women in academia deserves investigation.

2.4 New Zealand socio-political structure and the university

The Third Way policies of the 1990s and beyond, while promoted as a less extreme, more socially responsible alternative to classical Neoliberalism, retained a strong focus on free market education. Policies encouraged competition among educational institutes for both students and funding, as this was thought to promote performance and efficiency. In their fourth report “Shaping the funding framework” (Tertiary Education Advisory Commission, 2001), the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission³ identified a number of problems with the existing research funding framework for tertiary institutions, including limited sources of funding, its volatility and short-term nature, lack of incentives for excellence, and lack of public accountability. All of these claims are consistent with principles of Public Choice Theory, Neoliberal and Third Way politics in the belief that competition encourages institutions to perform and requires them to be accountable for their performance (Lauder, 1990; Rudd, 1997; Whitty and Power, 2002). As a result of these perceived problems, TEAC made recommendations in December 2002 that the funding policy be reviewed and in July 2002, the Labour government set up a PBRF Working Group to develop the design for a new funding model. The Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) arose from the recommendations of the Working Group, and was first implemented in 2003, representing a major change in funding policy for tertiary education organizations. One of the claimed objectives of the PBRF was to:

“ensure that excellent research in the tertiary education sector was encouraged and rewarded” (Tertiary Education Commission, 2009, para.1).

The discourses created around this concept of “excellent research” (including its identification, encouragement and rewarding thereof) will be investigated in more depth in chapter four.

The PBRF evaluation process involves assessing the research performance of Tertiary Education Organisations against three differently weighted criteria, and funding them to a level based on their performance score⁴. Although the amount of funding is based on the aggregate score of the organisation, the unit of assessment is the individual. In other words researchers within the organisation who meet the criteria for inclusion are

³ The Tertiary Education Advisory Commission later became the Tertiary Education Commission
⁴ *“The PBRF model has three elements:*

to reward and encourage the quality of researchers - 60 percent of the fund

to reflect research degree completions - 25 percent of the fund

to reflect external research income - 15 percent of fund

The major element, the Quality Evaluation, is held periodically. The first was completed in 2003 and the second, a partial round, was held in 2006. The next full round of the Quality Evaluation will take place in 2012.” (Tertiary Education Commission, 2009, para. 4).

individually assessed, according to set criteria (Tertiary Education Commission, 2009) and in this respect, the New Zealand assessment differed from the Research Assessment Process (RAE) already operating in the United Kingdom (Willmott, 2003). The PBRF assessment is also compulsory. This compulsory evaluation process, together with the policy of the Tertiary Education Commission to release individual scores back to the institution and what happens to these scores afterwards, has been a major cause for contention since its inception (Codd, 2006; Dalziel, 2005). In particular, individual experiences and effects of participating in this process on individuals (in terms of extra workload and stresses involved) have not yet been fully investigated.

The culture of managerialism, has led to the development and updating of existing systems for tighter control and monitoring in the workplace, that are both additional to and complementary to the PBRF and include performance assessment of both academic and general staff (Fitzsimons, 2004). Following the example set by governments in the United Kingdom (Cotterill and Waterhouse, 1998; Willmott, 2003), New Zealand universities have seen the development of increasingly powerful and hierarchical management structures, with reduced involvement in decision making for those staff at lower levels of the hierarchy (Dalziel, 2005). The PBRF signalled a change in the process of research management for universities. PBRF has provided a strong impetus for managers to intensify research management, to provide incentives for academic staff to increase the quality and quantity of research "outputs", and to regularly monitor and collect information about that research (Miller, Roderick and Sawicka, 2006). Research into the effectiveness, implementation and cost of this process is ongoing and intensive, both within institutions and nationally (Bakker et al., 2006; Tertiary Education Commission, 2009).

Research assessment processes in the United Kingdom (RAE) have reportedly increased competition rather than collaboration among institutes (Willmott, 2003). As with the RAE, inequities in the PBRF system have been identified in New Zealand that include assessment flaws in terms of fairness, transparency and confidentiality (Dalziel, 2005). The role of PBRF in discouraging new researchers has also been questioned with claims of increased competition amongst institutions for experienced academics with established track records at the expense of emerging researchers, counter to the claimed intentions of the policy (Adams, 2008; Hall, Morris Matthews and Sawicka, 2003). The disadvantages of this system to early career researchers are further exacerbated by the ability of successful researchers to negotiate reduced teaching and administrative loads on the basis of funding acquired in order to concentrate on research. The pressure to publish has often been accompanied by increased teaching and administrative loads among academics striving for efficiency, recognition and promotion, adding to their workloads. These claims will be investigated more fully in chapter four, however it is worth now looking at the gendered nature of the university

workplace, in order to identify issues that might create tension or conflict for women academics, in line with my research question.

2.5 Implications for women of changes in the academic workplace

The workplace and the nature of work have changed dramatically over the past two decades as a result of the processes of “globalisation”. As companies strive for competitive advantage in the marketplace, many new features designed to minimise costs and maximise profits have emerged. Bradley and Healy (2008, pp. 9-13) have identified the following:

- Increasing participation of women in the workforce (often on casual, low-paid, fixed-term or part-time contracts);
- Tighter control of employees through bureaucratic organization and managerialist strategies;
- Longer working hours; the blurring of boundaries between leisure, family commitments and work;
- Reduced emphasis on career continuity and the proliferation of individual employment contracts; emphasis on flexibility and lifelong learning.

These issues are of particular significance with regard to the potential impact of the gendered academic environment on the experiences of women, and how they can create tensions for women employees will be discussed in the following sections.

Although the proportion of women academics that participate in the academic workforce as a whole has increased steadily since the early 1980s, males tend to be more numerous than females at the top of university hierarchies. For example, Heward (1996) presented statistical evidence regarding the numbers of women employed in the university sector showing that in the United Kingdom, while the numbers of women in undergraduate study increased steadily from 28.6% in the 1930s to 45% in the 1990s, the proportion of women academic staff increased much more slowly from 9.9% to 21%. Furthermore the number of women in senior posts (i.e. above lecturer grade) remained static at around 10%, while the proportion of women on short-term contract positions was relatively higher in comparison with men. Examination of the gender and power structures in the tertiary sector led Heward to conclude that in the United Kingdom, despite the introduction in the 1990s of “equal opportunities policies”, many women remained in lower status, poorly paid “feminine” jobs. This was attributed primarily to discriminatory practices in staff selection and promotion that favoured males:

“They [policies] do not address the institutionalisation of hegemonic masculinities in genderized assumptions about, for example, merit. It is assumed that the concepts, such as merit, underlying staff selection and promotion procedures, are universal and objective. Women’s problems with promotion, it is thought, are associated with their domestic responsibilities, which are ameliorated with career breaks and crèches.” (Heward, 1996 p. 16).

Women's participation in senior management in New Zealand universities (Human Rights Commission, 2008, p. 74) is similarly increasing very slowly. In 2007 women held only 19.19% of senior academic positions (professor or associate professor), rising from 16.91% in the 2005 census, compared with 15.82% in the 2003 census. While six universities (Canterbury, Auckland, Lincoln, Victoria, Waikato and Otago) increased their proportions of senior women academics, the remaining two universities (Auckland University of Technology and Massey) actually showed a decline in the proportion of women occupying senior management positions. In a study of women academics at Massey University, Doyle et al. (2004, p. 15), similarly reported fewer women than men in senior academic positions.

While there is an obvious lack of participation by women at higher levels in tertiary institutions, the lower echelons of academia reveal a different story. Doyle et al. (2004, p.15) at Massey University found that women were more likely to be employed part-time and less likely to be employed as permanent or tenured staff. Women appeared to be less mobile in their employment, and although they were more likely to have begun their career at Massey than were men, women typically had shorter career tracks. Doyle et al. suggested these trends were symptomatic of an interrupted career due possibly to childrearing and family responsibilities. This observation is in agreement with the findings of Bradley and Healey (2009) and Heward (1996) who challenged the traditional discourse of "career" as an assumed linear advancement for women as being unfavourable to women's lifestyle choices which include family and perhaps periods of temporary employment. Doyle et al. reported little difference in the hours worked by male and female academics at Massey University, with both sexes claiming to work on average about 49 hours a week, and along with Dwyer (2008) called for more emphasis to be placed by employers on creating family friendly workplaces.

Gender disadvantages may also be perpetuated through existing norms about management practices, behaviours and styles. Studies in the 1990s and early this century have identified universities as patriarchal institutions, infused with male hegemonic discourses and management practices at all organisational levels (e.g. Acker, 1991; Cotterill and Waterhouse, 1998; Mackinnon and Brooks, 2001; Mayer and Tikka, 2008; Neale, 2009; Ozkanli and White, 2008). In one study of the views of women academics on working conditions and management styles, Thomas (1998) questioned thirty-four women in two different British universities (one "traditional" and one "ex-polytechnic") using semi-structured interviewing techniques:

"In both universities, the women respondents commented that the recent changes in the management of higher education had a marked effect on the nature of academic work and professional identity. There was a general consensus that working conditions had worsened and that the job was less pleasurable, with longer hours, greater stress, greater pressures to perform, increased monitoring and accountability all being cited by the interviewees" (Thomas, 1998. p. 93).

All these highly competitive (masculine) qualities are in direct conflict with the values of co-operation and egalitarianism held by many women; yet opposing them risks being seen as “not performing”, placing those women who do so at a disadvantage regarding their own career advancement (Ozkanli and White, 2008). As Ozkanli and White rightly point out, gendered power relations often favour males (for example strategic or promotional decisions are normally made by predominantly male senior managers). Many women may not willingly choose to opt out of the promotional path, but may have it forced upon them by the need to balance their other commitments such as children and family (Ozkanli and White, 2008).

Acker (1991) and Blackmore and Sachs (2001) claim that women work differently to men, and especially women in management who tend to make decisions on the basis of negotiation and consultation, rather than on the basis of independent evidence and judgements. Blackmore (1999) found that women who did adopt more aggressive management styles that were typically viewed as being “male” were often regarded with hostility and suspicion:

“In particular, strong women are difficult and dangerous because they trouble dominant masculinities and modes of management by being different. Feminists are particularly disruptive because they seek social change to achieve gender justice. As both insiders (as managers) and outsiders (as women) in male dominated cultures, women in leadership are often positioned as change agents, and as such often bear the brunt of organizational and personal anxieties.” (Blackmore, 1999, p. 3).

Blackmore (1999) suggested that while their “feminine” leadership styles may disadvantage women in higher educational institutes, it may be that many women do not want to change their ways of working, and why should they? Instead, we should challenge the hegemony of the discourses that require them to do so:

“The tendency to treat the issue of women in leadership in dominant management discourse as merely a matter of upgrading women’s skills to meet the demands of current modes of leadership is also blind to the gender politics of educational changes. Educational restructuring, with its emphasis on efficiency, accountability and outcomes, privileges ‘hard’ management and entrepreneurial discourses of leadership over less instrumental, more holistic and ‘softer’, ‘feminized’ leadership discourses. The former discourses decontextualize, distort, and depoliticize the issue of gender in their refusal to see how educational restructuring and shifts in cultural values continue to reshape and indeed constrain, the possibilities for feminist leadership practices.” (Blackmore, 1999, p. 3).

The goal of “equal opportunities” is problematic due to hidden assumptions that the normative male values within the culture of tertiary organizations are equitable and fair, and because the goal of being equal to these male values is not necessarily one that women aspire to (Kettle, 1996; Mayer and Tikka, 2008). Attitudinal and hegemonic barriers such as networking systems that exclude women are a feature of many universities (Blackmore, 1999; Curtis and Phibbs, 2006; Heward 1996; Kettle, 1996; Neale, 2009). Senior staff meetings, for example, may have fewer women participants, thus reducing the opportunity for women to have their say in policy making processes and perpetuating male hegemony (Ozkanli and White, 2008). Curtis and Phibbs (2006)

claimed that because women were less likely than men to have obtained their doctorate at an overseas university, their access to international networks was more restricted.

There is also evidence that processes such as promotions are gendered. Apart from the obvious disadvantages that lack of access to networks and power structures may create for women in attempting to raise their profile within an institution, the competitive nature of the promotion application process itself could act to the detriment of women who may consequently be reluctant to put themselves forward (Blackmore, 1999; Neale, 2009). Heward (1996) stressed the importance of women “having confidence, and especially seeing themselves as academically “able” in order to compete against males for promotion, but then cautioned that adopting a more male-oriented management style might expose them to criticism from their female colleagues (p. 18):

“Behaviour such as assertiveness, self confidence and self-advertisement, which is praised in men, may be criticized as unfeminine and risk alienation from women colleagues.” (Heward, 1996, p. 18).

These observations were supported by Doyle et al., (2004), who found that fewer women applied for promotion than men at Massey University, although those that did apply were equally or more successful on average. These researchers questioned why women tended not to put themselves forward, suggesting that either perceived difficulties associated with meeting or complying with the criteria, or lack of encouragement to apply may be barriers. Ozkanli, de Lourdes Machado, White, O’Connor, Riorden and Neale (2009) found that apart from the promotional processes themselves, barriers for New Zealand and Australian women academics included interrupted careers and lack of mobility due to family responsibilities. These authors also claimed that although senior managers were aware of these gendered inequalities, the extent to which organisational structures and cultures were responsible for supporting inequality was not recognised, perhaps explaining why they had changed so little.

In summary, the factors that may contribute to the marginalisation of women academics in New Zealand are likely to be complex, and will differ according to individual circumstances. There is little doubt that the university is a gendered institution, but the ways in which this contributes to creating conflict and tension for women are likely to be complex and varied. While there is evidence that marginalization exists, it is only by listening to narratives from women themselves that these complexities can be unraveled and the nature of women’s experiences be understood. If the practices that contribute to these conflicts are to be challenged, it is essential to first hear our stories.

Chapter 3

APPROACH TO THE RESEARCH

3.1. Introduction

This research uses mixed methods incorporating qualitative analysis and interpretation of academic women's narratives, selected elements of feminist methodologies and critical reflection. This chapter looks at my methodologies and approaches to the research. Different ways of thinking have different ways of creating and justifying knowledge (Carroll, 2005; Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002). One important implication is that both the research question, and consequently the approaches chosen are strongly influenced by the theoretical perspective of the researcher, that in turn depends on personal views held about knowledge and the world itself:

“a methodology shows how research questions are articulated with questions asked in the field. Its effect is a claim about significance.” (Clough and Nutbrown, 2007, p. 23).

It is thus essential to evaluate my own methodological stance in order to ensure consistency with the research question, and ultimately with the outcomes of that research.

“Each methodology links a particular ontology (for example a belief that gender is social rather than natural) and a particular epistemology (a set of procedures for establishing what counts as knowledge) in providing rules that specify how to produce valid knowledge of social reality (for example the real nature of particular gender relations).” (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002, p. 172).

In formulating the research question and the methods, the purpose of the research must be taken into account (e.g. whether it is for changing policies, for changing practices, for personal or professional development), since the purpose may guide or constrain the choice of methodology and/or method (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2006; Clough and Nutbrown, 2007). This is particularly true for feminist research, which often includes the goal of critiquing discriminatory practices or social injustices that may emerge as a consequence of the research, since these goals might influence the researcher's interpretations and compromise the validity of the research if they are not made transparent. The next section examines in more detail the goals of feminist research.

3.2 Feminist methodologies

The findings of feminist research are often at odds with the values and knowledge of dominant and more powerful societal groups, so it is particularly important that feminist researchers fully justify their methodological approaches in order to validate their feminist knowledge (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002). Because gender may be only one factor that influences values, knowledge, behaviours and interpretations, feminist methodology must withstand rigorous critique. In seeking a framework for feminist

discourse analysis, Lazar (2005) warns us that complex, interdependent and fluid meanings can have different interpretations and thus can be used both for challenging and for reinforcing the social order in ways other than what is intended:

“the relationship between discourse and the social is a dialectical one, in which discourse constitutes and is constituted by, social situations, institutions and structures. The notion of constitution applies in the sense that every act of meaning-making through spoken and written language use and other forms of semiosis contributes to the reproduction and maintenance of the social order, and also in the sense of resisting and transforming that order”. (Lazar, 2005, p. 11).

Feminist research thus tends to be characterised by a focus on clear articulation of the underlying ontological, epistemological and methodological principles.

“Feminist notions of social transformation are rooted in varied experiences of gender subordination, expressed in varied theories of gender and power, and incorporate a range of moral and political judgments on what constitutes injustice.” (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002, p. 6).

Feminist research is often highly political by virtue of its aims to critique and expose male dominated disciplines and processes, and in seeking to redress perceived disadvantages for women. Hence feminist methodologies provide a powerful approach for questioning the extent to which masculine and managerialist discourses have shaped the experiences of women academic employees.

Feminist methodologies, particularly critical approaches often include personal narratives or experiences to interpret contexts, so predictably this approach is widely criticised for its political agenda and for lack of scientific objectivity (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis may also be questioned on its ability to effectively promote the goals of emancipation as it claims to do. However, there is little doubt of its ability to draw attention to inequalities and injustices, hence its relevance to the present work. Feminism and critical discourse analysis have much in common, since feminist discourse analysis has, as it's main goal:

“critiquing discourses which sustain a patriarchal social order: that is, relations of power that systematically privilege men as a social group and disadvantage, exclude and disempower women as a social group.” (Lazar, 2005, p. 5).

Therefore these two approaches, my position in regard to them and how they guide the methods chosen will be the main focus of the following sections.

3.3 Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis seeks to challenge and redress perceived social injustices so as to provide equality for all members of society (Cohen et al., 2007; Crotty, 1998; Fairclough, 1989).

“Critical theory and critical educational research then, have their substantive agenda – for example examining and interrogating: the relationships between school and society - how schools perpetuate or reduce inequality, the social construction of knowledge and curricula, who defines worthwhile knowledge, what ideological interests this serves and how this reproduces inequality in society; how power is produced and reproduced through education; whose interests

are served by education and how legitimate these are (e.g. the rich, white, middle-class males rather than poor non-white, females).” (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 28).

Neilson (2005) endorses the usefulness of this approach in relation to individuals with disabilities who may be marginalised by the discourses of more dominant and powerful groups.

Areas of proven value of the critical theory approach are summarised by Cohen et al. (2007). Critical discourse analysis is often used when the research has a political context, since in order to elucidate hidden values, tensions and assumptions behind policy, it is necessary to critically examine not only the effects of the policy, but the policy discourse itself (Johnstone, 2008). For the purposes of the present research I will use the term “discourse” in its wider sense to include text (written, spoken or semantic), practices and the ideologies or power structures represented within text (Wodak, 2008). Researchers employing critical discourse analysis should not accept without question the agendas, values or ideologies of others, but should seek to identify and expose the power relationships between different cultural and political groups:

“Critical enquiry keeps the spotlight on power relationships within society so as to expose the forces of hegemony and injustice. It is at all times alive to the contribution that false consciousness makes to oppression and manipulation and invites researchers and participants (ideally one and the same) to discard false consciousness, open themselves to new ways of understanding, and take effective action for change.” (Crotty, 1998, p. 157).

Critical discourse analysis attempts to expose and then oppose restricting ideologies embedded within policies and questions existing social conventions in order to identify conflicts and inconsistencies. For transparency and fairness, researchers should not claim to be neutral and devoid of political interest (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Any personal beliefs, political agendas or values likely to influence their critique should be declared.

Analysis of text requires a focus on **language** (e.g. vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, syntax), together with identification of the language **genre**, defined as:

“ a particular usage of language which participates in, and constitutes, part of a particular social practice, for example, an interview genre, a news genre or an advertising genre.” (Jorgensen and Philips, 2002, p. 69).

In analysing discourse, it is particularly important to pay close attention not only to the discourse itself but also to the discursive practices such as the historical conditions, means and context through which texts are themselves both created and subsequently received and interpreted. The researcher must look beyond the text and its practices of production and interpretation to delve into the hidden meanings and ideologies that lie beneath (Van Dijk, 2008). Fairclough (1995) and Johnstone (2008) stress the importance of including analysis of the form and organization of the content as indicators of socio-cultural practices and relations, and the changes in these over time. When examining the discourses of organisations, it may be necessary to examine a range of different types of texts and/or seek different perspectives on the issues (Wodak, 2008).

Texts themselves may be linked through a process of intertextuality, in which the discourses embedded in one document, topic or text, for example draws upon those of another (Wodak, 2008). Omissions from text can also be a meaningful indication of the culture of an organisation:

“The distinction between what is explicit and what is implicit in a text is of considerable importance in sociocultural analysis. Analysis of implicit content can provide valuable insights into what is taken as given, as common sense. It also gives a way into ideological analysis of texts, for ideologies are generally implicit assumptions.” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 6).

Examination of implicit assumptions within text is often employed by feminists as a tool to elucidate hidden gender values. Policies and practices for example, are likely to be particularly relevant to the analysis of workplace discourses in the present research. In the light of the many recent structural and organisational changes in the New Zealand tertiary sector, it is important to be particularly attentive to any discursive changes that are a feature of today's rapidly changing academic and political environments.

Jorgensen and Philips (2002) warn that political ideologies, often found in large institutions or societies, can often distort reality:

“ According to critical discourse analysis, discourses can be more or less ideological. The more ideological discourses are those that give a distorted representation of reality (misrepresentation) and thus contribute to the maintenance of relations of domination in society.” (Jorgensen and Philips, 2002, p. 181).

Analysis of power structures within organisations on the basis of text is based on recognition that within the organization there is an ideology that may be found in the commands, orders, instructions embedded within the discourse of the organisation, and that is understood by the members of that organisation:

“This framework, which consists of socially shared, interest-related fundamental cognitions of a group and its members, is mainly acquired, confirmed, or changed through communication and discourse.

Most forms of social power in our society imply this kind of ‘mental control’, typically exercised through persuasion or other forms of discursive communication, or resulting from fear of sanctions by A in case of non-compliance by B with A’s wishes.” Van Dijk (2008, p. 29).

This pervasive aspect of power structures and discourse in people's worldviews and conversations may potentially pose problems when researching within one's own institution. Critical evaluation of the extent to which the workplace discourse may distort the views of both the researcher and the participants is essential.

“Discursive power is often directly or indirectly persuasive and, therefore features reasons, arguments, promises, examples or other rhetorical means that enhance the probability that recipients build the desired mental representations. One crucial strategy in the concealment of power is to persuade the powerless that wanted actions are in their own interests.” (Van Dijk, 2008, p. 63).

In busy, pressurised environments like the workplace, many women may not have had the time or the opportunity to reflect on the ways in which discourses shape their working lives. This may lead to acceptance of the ideologies and discourses they are confronted with, and as such can be viewed as a form of powerlessness. Questions that

may be asked of discourses include: Who can say or write what to whom and in what situations? Who has access to the forms or genres of discourse or to the means of its reproduction? How does an individual negotiate a different role or position within the organisation? Who are the “symbolic elites” and how are they portrayed within the institution? How do the elites exert influence over the less powerful? How might the discourse exert “false consciousness” that may lead the dominated group to act against their own best interests? Critical discourse analysis thus is a productive method for analysis and critique of workplace relationships. However, because there are issues of gender disempowerment associated with the university workplace, feminist methodologies are an essential component of my research.

Once the power imbalance is exposed, can it be changed in an environment where women are already too busy or too stressed? I am hoping that this research may stimulate critical reflection on this issue, for both participants and audience. Feminist post structuralist discourse, while having much in common with the principles of critical discourse analysis described above, seeks to identify specific issues that may contribute to the disempowerment of women, and this will be examined next.

3.4 Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis

One recent newcomer to the plethora of methodologies associated with feminism is that of feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis (FPDA), described by Baxter (2003) as containing elements of both conversational analysis and critical discourse analysis, yet possessing distinctive features as a method in its own right. The epistemological premises upon which FPDA rests are similar to those of critical discourse analysis in that discourse is recognised as a social practice, with gender being just one aspect of the subject’s identity, recognised as being performative rather than possessive. As with critical discourse analysis, meaning is thought to be historically and socially constructed. Deconstruction or analysis of discourses/texts enables the power relationships to be identified and exposed; values and assumptions are then questioned and critiqued from a feminist perspective.

One of the strengths of FPDA relevant to this study is that it can allow the views of marginal groups to be heard. There is no fixed polarisation into powerful (male) vs. less powerful (female) agendas, and by looking beyond these commonly held gendered assumptions a more complex interplay of many different discourses for many speakers can result. FPDA is non-materialistic since all events and speakers operate through discourses that are both socially constructed and individually interpreted (Baxter, 2003):

“feminist post-structuralist theory is concerned to identify the versions of subjective reality available to women, and the competing social and political interests which sustain these versions. It aims to describe and critique these different versions of femininity, as well as the multiple, but not unlimited range of subject positions pertaining to each version.” (Baxter, 2003, p. 31).

These goals would seem particularly appropriate for an academic setting where there is likely to be a long-standing culture of academic, pedagogical, philosophical and cultural debate, in contrast to say a corporate environment where the institutional goals are more clearly defined.

3.5 Critical reflection

The importance of first exploring/reflecting upon one's own past in order to elucidate hidden values, beliefs and conflicts that might influence the interpretation of information from both textual and narrative sources is identified by Weiler (1999). Weiler's narrative history of women teachers provides a useful exemplar for a research method that includes self-critical reflection on the sources of one's own knowledge that is relevant for my study:

"When I undertook this history, I held the unexamined belief that I could come to understand the lives of these women and that in writing their history I would provide witness to their valuable and unrecognised worth. But when I began formal research into this world through interviewing retired teachers and reading local school records and state documents, these guiding assumptions became less sure. I came to see more clearly that the social and cultural world of my mother and other teachers was built on the assumptions of white and Protestant hegemony. And what I saw as autonomy and pride in their work coexisted uneasily with evidence of increasing state control and community surveillance. (Weiler, 1999, p. 43).

Recognising the effect of one's own perspectives is especially important because one's personal status can influence interpretation of the social realities of others. Failure to declare personal positions on key issues may confuse and mislead those trying to understand the researcher's interpretations. Overall (1998) raises a major problem with the legitimacy of individual personal experience, and cautions against the dangers of over-generalisation from a single member of a minority group (including the self) to the group as a whole:

"Failure to be aware of one's personal history and social identity in philosophical enquiry could cause one uncritically to take one's personal situation as universally applicable, or to fail to notice those aspects of one's identity that compromise one's understanding of, for example, a moral issue". (Overall, 1998, p. 193).

This is a really important point, one that I need to be particularly careful about when evaluating my own personal work narratives. An agenda for critical reflection should include reflection on the extent to which personal experiences might colour any interpretation and analysis, and how one might accommodate/empathise with views that may differ from one's own. Keeping a reflective journal allows personal experiences to be recorded as they occur and then revisit these experiences later as required (Holly, 1997). Thus personal experiences can be returned to and reflected upon in the light of new experiences, or with hindsight, and can be compared with narratives or stories from other women or institutions in order to seek common themes or differences.

3.6 Narratives

Methods based on listening to narratives are common in feminist research, particularly because of its concern with listening to the experiences of women in order to identify sources of discrimination and disempowerment (Gill, Matthews, Zannettino, and Carroll, 2008; Liamputtong, 2009, p.9). For example, Clarke (2001) uses narratives based on her interpretation of both written and oral responses to pre-presented interview questions in order to understand how women's identities are constructed through complex interactions among their multiple roles of work, education and personal lives. Clarke also acknowledges the importance of personal and critical reflection on one's own life history in order to gain more insight into the complexities of multiple selves:

"When we tell stories about our lives we construct these within larger narratives or discourses which provide criteria for evaluating the actions of, for example, the good mother, the serious student or the enterprising worker. Critically reviewing the stories that had been transcribed from our interviews enabled these women to consider other possible directions or courses of action which the central characters might have taken. This was not a question of seeing the error of their ways, but of seeing how their identities are constructed through multiple, changing and often contradictory discourses of work, education and domestic life." (Clarke, 2001, p. 4).

Munro (1995) in researching the life histories of three women teachers combines the multiple methods of life history narrative with document analysis and personal reflection, using techniques based on cultural ethnography, providing a useful exemplar of integration of these multiple methods.

"Life history method can also provide a research methodology that addresses feminist concerns that research be situated contextually, challenges the norm of objectivity by acknowledging the intersubjective process of meaning making and be collaborative and reciprocal. Lastly by providing opportunities that allow people to become "visible and to enhance reflexive consciousness"...the life history process can address feminist concerns that research be empowering and transformative." (Munro, 1995, p. 141).

In her feminist post-structuralist study of women and retirement, Carroll (2005) used mixed methods that included a structured questionnaire, reciprocal conversations, and a series of four semi-structured interviews conducted over a period of 18 months to explore issues faced over this transitional time of their lives. Carroll reflected upon her own experiences as well as inviting reflective comments from the participants (for example through follow up discussions, emails) in her evaluation of the richness and diversity of issues facing women in planning for and experiencing retirement. This concern with the construction of meanings in context and for "reflexive consciousness" or reflecting on meanings and/or challenging inequalities found within is one element of feminist research that is of relevance for the present study.

A feminist perspective is relevant for my research, since my aim is to examine the experiences of women in today's rapidly changing institutional context - to construct and/or challenge meanings from their experiences, and to use these experiences to draw attention to any unjust, patriarchal or discriminatory practices that may influence freedom of choice. As discussed in the introduction, I will seek answers to the question: How have recent organisational changes in the tertiary education sector shaped

tensions for academic women in New Zealand? Jipson, Munro, Victor, Froude Jones and Freed- Rowland (1995) pinpoint the need to justify one's personal **motives** for asking such questions:

"In taking up an identity as teachers, were we positioning ourselves actively in resistance to traditional patriarchal impositions, or was our concern with being impositional merely one more struggle within the culturally inscribed construction of women in which teachers are positioned as nurturers and facilitators, denying their other roles as active meaning-makers."(Jipson et al., 1995, p. 7).

In the present research, I will seek to understand women's experiences within the academic sector, in order to identify any gender-based discriminatory practices, while also acknowledging likely complex interactions between gender and other factors such as race/ethnicity and class. My research methods developed from aspects of these feminist methodologies are presented next.

3.7 Methods

A mixed or multi- method approach is used in this study, similar to that adopted by (Carroll, 2005) in her study of Australian women and retirement and by Weiler (1999) in her study of American women teachers. The methods have three components: Critical discourse analysis; narratives; and critical reflection.

3.7.1 Critical discourse analysis

The goal of the textual analysis is identification and critiquing of the discourses that frame the tertiary institution, drawing on some elements from a feminist post-structural perspective. The analysis questions how the discourses have changed since the 1990s, and how are women positioned within these discourses. Three written texts are examined using a framework for questioning the discourses, that I have developed drawing on methods described by Fairclough (1995), Jorgensen and Philips (2002), Van Dijk (2008), Wodak (2008) and Wodak and Meyer (2001). The three texts selected include one text from each of three different strategic policy levels, from governmental to institutional, all of which are available in the public domain. By choosing one policy text from each level, I hope to identify whether there are any inter-textual links among discourses, practices and/or genres, with the workplace providing the background context in which these discourses/practices and genres are enacted. My framework for textual analysis is presented in Appendix 1, and details of the three documents are below.

Document 1: Government (cabinet) policy document

Tertiary Education Strategy 2007-2012 Incorporation Statement of Tertiary Education Priorities 2008-2010.

(TES/STEP)(<http://www.tec.govt.nz/templates/standard.aspx?id=1183>).

The Tertiary Education Strategy (Ministry of Education, 2007) sits at the top of the political hierarchy of the three documents analysed, since this document provides the

primary signal to the TEC and to tertiary institutes of the government's priorities for tertiary education policy from 2007 to 2012, and as such the document is used to guide strategic planning and decision making within these organizations:

"It sets out the government's expectations and priorities for New Zealand's tertiary education system. It will guide the Tertiary Education Commission's investment decisions and act as a reference point for the government's policy making and relationship with the sector." (Michael Cullen, TES, Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 1).

Document 2: Policy Implementation Document

Adams, J. (2008). Strategic Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund. The Assessment Process. June 2008. (<http://www.tec.govt.nz>).

At the policy implementation level, I have selected for analysis the report by Adams (2008) "*Strategic Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund. The Assessment Process*". This report is a review of the 2006 PBRF evaluation round, commissioned by the TEC. I chose the report by Adams (2008) for analysis because of the pervasive influence of the PBRF assessment process on the workplace. The TEC, established by government, is the organisation responsible for liaising between government and the tertiary education sector, and for the implementation of policy. The review, by Dr Jonathan Adams (Evidence Ltd, UK) forms Phase 2 of the "Independent strategic review of New Zealand's Performance –Based Research Fund", and is the second part of a planned three stage Evaluation strategy⁵. At the time of writing, the PBRF Sector Reference Group, again established by TEC,⁶ is considering the Phase 2 report and submissions received in order to develop the assessment process for 2012.

Document 3. Tertiary Education Institute Public Document

Massey University. Annual Report 2008, (http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/about-us/council-management-and-strategic-plans/policy-guide/policy-guide_home.cfm).

At the level of the tertiary institute, I have selected the most recent Annual Report of Massey University (2008)⁷. The Annual Report was selected because it is a public document whose purpose is to provide a summary of the status of the institution, together with the management's evaluation of its strengths, limitations and future directions (O'Brien, 2006). The Financial Reporting Act (1993) requires large profit-making companies to provide audited financial statements in compliance with

⁵ The three review phases being: Phase 1 design and implementation of the 2003 quality evaluation; phase 2 a more detailed review and evaluation of the wider impacts of the PBRF on the tertiary education sector; phase 3 will be an evaluation of whether the PBRF has fulfilled its stated objectives and whether overall benefits have exceeded the costs."(Web research Ltd, 2004). The outcomes of the first review (Web Research Ltd, 2004) are presented in the document entitled "*Phase 1 evaluation of the implementation of the PBRF and the conduct of the 2003 quality evaluation*".

2. Criteria for membership are that the committee "represents an appropriate range of participating TEOs; has an appropriate balance in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity; has the knowledge and expertise necessary to provide informed, dispassionate, and reliable advice; represents an appropriate range of academic disciplines and academic research managers; includes academic staff at different points in their careers; and includes some members with a non-academic research background." (Tertiary Education Commission, 2009)

⁷ The mission statement from this document is included in Appendix 2, for convenience.

International Financial Reporting Standards, within five months of the end of their financial year, and the annual report is the vehicle used to present these (Wagner, 2005). I will focus my analysis on the discourses pertaining to the social, economic and cultural climate of the university, and how these link to discourses found in the other two documents selected for this study, the Tertiary Education Strategy (Ministry of Education, 2007) and Adams (2008). The annual report has no single attributable author, but draws on a number of sources; consistency in both writing style and personal perspective of the author is therefore difficult to achieve. While the university is a large corporate body, it is also a public institution dependent on both government and private funding. Furthermore, universities are primarily service providers rather than generators of products, so their strategic goals will differ from traditional profit-oriented companies. Annual reports are usually written with a varied readership in mind including financial managers, potential investors, competitors, lending institutions, government bodies, staff and students (or parents), who may wish to analyse the report for a variety of different reasons. The annual report has the difficult job of presenting a favourable impression of the institution's economic, social and cultural well being to these diverse readers, who may have conflicting priorities. For this reason, annual reports are usually polished and colourful documents that should be easy to navigate, read and understand.

3.7.2 Narratives from academic women

Five narratives from academic women currently employed in the tertiary education sector form the second part of my mixed method research. Participants were identified through snowball sampling and/or personal knowledge of their compatibility with the criteria for research i.e. all are women academics with several years experience in the university environment. Consistent with the recommendations of Baxter (2003) for post-structuralist feminist research, a range of participants was sought in terms of age, years of experience, and family, professional and cultural circumstances. No attempt was made to select participants according to whether married/single, parent/childless, by job title, or by cultural background. Interviews from five participants should yield a sufficiently wide range of stories that allow the scope of issues to be identified, yet enable some common themes to be revealed. Also, five narratives should not generate more information than is needed or could be analysed in the timeframe of the study. Initial telephone or email approach was followed by a written invitation to participate in the study. The framework for discussion (Appendix 3) was also supplied to the participants prior to the meeting so that they had the opportunity to reflect on their responses and prepare for the discussion if they wished.

Three open-ended question/topics formed the framework for discussion and these were developed through analysis of literature and discourse analysis. By developing a framework that contained relatively few open-ended questions, but with a clearly articulated agenda of the issues, and by making this available to the participants

beforehand, my aim was to elicit deep and rich responses. In this respect, my method followed recommendations for question development given by Liamputtong (2009, pp. 46-50). I experienced some difficulty in deciding what to call the narratives. I felt that "interview" was too formal and had implications of power for the researcher that as a feminist engaged in feminist research I was anxious to avoid. The term "narrative" suggested an oral history format in which the women talked without input, and seemed a clinical way to collect data of this kind. Partly because the numbers of key participants were small and partly because I was seeking to explore in-depth experiences and their meanings (Gillham, 2000, p. 6), I decided to use the term "focused conversation" (as defined by Clough and Nutbrown, 2007, p.84). This term seemed appropriate for the study because during the pilot I found that I wanted to give something back in return as this helped reinforce a sense of collegiality that was mutually beneficial, yet recognised the need to encourage different voices and opinions. I also wanted to include some personal responses to the women from time to time as it seemed to be helpful for the flow of the conversations, although I was careful to do this in a way that did not direct or intrude into the narrative. Face-to-face participation in the style of a conversation allows subtle rich experiences with deeper understanding to be explored. I should stress however that the use of the word conversation does not imply a casual chat; the framework in Appendix 3 was adhered to. In a face-to-face focused conversation the researcher and participant are known to one another and thus the conversation relies on development of trust and confidentiality between participant and researcher. The names of participants, however, were not recorded and remain anonymous to the reader. Some demographic details were collected, but these were kept to a minimum, and related primarily to professional details. Personal information was only recorded as volunteered by the participants during the conversations.

Preparation for the conversations was essential. For ease of analysis, the questions were grouped into themes. Questions were pre-tested with one respondent, not included in the final five narratives, to ensure appropriateness and clarity. Additional minor focusing of questions was done through participant feedback, analysis and reflection from the pre-test data. Each conversation was carefully planned and structured, with some minor differences in the order of each question that depended on the way in which each conversation developed at the time. This was usually made at the time as thought necessary in order to accommodate the interests and individuality of the participants, and to make for a more relaxed and informal experience for both. I also felt that allowing participants to follow their natural train of thought as much as possible within the topic area was beneficial in that it would elicit a fuller and more informed conversation.

Low-risk ethical approval was obtained through peer review and notification of the study was sent to the Massey University Human Ethics Committee before commencement of any data collection or discussing the study with any of the participants in any way. The

information, consent sheets, and question framework are attached in Appendix 3. Each of the focused conversations lasted between approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour.

The focused conversations were transcribed as soon as possible afterwards.

Transcribing each individual conversation in this way gave me opportunity to reflect on my own technique as an interviewer and to develop my skills of “going with the flow” in conversations. Transcribing personally also forms the first step in data analysis, since it allows the data to be reflected upon while it is fresh in the mind (Liamputtong, 2009, p.57). While I acknowledge that this might introduce some bias in the data because of my own learning process, I felt that the short and long term benefits of this practice made it worthwhile.

Analysis of the transcriptions involved grouping statements/information into categories that reflect similar and relevant themes, in line with the framework for conversations. Gillham (2000) notes the importance of identification and elucidation of consistent themes arising from multi-method research, and this technique seems particularly relevant to the present study. In this respect methods used for analysis are similar to those adopted by Munro (1998) and Weiler (1999), with qualitative analysis proceeding in the following stages:

- Transcription as soon as possible after the conversation.
- Reading, checking and reflection on the data.
- Identification and highlighting of key points in each conversation.
- Entering key responses from each conversation into a grid.
- Development of categories (themes) for responses to each question by the participants.
- Reading, reflection and checking.

Throughout the analysis process, particular emphasis was placed on recognition/ reflection of the existence of multiple roles revealed through the conversations, exposing and critiquing these from a feminist standpoint to examine how/if women’s experiences may have changed in the light of recent political and institutional changes. In writing my interpretations, I have occasionally edited comments to avoid identification of the participants, and where this was done I have indicated in square brackets.

3.7.3 Method for critical reflection

The final part of my method, critical reflection upon personal history and experiences of workplace policies and practices, allows identification and articulation of personal values and world-view (ontology). Journal records are one method used to provide material for critical reflection on the extent to which personal experiences might influence the interpretation of narratives from the case studies, consistent with the recommendations of Holly (1997). Personal narratives are drawn from a reflective journal kept from March 2008 to November 2009, and from other personal experiences, and used to support my analysis of the official texts and/or to examine how my own experiences are similar to or differ from those of the women participants.

3.8 Who are they?

This section briefly introduces the five women whose narratives form the focus of this study (I have previously introduced myself in chapter one). All five women were employed as full time academics, as lecturers or senior lecturers at the time of the study. Apart from this, there were few common threads. The women ranged in age from their 20s to 60s, and their duration of employment varied from a few years to careers with the university that spanned 20 or more years. A range of different professional/academic fields were represented and while all were currently employed by Massey University either at Wellington or Palmerston North campuses, some had also experience working in other academic fields and/or other tertiary institutions. Initially my aim had been to converse with women who considered themselves to be “on the margins” in terms of their social, cultural and/or economic/working class status, but because of difficulties of identifying/self-identifying these criteria in potential participants and issues of confidentiality/anonymity in a relatively small workplace, I decided to cover a wider spectrum of women, in order to identify if possible the scope of any issues that emerged. While the small number of participants prevents the drawing of generalisations, it can make issues held in common by such a diverse group more meaningful. What I most wanted was to present the views of some women academics who for various reasons were not currently employed in positions that conferred particular status or power. As I read some of the policy documents for the content analysis part of the study, I also realised that too often in the course of collecting data for policy development, it was the managers, research directors and departmental leaders whose views were being heard. Hence I wanted to hear the stories of women who were not primarily employed in those roles.

The women who agreed to tell their stories are introduced briefly below (in no particular order). The study group included:

- A woman in her early 60s with a long career history, including experience in academic and non-academic staff positions. Although her children were now independent adults, she had experience that included both administrative work and development of study programmes and curricula, while juggling parental and family roles.
- A woman who had been working as a lecturer for less than five years, who was in the early stages of her research career. This was her first position in a university after completing post-graduate qualifications. She had a partner and a small child and had returned to work full-time soon after starting a family.
- A woman who had moved into her present academic position from a similar role at a different tertiary institute. While not initially expecting to become an academic, she had created and developed her present position and was now an experienced academic with a research area that reflected her interests.

- A woman in her 60s who was now developing her academic career after many years employed in positions that had previously centred around teaching and administration. She also had experienced working in the university environment while supporting a growing family, who were now independent adults.
- A woman who worked as a lecturer for between ten and fifteen years, with an established research record. This woman also had post-graduate qualifications and a partner, but no children. She had developed her present career from initially a part-time teaching position.

The voices of these women, set in context of the official texts and of my own experiences, form the analysis in the next chapter. My interpretations are linked to the critical discourse analysis of textual resources and the outcomes subjected to further critical reflection.

Chapter 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

What we say

4.1 Scope of the discussion

In this chapter, the conversations with the five women are interpreted in the light of my analysis of the three texts selected as relevant to the academic environment. The analysis pays particular attention to how workplace discourses and culture create tensions for these women and the effects of these in constraining or increasing their freedom of choice. The story that emerges is a very complex one that interweaves both official and unofficial narratives. The tensions that appear overlap and merge with each other. For ease of interpretation my analysis is grouped into three main themes establishing core ideas that create tensions for the women, and through which their narratives challenge the institutional discourses. These tensions are critiqued drawing on elements from a feminist post-structuralist perspective and related to my research question: How have recent organisational changes in the tertiary education sector shaped tensions for academic women in New Zealand? The three themes examine tensions created, modified or transformed through conflict between the women's own professional identities and organisational culture, between workplace expectations and how the women see themselves as teachers, researchers and administrators, and between the women's personal lives and the workplace:

- **Organisational culture and the professional self**

This theme examines tensions between the culture of the university and how the women view themselves as professionals. Contextual issues include the broader university environment, the role of the university and the views of knowledge encompassed within the corporate discourses adopted by the university. The theme critiques the tensions that emerge between the perceptions held by women of themselves as professionals and the corporate vision of the institution.

- **Changing roles, expectations and contradictions**

This theme explores the tensions created for women by the changes, expectations and contradictions in the workplace. Conflicts associated with these expectations in relation to their roles as teachers, researchers and administrators are identified and critiqued, together with issues of communication, power and gender in the workplace, and how these affect the women's lives.

- **Multiple roles, the culture of the individual and work/life balance**

Tensions created by conflict between women's multiple roles, the culture of the individual and work/life balance are related to the corporate discourses of economic productivity and managerialism. Methods employed by the women to resolve problems/conflicts arising from these issues, if that is possible, are investigated.

4.2 Organisational culture and the professional self

The first tension emerging from within the narratives of the women is that of the way the culture of the academic workplace impinged on the way the women viewed themselves as professionals. It is significant that all five women saw themselves as professionals, and provided self-descriptions that separated their research and teaching interests, showing they had a strong focus on this differentiated aspect of their career roles:

"I'd describe myself in terms of my research and teaching. I probably would start off and briefly mention the subjects I teach and then I would say but my real passion is in [research area]."

The order in which the women preferred to describe their teaching and research roles varied, and this partly depended on their individual interests, but one woman said that she would change this order, depending on the listener. For example when talking to students, she said:

"Yes it does differ. I talk about my main teaching interest, which is [edited] and then perhaps throughout the course later I would mention things that I did to do with research."

Alternatively, the academics own professional interests took priority; a preference for either teaching or research could guide their self-disclosure:

"I prioritise teaching over my own research, which has meant that my research is lacking out badly, but I actually do prioritise teaching."

"Yes, and that's the area I also research in, so it would almost be like I was getting the teaching part out of the way before I spoke about what I was really interested in."

"Yes it's the teaching that I spend most of my time on."

The above comments carry with them implicit meanings around the need to prioritise research over teaching. One woman apologised for making teaching her priority at the expense of her research, while another clearly signalled a preference for research. None of the women blurred the distinction between the two roles of teaching and research, for example by describing themselves as "academic", yet one woman recognised tension between the two, attributing the cause of her tension to lack of available time that created a need to prioritise between the two activities:

"I'm an academic which I really enjoy, but I've been focused on teaching and now, only now am I getting focused on research because time has been available to do that. This tension between those things; so that is how I would describe myself professionally."

The words “now, only now” suggest frustration with the lack of time made available over the course of her career to pursue her own research interests.

On personal reflection, I would describe myself in a similar way in terms of these dual roles – as a teacher primarily and then a researcher, with the order reflecting my own interests, as these women did. However, I am aware that this order of preference has not always been so. My priorities have changed over the past decade, following a move from another university which, in those days, was more research oriented. On arriving at Massey I took the opportunity which was then available to follow up my teaching interests through professional development papers, and I just kept on going to the point which led me to this thesis. Over the last five years I have seen this university shifting towards a stronger focus on research, and wonder were I to embark now on this teaching centred role, whether it would still be supported.

It appeared that there were gender issues around the tensions between teaching and research. With teaching, the workload difference between men and women was attributed by one woman to the extra time and care taken by women over pastoral care of students:

“I don’t know if I was a guy I would care as much about how the students are feeling.”

Several participants saw many of their male colleagues as being more research focused and pragmatic about prioritising research over teaching to suit their own needs and strengths, consistent with findings by Acker (1991) and Cotterill and Waterhouse (1998), suggesting that men and women may differ in both the ways they prioritise and their reasons for doing so. For example, one participant noted:

“We’ve seen men in particular saying, you know, like we get these messages all the time -from particular men here - sort of saying you have to give more time to research, and you know you shouldn’t over teach and all this, you know the whole thing. I think it’s because it is a feminist issue here. I think many men, who have been focusing on research, and that research is their thing, have felt at a loss, and still been important but they have been berated if they haven’t been good as teachers as well. Re-establishing that ground where research is power and teaching is marginalised.”

Another woman also thought that men and women do have different preferences and priorities, and she was aware of the need to adopt a more masculine attitude to get promotion, but this conflicted with her feelings of responsibility towards her students:

“I was at one of those women’s meetings and one of the speakers advised us that if we wanted to get on as academics we would have to act like men and that involved sacrificing teaching and not spending time on it and going ahead with your own research. And I felt quite angry because I thought that just wasn’t fair on the students.”

It appears from the above comments that there are two intertwined issues operating here to create conflict. Firstly the ways in men and women rationalise and prioritise between their research and teaching/pastoral care roles may differ and secondly the system itself is gendered in such a way as to favour this predominantly “male” way of prioritising between them. It is this latter issue that may be pressurising some women to

fit in the system, contrary to their inclinations, that has the greater potential to cause tension. There are certainly implications for promotion in prioritising teaching and women who do so recognise that they may be disadvantaging themselves in the promotional stakes, but despite this, one woman has chosen to follow the teaching path and she provided a reflective analysis that the implications of the current emphasis on research may not necessarily provide the best learning environment for students:

“The teaching research nexus is not as powerful and strong as we might think, and it might inform part of my teaching but it doesn’t inform the whole of it, so its very slight. “

Another woman recognised a negative impact of PBRF on teaching as staff were encouraged to spend more time on research, and to reduce the amount of effort placed on quality teaching:

“So again part of this PBRF, part of all that, is a return to this limited notion about what teaching is - dissemination as opposed to any emphasis on learning. So there is a return to the emphasis on content as opposed to on process, or the process of teaching.”

One of the women noted that there were tensions between wanting to provide good pastoral care for her students and the other demands of the job:

“Kind of layers of responsibility when you are a teacher. A little bit more you is responsible to a certain degree for your student’s welfare and that’s - well part of me wants to be responsible, but part of me feels like I don’t have the space internally to be able to do that.”

The extent to which women academics seeking promotion may be disadvantaged by a preference for teaching or pastoral care has not yet been fully examined on a national basis, although Doyle et al. (2004) identified high teaching loads as the greatest barrier for new women researchers in attempting to develop their research portfolios. This is not just a New Zealand issue, and is in line with findings of Ozkanli and White (2008) in Australia, who recommend a widening of promotional criteria to place greater emphasis on teaching and community service in order to remedy the shortage of women in senior academic positions in Australian universities. Widening promotional criteria in line with recommendations by Ozkanli and White (2008) to place more emphasis on teaching and pastoral care duties would be also helpful for women, and any men, who choose this kind of priority.

The comments made by the women with regard to the teaching/research nexus align with existing policy texts. Division of roles into teaching and research reflects the way the two roles are distinguished in the Tertiary Education Strategy:

“Our aim is a high income, knowledge-based economy, which is both innovative and creative and provides a unique quality of life to all New Zealanders. Tertiary education will help achieve that goal by providing high quality learning and research, contributing to the sustainable economic and social development of the nation and providing for a diversity of teaching and research that fosters the achievement of international standards of learning, and as relevant, scholarship.” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 8).

The prioritising of research earlier discussed in the participant’s narratives is also found in the policy texts. References to older policy rhetoric such as “high income knowledge-

based economy” retained links with the previous strategy (Ministry of Education, 2002) in promoting the need for knowledge to serve national economic goals, and for this to be achieved through both research and teaching.

An important difference for the 2007 Strategy was the requirement for clearer distinction between the activities of each part of the tertiary sector (universities, polytechnics, Wananga, Private Training Establishments), with the government’s specific vision for the activities of a university being to:

- “1. *provide a wide range of research-led degree and postgraduate education that is of international quality*
2. *undertake excellent research in a broad range of fields*
3. *engage with external stakeholders (communities, business, industry, iwi, and the research community) in the dissemination and application of knowledge in promoting learning.*”
(Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 14).

The Strategy thus continued strong managerialist traditions in requiring universities to operate more like businesses or corporations, with clearly defined objectives. Each of these three objectives will be discussed more fully later, but it is important to recognise here that phrases and terms such as “research-led degree and postgraduate education of international quality”, “excellent research”, and “engage with stakeholders in the dissemination and application of knowledge” signalled to universities how the government expected them to operate; as producers of high quality research aligned with the needs of communities, industry, iwi and research communities, and that research knowledge should also provide a foundation for degree-level teaching.

Language/discourse reflecting these separate research and teaching functions of the university can also be found in the first sentence of the Massey University mission statement presented in the Annual Report:

“Massey University is committed to meeting the needs of New Zealand and New Zealanders, enhancing access to university study for diverse populations, preparing students for life-long learning, and meeting international standards of excellence in research and teaching.” (Massey University, 2008).

The positioning of the word “research” before “teaching” is supportive of the way these activities are prioritised in the Tertiary Education Strategy. Phrases such as “lifelong learning”, “diverse populations “ and “meeting the needs of New Zealanders” appear in both the mission statement and the Tertiary Education Strategy (Ministry of Education, 2007), exemplifying the inter-textual nature of discourse as the language filters down through the documents into the institution from the Strategy.

The discourses created in government policy are thus developed into institutional goals set down in the mission statement. Both documents present a businesslike, more corporate vision for the university; a culture that includes increased emphasis on the separation of research from teaching. Research is seen as the vehicle for “dissemination of knowledge”, both to industry and to students as future industry leaders. The extent to which this increased separation of research and teaching permeates the university culture, providing the basis for individual roles, actions and choices was apparent in the

distinctions made between these roles in the women's narratives. It was also evident that not all women prioritised research. For two women, this was cause for unease. Their comments suggest that, for some women the freedom to choose how to divide their time between teaching and research is compromised by the institutional goals and/or the institutional discourses.

There are promotional implications for women embedded within the research-led teaching discourse in that institutions (and some research managers) are likely to see teaching as being "inferior" to research, and rank them accordingly in the promotional stakes. Thus there are equity issues with the discourses of research and teaching that are of concern for both individuals and institutions where teaching is seen as their primary, most important or favoured activity, and this may explain some of the frustrations of the women in this study. It is worth reminding the reader that all the women had earlier felt the need to stress their professionalism and to point out whether they prioritised research or teaching, suggesting that there was some element of conflict over the need to choose between them. Several women were frustrated with the lack of time available for research due to the conflicting demands of teaching and administrative duties. It is significant that women who expressed the most dissatisfaction with the equity and transparency of the PBRF assessment process were from departments that had previously operated within a polytechnic (not traditionally a research institution) and/or whose primary interest was identified as teaching.

Doyle et.al. (2004), in their study of women and promotion at Massey University, found that women tended to spend more of their time on average in teaching related activities than men, and also more time on pastoral care, and this is consistent with the women's narratives. It may be that women are encouraged to do more pastoral/caring work because some managers may have expectations about stereotyped gendered roles which say women are better carers and teachers, although it is also likely that some of these five particular women really do like teaching more. Further research would be needed to elucidate this issue. Doyle et al. (2004) made links to there being more women in lower ranked positions than men. However, this study suggests that there may be other contributing reasons. It may be that women often prefer to be more involved in teaching than do men, or that the particular departments these women belong to are more teaching oriented, or that these women are more conscientiously focused on their students' needs and thus tending to spend more time on teaching as a consequence. The nature of the teaching and research were also perceived as important, and for some women tensions were created when their own interpretations of these roles did not align with the workplace cultural vision. Some of these issues can be seen in the next section that examines why the women chose to work in the university in the first place.

While the government narratives and institutional discourses stress the need to link research with industry requirements (Ministry of Education, 2007; Massey University, 2008), none of the women claimed to be attracted to their positions because of opportunities for involvement with industry, and/or industry related research. Tensions emerged between the strategic policy goal of servicing industry, and the way some of the women valued their academic freedom to research in areas of interest and relevance to themselves, and to their academic discipline. Two women said that one of the most valued aspects of being an academic was the freedom to research in areas of their own choosing that would not be of interest to industry. In other words, they chose to work in a university because they did not think it was possible to pursue their particular research interests elsewhere:

“ I never consciously felt this is what I want to do but I was aware that the kind of things I was thinking about in terms of research – the things I was interested in weren’t possible to investigate in industry. I wanted to be able to look at things in that way, I wasn’t really interested in money.”

It would be worth researching further the extent to which constraining the way academics can research may discourage other women (and men) from choosing an academic career in the future.

Another of the women also said that she really wanted to be an academic so she could both teach and research in a particular area that she was interested in:

“When I did my degree I really, really wanted a lecturing job and I really wanted to pursue my area of [edited] – you know as a lifetime occupation. It’s what I believe I was born to do. And of course there were absolutely no jobs in the field and certainly no jobs researching.”

This same woman also expressed her concern at the constraints that the current management climate had placed on her freedom to choose her areas of research:

“The other thing that has changed is that in the past you could get involved in something that perhaps wasn’t worth much in terms of PBRF but now things that I’d quite like to do, like writing a book review, would be considered a poor use of my time.”

Pressures to research in areas that suit industry may lead some academics to seek employment elsewhere, and may discourage others from embarking on an academic career. This drift away from academia, combined with a dearth of new recruits may be a contributing factor in “the greying” or ageing of the academic workforce that has been reported in the press in recent months (Easton, 2009).

There is a risk that the drive for quick turn around research to satisfy the requirements of PBRF may discourage academics from embarking on longer term high quality research whose value may not be seen as leading directly and quickly to PBRF outputs, and therefore may struggle to receive funding. Adams (2008) notes:

“Research is a long game, sometimes over decades between initial ideas and their delivery into products and processes. Short-termism is therefore another policy concern, and found in research-based industry as much as the public sector.” (Adams, 2008, p. 46).

Enjoyment of the work was an important factor that had encouraged the women to remain in the university. Three of the women had worked their way up through the institution, for example by completing a postgraduate degree, perhaps accompanied or followed by part time teaching, moving from fixed contract and/or as general staff before becoming full-time academics, rather than as a consciously chosen career path. A typical response was:

“When I did my masters I was offered part time teaching and I just really enjoyed it - it went from there. I don't know if I really chose it.”

One woman said she was prepared to put up with lower paid positions in her early career because of the enjoyment of the teaching and/or of the research:

“And one thing I am really pleased with is that I did not give up and kept doing it regardless. I lived in poverty for years. And now I have a job where I'm paid to do research I enjoy and it's wonderful.”

The above comments are supported by literature on learning and motivation. Research has shown that the best motivation for learning is intrinsic motivation for interest, rather than extrinsic goals or rewards that are not of the learner's choosing (Light, Cox and Calkins, 2009; Sansone and Harackiewicz, 2000; Wlodkowski, 2008). Enjoyment is an intrinsic motivator, while performance pay and “incentives” such as research rewards and medals are extrinsic. Many women are prepared to work in a job they enjoy, at a lower pay than they probably should receive, if the intrinsic rewards are perceived, although they may be unhappy about the career prospects (Briar, 2009). However, what we see in the university now is a plethora of departmental, institutional and national awards and prizes (e.g. Massey University, 2008, pp 9,13) all presumably designed to encourage staff to produce more outputs, or with the goal of lifting peer esteem and productivity. These are all extrinsic rewards, and it may be that some academics (including myself) do not regard this type of reward as being particularly motivating, when compared with the intrinsic motivation of the research itself. Directing academics to work on research projects that meet industry needs, but have little intrinsic interest is less likely to produce work of a world-class standard.

However, a different view is represented in the official discourse. The government's view of productivity is defined in the Tertiary Education Strategy in a way that is consistent with the economic goals of a capitalist society:

“The output of goods and services in the economy, a sector of the economy or an industry from the effective use of skill, capital and innovation.” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 41).

This is a narrow view of productivity in which an increase in knowledge or understanding is apparently not seen as productive unless it leads to an increase in goods or services that contribute to the economy. By strictly adopting this definition, cultural development and understanding for its own sake cannot be defined as productive:

“There is a clear link between trades, technical and professional qualifications and the workplace. But it is not only these areas of study that contribute to innovation and productivity.”

Productivity and innovation will come from the development, retention and effective use of people with highly developed skills in the areas of critical thinking, problem solving and decision-making. It is these skills that underpin the effective management and entrepreneurship needed to develop globally competitive firms.” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 23).

The implications in the above statement are that the government values critical thinking, problem solving and decision making purely because of the perceived usefulness of these skills in a business and/or industry context. Little mention is made of other forms of learning that do not fit this model such as learning for pleasure, for social reasons, for self-improvement, for leisure or even to downshift. Echoes of the view that valuable knowledge is that which contributes to technological development also appear in the mission statement, confirming the inter-textual link: *“We offer high-quality learning experiences that empower people and their communities to prosper in an increasingly knowledge-dependent and technologically advanced world.” (Massey University, 2008).*

Codd (2006) recognised the narrowness of this view of knowledge in stating:

“In the knowledge society, knowledge itself becomes central to the production process. Knowledge is no longer a source of enlightenment, empowerment or critical self-awareness; it is a product, a commodity to be owned and traded, a source of surplus value like all other goods and services.” (Codd, 2006, p. 227).

I would further argue that this concept of knowledge reflects a positivist epistemology since it implies that some knowledge is more valuable than others, that there are absolute truths to be discovered by research and used by industry. This view of knowledge is in direct conflict with interpretive, post-structuralist and feminist epistemologies that acknowledge multiple voices and multiple realities in creating knowledge (Baxter, 2003).

Ontological conflict with the “official” view of knowledge may cause tensions for many women teachers and researchers. For example, the following reflective self-disclosure by one of the women of a personal and experiential approach to knowledge reveals an underlying epistemology that may be at odds with the positivist and content driven knowledge dissemination discourse of the Tertiary Education Strategy:

“I often tell people that I like to do things, and I think about what I’m doing. If it’s teaching, I’m thinking about it as I’m doing things”

Van Dijk (2008) states that discourse, through the creation of ideologies, is a form of mind control:

“Those who control discourse may indirectly control the minds of people. And since people’s actions are controlled by their minds (knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms, values), mind control also means indirect action control.” Van Dijk (2008, p. 9).

In reflecting on the moral implications of teaching content that is valued by the “knowledge economy”, I feel increasing unease about the value judgements and mindsets that accompany this discourse. How many students are enrolling because they want to become “industry leaders”? What is their vision for the future? What about the alternative ways of knowing? Should responsible universities acting with a social

conscience be promoting or rejecting the “knowledge economy” discourse? The women’s stories have revealed tensions between this “official” view of knowledge and their professional selves as teachers and researchers. How their views compare with the management culture of the university will be examined in the next section.

4.3 Changing roles, expectations and contradictions

The expectations and contradictions in the workplace created tensions for women working within the universities’ corporate management culture. Key areas of difference included workplace relationships and interactions with colleagues and managers, workloads and issues of teaching and research expectations.

Stories about high workloads and time pressure were typical among the women:

“Well, after getting up after only four hours sleep because I had to prepare my lecture, I was here in the early hours of the morning, rushed home, snatched some sleep back again for my nine am to twelve am, three hour class, and I wish I could say that wasn’t typical but it is.”

Other women also told of taking work home on a regular basis so that they could continue working in the evening, thus blurring the boundaries between home and work, consistent with observations by Cotterill and Waterhouse (1998) and Watty, Bellamy and Morely (2008). One of the women said:

“I try really hard not to take my work home and I don’t physically do work at home but mentally I do. I always wish I had a job where I just went to work did my job and went home.”

The comments signal inner conflict about work impinging on quality time at home. This will be discussed more fully in the next section, but it is significant that all participants, without exception, had noticed that the demands of work, workload and stress, had increased, particularly in the last year or two. For example comments such as:

“It’s become much more intense in the last year, year and a half. It’s really noticeable. I’m a lot more stressed.”

Comments of this nature can be directly linked to the productivity discourse of the previous section, as demands for higher and more accountable productivity mean that the work has become more intense, as academics try to meet the increased expectations. One other woman noted a sense of isolation and lack of human interaction that she attributed to pressure of work:

“I go whole days and not talk a single word to anyone.”

Other women agreed that excessive workload had contributed both to a decrease in the frequency of interactions with colleagues and a decrease in collegiality itself in recent years. Pressure of work had contributed to academics closeting themselves away to avoid unnecessary interruptions, so as to increase productivity:

“Yeah, I guess, I don’t know, its always, everybody seems really focused on whatever they are doing. Everyone is in their little offices, so its like every once in a while interactions occur. It suits me quite well.”

There was a sense of not wanting to disturb the work of others, even to talk about the highly prioritised task of research:

“I feel like I want to talk with people I work with about my research but I don’t feel like – it’s - they’re too busy and no space, no head space.”

One of the women attributed this decrease in collegiality to workload increases associated with the demands of the institution for increased administration and accountability:

“There seems to be a huge proportion of administrative meetings these days. The culture of the place has died. They can’t get people to staff do’s. Everybody’s too tired, too jaded.”

In spite of the workload constraints, some of the women were still happy with the collegiality, with most describing colleagues in a favourable light:

“I’ve made the most of being here I’ve met some fabulous people. Some of my colleagues have become my really best friends.”

It is worth noting that this woman had worked in the institution for a number of years and had had opportunity to develop these friendships over that time. On a professional level, though there could be tensions, and possibly this was because of increased pressures on staff, particularly if they were more senior or managers. These comments will be returned to later, as there are links that can be made with my discussion of PBRF and its associated discourse. The effects of changing organisational culture on collegiality, the complex and interwoven roles of academics and managers, and on the extent to which staff feel supported and secure in the academy are likely to be complex with many interwoven strands and layers.

Comments regarding collegiality revealed a complex mix of personal and professional relationships that involved both friendships and frustrations. One woman identified tensions with her peer group:

“While it’s good to have colleagues that you can talk about similar things, at the same time there are always tensions.”

While a second woman found managers could be a source of tension:

“I don’t feel like it’s very supportive in order to achieve the things they say they want us to do. On a personal level I get along with them pretty well, but on a professional level it frustrates me. They’re nice people, but [silence].”

Perceived quality of managers was indeed much more varied. Communication strategies within the women’s own departments strongly influenced perceptions of the level of support that were given to achieve departmental goals. Recognition of achievements by managers influenced their willingness to see workplace practices and work issues in a favourable light. One very positive comment revealed pleasure derived both from intrinsic personal satisfaction and from managers who encouraged and gave positive feedback for her achievements:

“Yes the department is very good at assisting and being positive and rewarding success and encouraging success and because I’ve been in this department I’ve done things that are quantum leaps for me, that are completely out of my comfort zone.”

Perceptions of managers varied according to the particular campus and sometimes the department that the women were working in. Some comments from the same woman about particular managers were very favourable:

“One of the best things about working in this department is that we’ve got a fantastic head of department.”

However, there were some instances where support was less forthcoming. Lack of transparency and/or equity tended to produce negative feelings towards the department and a sense of disinterest or abandonment by the department or manager:

“I think my manager is to be honest a lovely person but a terrible manager. I don’t think there’s much transparency in the department I belong to so that I personally feel some people get treated differently than other people and I feel there are favourites.”

While not wanting to criticise her manager personally, there was a perception that the management expectations and processes were not always clear and that management did not treat people equally. This particular comment perhaps again indicates the complexity of issues that can create tension for women as it suggests how conflict with and/or lack of clarity in institutional goals as discussed in the previous section can spill over into personal conflict with managers. It is worth remembering the different goals of managers and academics when examining sources of conflict. The different cultures of these two roles - the valuing of independence and autonomy by academics and the requirement to implement university policies and processes by administrators - can often lead to misunderstandings according to Kuo (2009).

One view expressed was that opportunities and support from managers depended to some extent on whether the department was male or female dominated, and noted that some disciplines tended to be either male or female dominated, with one woman suggesting that more “female” departments provided the better opportunities for women, and they were less inclined to play “power games”. Of previous experience working in a department where male hegemony was more evident she said:

“Males were given all the opportunities, were frequently given work when there were more qualified females. Looking back it was atrocious.”

One woman with a long career history had noticed some improvement in recent years over past experiences with regard to gender differences in management style, but she still felt that differences between men and women in ways of planning and organising work often counted against women:

“In terms of power structures, there was very much a glass ceiling in the university and it was very difficult as a women to advance. All the committees I worked with were mostly men – not entirely but mostly men and it’s hard to explain but there were all sorts of subtle ways in which they worked.”

In particular she thought that women's style of management included a preference to negotiate and consult more than males, and that to some people (particularly male bosses) this might seem weak:

"We [women] don't see you look weak because you are asking people what they would like here, instead of just working it out for your self and delivering it."

At Massey, it appeared to this woman that the male corporate management mode was the norm:

"Yes, well any new program or activity in the university is often worked out first and then put out for consultation. The idea that you consult first get all the ideas and then put it together and then put it out/back is a completely different way of thinking."

These comments are consistent with findings internationally. Heward (1996) and Mayer and Tikka (2008) noted that women in management positions tend to work differently to men, using negotiation and collaboration rather than, as this woman put things, 'working it out first'.

Workload issues associated with administration duties were frequently cited as causes of conflict and tension. Two women had previously experienced fairly large administrative loads in terms of paper co-ordination, management of high numbers of degree students and responsibilities for developing new course materials that were expected of them, but not allowed for in their workload allocations:

"And also I took on a management job as a programme coordinator and anyone who has done that has not been able to complete their study; they've had to dump it before they can go on and complete their study because it takes over and consumes your life. You are given point two to do that but in fact it's point eight. Because it's so pastoral it becomes point eight and you're managing that as well as the other point eight of your job. So that your study doesn't happen, can't happen and it's not until you have left that responsibility that you are able to get on and complete your study."

Thus the administrative work was usually accomplished at the expense of study or research and could leave women with a sense of inadequacy, this could cause tension or anxiety at not meeting the increased expectations of the department.

When listening to the women talk about their research it was apparent that institutional policies and practices associated with research management have created tension and conflict in their experiences of the working environment that were broader than simply a drive for more outputs. Initially most comments from the five women were centred around the higher workloads needed to comply with greater expectations from managers in terms of number and quality of research outputs, but other issues also emerged.

One woman noted that her ability to think and plan new and collaborative research was compromised by the effects of her high workload:

"I don't know might be a space thing, but it's also a time thing. Everybody is just so busy trying to get the research they know they can do done, and teaching, that there's no time to kind of have a think about the things you could do with other people because it takes the time away from the things you know you can do."

While it is acknowledged that this could be also due to time management issues, the fact that all five women were experiencing difficulties with high workloads suggests that the problem may be a wider one and this warrants further investigation.

My own experiences support this statement. On arriving at Massey University, as a new academic staff member, with the requirement to start researching in a department that had recently been a polytechnic, I found that (excluding preparation and marking) fourteen hours a week teaching contact time, was (and still is) considered “normal” for a lecturer. High teaching loads such as these leave little time for research, as comments from some women have indicated. I have been guilty on more than one occasion of avoiding social contact with colleagues when I am busy. Conversations with the five women revealed that there were no consistent workload policies that were equitable across the university and this is consistent with the findings of Doyle et al. (2004).

Differences between campuses and departments influenced the light in which some women saw their research managers. Women who didn't feel supported by management were less positive about meeting the expectations in terms of workload. Perceptions of workload and the pressures of work (particularly the research) varied according to how well the women felt they were supported, both in terms of the conduct of the research itself and in the preparation of the documentary evidence (portfolios), as the following two comments illustrate:

“Yes, things have changed over here, things have changed. Just the pressure to research and I feel like personally at the moment I'm completely stuck with my research. I'm having a black year for it, and I would like some mentoring and some help, but I wouldn't even know how to do that because I don't have the respect for anyone in management, or I'm unable to approach our manager for help. So I'm in a funny position at the moment.”

The feeling of lack of support as a researcher and the tensions created because of this is evident in the despondent tone of the above narrative. This woman really wants to move forward in her research career, but is not getting the support she wants from her manager. Similar difficulties experienced by women researchers in obtaining suitable mentors/role models, and their difficulties in approaching managers (often males) for assistance were reportedly faced by women in a British university study by Bagilhole (1994). Similarly, the comment below suggests that this woman is feeling frustrated because she sees inequities across the university in the quality of administrative support that is available:

“I have to do PBRF. I feel a bit annoyed because in the last round I think I should have done better, but I don't think our department got a lot of help in getting our folios together to that level that the [edited] department did, because their manager wanted them to do the best they could. And I think we've lucked out, but I personally think we have a manager who should not be a manager and this actually is affecting how well we individually in the department do.”

There were also concerns that pressures to produce outputs highly ranked by PBRF (e.g. journal articles) could drive researchers away from other kinds of research that might be valuable in different ways.

“I know with an article I published last year that every one said was a waste of time because it went on the internet, the journal wasn’t ranked had no PBRF output status....I’ve got so much peer esteem as a result of putting out that article that no one advised me to do.”

These observations are consistent with the comments made by Codd (2006), and the issues raised by Adams (2008) that were mentioned in the previous section about the potential effects of PBRF in shaping knowledge creation. Here again is evidence of the complexities of the multi-layered links among collegiality, research and the management culture.

Another risk for output driven research is lack of engagement with the research itself brought about by excessive pressure to produce work:

“ I guess they feel they need to measure performance in some way, but then I do feel like a lot of the time you’re doing research for the sake of getting those outputs and not for any real, you know, benefit beyond achieving those outputs.”

“There’s a real problem that we have become so output driven it is affecting our research.”

The above comments sound reminiscent of assessment driven learning, that again has been linked with shallow learning and lack of motivation and engagement in the literature (Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 2005; Light, Cox and Calkins, 2009; Wlodkowski, 2008).

One woman expressed a concern about the way the pressure to produce excellent research was continuing to increase, while the definition of what constitutes excellent research itself was also changing:

“The goalposts keep changing. First of all you’ve got to get published in international refereed journal. Then it’s that you’ve got to get international funding as well. And then it’s something else. It gets harder. It seems to get harder and harder to meet the expectations of being an excellent researcher.”

This comment suggests not only anxiety with maintaining a high standard of performance, but also with the ability to know and to measure what constitutes excellent research. There is also anxiety about how much research is enough to satisfy the apparently ever-increasing expectations of management.

The tensions described above for women associated with research can be directly linked to the government’s strategy for funding research on the basis of quality evaluations, signalled in the Tertiary Education Strategy:

“The new investment-based approach will expect and reward high performance. An assessment of the organisation’s performance and assurance of its quality, will increasingly inform investment. The quality assurance and performance monitoring system will have an increased focus on outcomes. There will be greater transparency in the performance of the tertiary education system, and of tertiary education organizations within the system, as the quality of performance information improves and is made more available to students and the public.” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 13).

The idea that research performance can be monitored and quantified assumes that reliable data can be collected about research “outcomes” and their quality, that public accountability will improve performance, and that funding according to performance will

improve performance quality. None of these assumptions have been fully tested and proven, all are based on Neoliberal and Third Way economic theories (e.g. Cheyne et al., 2008; O'Neill, 2005), and they provide a basis for the PBRF. The performance-based funding model is consistent with the politics of Public Choice Theory, accountability and managerialism (see section 2.4) and has been justified in terms of government's support for policy initiatives to create a "knowledge economy and society" (Adams, 2008). The emphasis in the above quote on higher productivity and assessment driven performance resonates with the comments that were made by the women on high workloads. It is easy to see how this style of management can create performance anxiety and stress. Women, because of their additional family and personal responsibilities may be particularly disadvantaged in keeping up with the increased workload expectations, and this could also disadvantage them in terms of promotion (Curtis and Phibbs, 2006; Mayer and Tikka, 2008; Neale, 2009; Ozkani and White, 2008). Women who perceive themselves as disadvantaged in this regard may be more likely suffer to from overwork, stress or anxiety as a result.

I will next examine how some of these tensions identified by women associated with their research and its management can be interpreted in the light of government and institutional discourses associated with the funding of research.

The task of implementing the research funding policy according to the government's economic goals falls to the TEC, and their approach can be clearly seen in the design of the PBRF. The PBRF Working Group (Ministry of Education, 2002) established to develop a model for PBRF was a committee of nine members (including only two women, five professors/associate professors, one representative each from IPENZ and TEC). Boston (2006) noted that several key universities supported a model that increased funding in areas of research excellence:

"several vice-chancellors and deputy vice-chancellors with responsibility for research during 1999-2000 argued strongly in favour of New Zealand adopting a performance indicator model." (Boston, 2006, p. 11).

In the early rounds of the PBRF, universities with an existing active research culture (Auckland and Otago) benefited the most financially, compared with newer universities yet to establish a research culture (e.g. Auckland University of Technology), thus enhancing differentiation among the sector institutions to the benefit of the established universities (Adams, 2008). It is hardly surprising that management would support an initiative that had such potential to act as an incentive to increase staff productivity. And of course it is not surprising that some institutions support it because they do better financially in PBRF:

"The arrival of the PBRF has been associated with a universal and substantial refocusing of institutional strategy around the research mission and the development of a number of mechanisms to support that strategy." (Adams, 2008, p. 35).

The discourse of “research excellence” meets the need for justification of a performance-based model for funding on a basis other than that of sector differentiation, which is less likely to be accepted by academics who are not research managers and by the public in general:

“Had it not been possible to defend the proposition that the PBRF would deliver such things as more and better research, and improve research training and better information for policy making then plainly the PBRF would have lacked the necessary intellectual foundations and political credibility.” Boston (2006, p. 7).

In fact evidence presented by Adams (2008, p. 44) strongly suggests that the PBRF model tends to privilege research fields and modes that most readily align with its assessment model. For example, while the model works well for traditional academic fields such as the sciences, it works less well for longer-term research, social sciences and the creative arts:

“The PBRF model over-promotes a particular research outcome, one that most easily fits a traditional western scientific paradigm. This may have an effect on research links with users, policy-based research and non-university research portfolios”.

“Subjects associated with applied research and professional practices are less likely to produce readily assessable outputs.” (Adams, 2008, p. 7).

While there were no clear differences among the women’s perceptions of the research environment according to discipline, it may be that this group is too small to detect whether or not any differences exist. However, it is worth noticing that other researchers have found differences in PBRF scores on this basis, with some disciplines, such as arts, nursing and social sciences that tend to employ more women being disadvantaged (Curtis and Phibbs, 2006). This may be partly attributed, particularly in fields such as nursing and midwifery, to a greater focus on teaching and training. Given that Curtis and Phibbs also found evidence that PBRF scores may be used for promotional purposes, one important implication is thus lack of equity for women in promotion as a result – clearly a potential ground for creating anxiety and stress. As a result of these observations, Curtis and Phibbs concluded that the 2003 quality evaluation was “a gendered measurement tool in the sense that it reflects masculine norms and values” (p.411), and that through emphasis on targets and performance was likely to reinforce male hegemonies within participating institutions.

In addition to these inequities among disciplines, there are also issues associated with the identification and measurement of “excellent” research, and the potential for the assessment process to change professional practice. Adams (2008) expresses concerns about the implications for changing workplace practices that are relevant for the present study:

“There is some concern that the PBRF affects professional practice, user related research and commercialisation. This stems from differing views on what constitutes research excellence despite the breadth of the guidelines. Senior staff may have footholds in academia and a profession, but high-impact, non-academic activity across a broad boundary does not readily

qualify as “original research”. Subjects associated with applied research and professional practice are less likely to produce readily assessable outputs.” (Adams, 2008, p. 7).

Adams suggests that PBRF will have an even more pervasive effect on the academic workplace, redefining what counts as professional practice. Industry-led and commercially valuable research may not necessarily align with world-class or “excellent research”. What constitutes “excellence” is not necessarily agreed upon or even clearly defined. Agreement may vary across disciplines and subject areas, with the potential to create frustration and confusion about expectations, as noted in one woman’s comments earlier. Quality research can take several years to accomplish, and in today’s competitive climate, several more years to achieve publication in a high-ranking journal. By this time, the criteria for research excellence may have changed several times.

4.4 Communication practices, power and gender

Communication practices, power and gender issues within the university, influenced by and intertwined with the workplace culture and associated discourses previously identified, can create tensions in women’s lives. As the focused conversations progressed it became apparent that many of these issues were intermeshed in complex and subtle ways, hence issues with the hierarchical structure of the workplace and communication issues are also related with issues associated with the corporate vision, knowledge and management discussed in the preceding section.

The hierarchical nature of the university was clearly recognised by one woman as a development from the corporate model, and came in for some harsh criticism:

“Obviously this is a power organisation based on power structures and that because it’s made of smart people. I think those power structures are even stronger than they might be in other organisations and both more obvious and less obvious. And one of the things of course that has changed in the last twenty years, twenty five years probably, is that we’ve gone from what was really a flat structure, well more or less. That’s changed to a completely hierarchical model now. We’re now much more like, you know, corporate organisations and the whole surveillance thing. It’s changed dramatically”

Another woman said that in her department, lack of communication in what was a hierarchical structure led to confusion about the day-to-day practices:

“It doesn’t make things easy, like not knowing the hierarchy of the management and who’s responsible for what. If there is a hierarchy, it should be backed up by a stand. Like the mana of the people in those positions, and I don’t feel it is in research.”

While another likened the university environment to school:

“I feel like I’m at school, like I’m a student.”

One other woman also saw the communication practices in the rapidly changing workplace climate as being confusing:

“Communication practices, that’s interesting. Now communication is a funny thing between management and us. It’s completely disjointed most of the time. I feel like it’s not clear, not really clear, on who does what and who’s responsible for what, who’s leading what.”

“ Yes it feels more like there is something building, but not in a good way. It’s kind of uncomfortable but I don’t really have much prior experience of what the working environment was like over time, so I don’t really have anything to compare it to.”

These comments suggest that tensions are created through lack of information, consultation, misunderstandings and poor communication between management and staff, consistent with the findings of Kuo (2009). Adams (2008) suggests that “gate keeping” practices exist and are enforced by managers or those in more powerful positions, both within the institutions themselves, and within the Tertiary Education Commission. This style of management could certainly account for some of the perceptions of lack of communication and consultation. Adams (2008), in conducting his review of PBRF acknowledged his unfamiliarity with the New Zealand legal, cultural and social environment, and described his access to participants thus:

“Choices about survey participants were made by TEC staff after initial consultation with the reviewer. The key stakeholders were all identified by the TEC, based on the TEC’s perception of priorities and relevance. All communications with the reviewer were through support staff working for the TEC.” (Adams, 2008, p. 14).

Evidence of gate keeping within the institutions was also provided in his statement:

“ TEC’s were advised of the subjects to be covered at their location but were left free to choose exactly which disciplines and representatives might be interviewed. The aim was to ensure that a broadly holistic sample was taken within reasonable work bounds, with appropriate overlap but without undue duplication.” (Adams, 2008, p. 14).

Adams clearly acknowledged these as limitations in his report, and also acknowledged that more experienced researchers, heads of department, research co-ordinators, managers and team leaders were included in the participants he was allowed to interview:

“An implied ‘limitation’ raised later was that the survey, in the pilot and later work, tended to acquire more information about research leaders and the more research-active than the rest of the community. This was entirely deliberate. There is very little point in focusing a survey of methodology designed to assess and fund research excellence on those who are explicitly not doing excellent research.” (Adams, 2008, p. 13).

The small size of the academic community in New Zealand means that many of the participants in the review were also likely to be responsible for managing and developing the assessment practices, adding further complexities to the results. In fact, Adams was right in pointing out this imbalance. Of the 186 participants in his review, 98 were either professors or associate professors. One of the women in this study felt as if she were under surveillance and this could be a risk associated with PBRF, since it is known that assessment information is available to managers:

“At a local level, it would be quite wrong if such information were to be used for staff appraisal, yet I found two leading research institutions that not only proposed to do exactly this but claimed they were unable to operate unless they did so. I have rarely encountered such a blatant abdication of proper management responsibility nor such willingness on the part of academic institutions to relinquish their autonomy to government.” (Adams, 2008, p. 71).

It is worth examining next the extent to which gender discrimination in the university hierarchy might be a contributory factor to the creation of tensions for some women,

especially given that the managers appraising staff performance are more likely to be men.

Of the sixteen members of the Massey University Council listed in the 2008 Annual Report, only six are women, while the senior leadership team comprises twelve men and only four women. Of the senior officers, the chancellor, pro-chancellor, vice-chancellor, registrar and deputy vice-chancellor are all men (Massey University, 2008). Bryson (2004) cited in Curtis and Phibbs (2006, p. 402) states "*Men dominate gate keeping positions*". It is therefore necessary to ask whether there are gender biases within tertiary organisations as a whole, and have these changed over time. While this may simply reflect that there are fewer women than men in senior academic positions who are available for promotion to the highest levels, Curtis and Phibbs (2006) noted that there was a significant difference among men and women in "*origin of doctorate*", with women academics more likely to have obtained their doctorate within New Zealand. Curtis and Phibbs suggest that this factor alone may cause women to be disadvantaged because their access to international networks may be more limited as a result, and that this may have a bearing on their career advancement. Women with families who are less able to travel internationally or even nationally may be especially disadvantaged in this regard.

Consistent with claims in the literature of discrimination against women with parental responsibilities, some evidence pointed to the existence of overt gender discrimination within the university:

"I sort of wonder, like my perception of a professional environment has been only determined by my experience here. I've only experienced one negative experience because I'm a woman. When I was interviewed for my job I was asked if I was planning on becoming pregnant."

This kind of attitude is consistent with the overt discrimination described by Lazar (2005, p. 7) as "*blatant exclusionary gate-keeping social practices*" perpetuated by men against women. One presumes that had the woman said "yes", she might not have been successful in her application. There are also more subtle discriminatory practices; these can be very pervasive, because often the perpetrator has become so accustomed to the organisational culture that he (or possibly even she) is unaware of their import. This woman was very aware of the gender discrimination in her following comment:

"Other people I work with when I first came back after maternity leave expressed their surprise and joy that I haven't let being a mother affect my ability to work long hours."

Here what might be at first assumed to be praise, also carries the implicit assumption that the woman who is a mother is not expected to work as hard or be as productive as the woman who is not. As Lazar (2005, p. 7) states:

"Gender ideology is hegemonic in that it often does not appear as domination at all; instead it seems largely consensual and acceptable to most in a community."

Comments made about motherhood, such as the one above may fall into the category of consensual assumptions. Career interruptions, part-time or casual employment are

often seen as the norm for mothers with young children. The tendency for women to be employed on either part-time or casual contracts that do not provide opportunities for promotion is claimed by Briar (2009) to be a barrier to women in gaining a career position. Women often do not consciously choose to work part time, but because of young families, and the fact that it is the woman who is normally expected to shoulder much of the childrearing responsibility, this may be the only option for some. This division of roles is often accepted as the norm in Western societies, yet career interruptions are not normally taken into account when applying for promotion. Career interruptions have been cited as a barrier for women when applying for promotion (Ozkanli et. al. 2009). Doyle et al. (2004) found that more women than men were employed at lower level positions at Massey University, while the reverse was true at the top of the hierarchy. The next section examines how women deal with tensions between work/life balance and the gendered workplace culture.

4.5 Multiple roles, the individual and work/life balance

Tensions created by conflict between women's multiple roles, the culture of the individual and work/life balance, and the corporate discourses of economic productivity and capitalism were apparent in some of the participant's narratives. Family roles and responsibilities were not usually mentioned early in the interview, and where this did occur it was often in conjunction with some kind of disclaimer to emphasise that family responsibilities did not form an intrusion on their working life or affect their work in any way. Some of these comments suggest that tension is created in needing to hide those personal roles that might be seen as an obstacle to productivity a for fear of being perceived as weak or in some way unable to meet the expectations of the university workplace. For example one woman who was a parent commented that it was necessary to avoid letting personal circumstances be known in case it might be seen as detrimental to her career aspirations:

"Like there's no room there. Like I have to pretend I don't have a son when I'm here."

In contrast, another woman I talked with (not a parent) described herself thus:

"I'm not a parent so that I don't have to describe myself as a parent - as a professional."

Both the above comments express recognition of (and/or reaction against) socially constructed gender ideologies associated with lower expectations surrounding women with dependent children and the workplace. Implicit in the words of both these women is acknowledgement of a need to hide the fact of being a parent; perhaps for fear that managers might see parenthood as unprofessional or as an impediment to their performance at work. These observations are consistent with the findings of Doyle et al. (2004); Howard (1996) and Ozkanli and White (2008), who noted that many women feel disadvantaged in the workplace by personal circumstances such as families and children, hence may choose to hide these circumstances for fear they may be seen as

an impediment to their productivity. The suggestion that PBRF scores are being misused by some institutions for staff management purposes (Adams, 2008, p.39) would explain why some women would want to hide any information that could be seen as affecting their performance in the workplace:

“My overall conclusion is that the system adopted in New Zealand has been broadly accepted (in my interviews around the TEOs it faced no strong challenge from experienced academics) but leaves some discontent among the less empowered who see it as a source of uninformed criticism.” (Adams, 2008, p. 62).

There was no evidence that any of the women with dependent families were allowing their other commitments to affect their work. In fact, several comments clearly suggested that work was often the most important factor in the work/life continuum, for example:

“We have no work/life balance, its all work.”

In my own case it was impossible to hide the fact that I am a single parent with a child who had special needs, yet there is a feeling of anger that it was expected that women should do so. I am familiar with the feelings of anxiety and guilt when having to leave work in a hurry to attend to a family crisis or when a recuperating child is tucked in a corner of my office. In recent years, as the culture of managerialism has intensified, I have found myself increasingly pressurised to submit papers and travel to national and international conferences, despite the personal difficulties that this would clearly create, perhaps reflecting the fact that managers value the “quick turn-around” for this kind of output. The fact that I cannot do this is an additional source of anxiety, since these limitations on my ability to network are also likely to disadvantage me in the current workplace climate.

In responding to the question: “How do you achieve balance between work and other self /home/family/...whatever?” most respondents were adamant that the job of an academic could not be done in the thirty seven and a half hours specified in their employment contract. Estimates of hours worked typically ranged from 50 to 60 hours a week, anecdotes included many late nights worked – either in the office or at home for preparation and marking. Most academics admitted to taking work home at some point:

“I worked out that for the first few months of this year I was averaging about fifty hours week. And its meant to be thirty seven and a half, and I was thinking I’m not getting paid for those extra hours but I don’t think its possible for me to do the job I’m expected to do in thirty seven and a half hours. It’s like I cannot imagine I can work harder that in thirty seven and a half hours to achieve what I do – it’s not possible.”

We discussed the effect of working these long hours on stress and work life balance. Trade offs were usually to the detriment of their own self. The additional working hours were accomplished at the expense of the women’s own lifestyle, e.g. hobbies, exercise, or at the expense of time spent with families, children, relatives and loved ones. While some were happy to do this, others found this imbalance to be a major source of stress:

“People often say to me, and in fact it is women who say to me, oh you’re working too hard but they don’t understand that it isn’t work for me it’s what I love. So to be sure there are times, like when I’m marking and things like that, it most definitely feels like work, but if it’s research I mean it’s just a hobby.”

“We just work long hours and we still never feel that we achieve. There’s always the sense of being not good enough.”

Feelings of inadequacy were accompanied by concerns for the future health of an academic population working at the present intensity:

“I find that I’m so busy doing things during the day that at the end of the day I’m exhausted, so in terms of balance I’m not, like I’m not always on the go, and I crash. Some people can do that but not me.”

“Really when you talk about the work life balance, you don’t expect to have that balance when you are younger - when you’ve got kids and that - but at our age I would have expected to have more life and less work. But it’s actually not like that at all. It’s just, you know, really difficult. “

In this later stage of the conversations, there was a tendency to return to the problems with workload – some women clearly felt it was important, so I think it is important to do so too – a reminder that the story is a complex one with many overlapping tensions. Stories of stress and exhaustion at the end of the day were commonplace. These stories are consistent with the trend for longer working hours under Neoliberal and managerialist workplace policies that encourage individual contracts and competitiveness (Cheyne et al. 2008, p.201), and New Zealanders typically work long hours in comparison with many OECD countries (OECD, 2010).

There was for some of the women a physical blurring of the boundaries between the workplace and home. Taking work home was a typical solution to the need to get through all the work, again consistent with changes in the structure of work under managerialism (Cheyne et al., 2008, p. 202). The employment of this strategy supports the calls by Dwyer (2008) and Ozkanli and White (2008) for flexible work policies to be encouraged, and is in line with recommendations of Watty, Bellamy and Morely (2008) who found that flexibility and autonomy in teaching and research were rated the two most important factors in contributing to work satisfaction of academics in business disciplines (although the proportion of women was not clear). For some women in this study, flexible hours were not the ideal. While in my case flexible hours are appreciated, since as a single parent without this I could not stay in the university system, carried to excess there are obvious health implications in working very long or late hours.

The need to make the choices in order to achieve work/life balance was clearly recognised by a number of the women interviewed:

“Well I find that I ignore myself and I don’t go out, so that I have only two things – family and work that’s it.”

On the other hand, some women were making conscious choices in trading the work ethic in favour of quality of life, regardless of what the expectations were:

"I think I've made choices in how I've operated, and every now and then I sometimes wake up at night and go ummm, I should be a senior lecturer by now."

Others made choices, but then felt anxious, compromised or even alienated by the work ethic they saw around them:

"Well we make a choice I think, lots of choices to be honest. One is your personal life I suppose, and how much you take from that. The other choice is how well you do your study, or if you do your study, and you wear the consequences of compromising teaching or feeling compromised in yourself because you are increasingly out of step with the culture of the place."

The conflict for some women is evident, although not yet resolved:

"I have got other things I want to do, and if I had the money I'd retire tomorrow, and I actually love my job and want to enjoy getting at last some research under my belt, but I also want to garden and, you know, do other things."

For myself it is a case of juggling the work/life balance, doing what seems to be a fair day's (or in many cases evening's) work. Conflict between the personal and the professional for me as a single parent, would arise through conflicting demands on my time – the need to meet a report deadline for instance becomes compromised by personal issues such as school holidays, sick children. These findings are in line with those of Mayer and Tikka (2008) for women academics working in Nordic countries. Flexible working hours can only go part way to alleviating these problems, Mayer and Tikka found that in spite of having generous family and parental leave provisions, women still faced risks of losing their contracts if they took long maternity leave, or were pressurized into returning to work before the end of their allowed leave period. Recognition of these risks resonate strongly with warnings from Adams (2008, p. 39) of implications for the long term effects on the academic workforce of the current short term and highly output driven workplace culture that has arisen in the wake of PBRF:

"Reduced hiring of junior staff and side-lining of those who do not immediately perform may threaten sustainability." (Adams, 2008, p. 39.).

In this study, women found that sometimes it was necessary to make choices in order to make time for families, yet it left them with a feeling of guilt and inadequacy at putting family first. Flexible hours should not mean extra hours, yet as we learned earlier some of the women were working far more than the thirty-seven and a half hour week for which they were paid. However urgent the circumstance, there is always a feeling of guilt - there is always the reflection: "Have I done enough?" "Is this what is expected of me?" This is expressed very clearly by one of the women who says:

"Yes, I think the biggest issues for some of us is role conflict. Commitment to [edited], commitment to what you are doing, deep commitment, but almost inability to do what we think needs to be done because of insufficient time to do it. So it makes you feel all the time a) inferior because you're not managing; b) frustrated because you know that's not entirely true, or if it is, it's because of a very good reason that's beyond your control."

One woman saw possible issues with these conflicts of time pressures both in and out of the workplace creating or increasing long term problems for staff health. For the university this could mean problems with retention of valuable experienced staff:

"I'm not surprised to see a lot more women, for example, are setting up their own businesses rather than working in the corporate structures, or universities or whatever. And I think those sort of strategies will start to happen more and more. I think you will see more and more of that sort of thing. People taking other options because you cannot go on. I think there becomes a time when people just can't do it any more."

Gendered work/life balance issues such as those described above, created or exacerbated by Neoliberalist and managerialist workplace policies, deserve further examination since the tensions they create raise questions not just for staff health, but also for the sustainability of the university in the longer term.

4.6 Summary

In summary, the women who told their stories had very different work/life roles, yet there were some common threads that emerged under each of the three themes examined.

• Organisational culture and the professional self

Tensions emerged between the organisational culture and the women's views of themselves as professionals. Recent major political and economic restructuring in of the tertiary education sector in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 2002; 2007) has translated into managerialist workplace discourses and consensual assumptions within these discourses that have contributed to tensions between the workplace and the professional self for the women who participated in this study. One of the key areas creating these tensions lies in the separation of the dual academic roles of teaching and research. All the women felt the need to justify their position as professionals and to clarify their priorities in regard to teaching and/or research. The discourse of "research-led teaching" has created institutional policies that give priority to the research role. Some women felt that this was a gendered issue in that male colleagues tended to be more pragmatic in prioritising research while some women preferred to be more involved with teaching and pastoral care. There was recognition that women who preferred these roles could be disadvantaged in terms of promotion. Those women who chose to prioritise teaching found that this conflicted with expectations to research, and their choices were constrained if they wanted to advance in their careers. One participant thought that women spent more time on assessment and giving detailed informative feedback than was the case with her male colleagues, or than was allowed for by management in the allocation of workloads. This agrees with findings in a previous survey at Massey University, and can impinge on research and productivity in such a way that may disadvantage women in promotion (Doyle et al., 2004).

A further source of tension was that some of the women felt that their academic freedom to research in their areas of interest was constrained by the need to work in areas of relevance to industry, in line with the "knowledge economy" discourse. Concerns were also expressed that the need to produce outputs that were of value to industry in the short term would discourage longer term, higher quality research, or research that was not directly industry related. In reflecting on the responses of the women, in the light of

these “official” discourses, some deeper ontological conflicts associated with the “knowledge economy” were also apparent.

The increasingly corporatised workplace practices are accompanied by changes in the view of knowledge, consistent with these managerialist strategies (Codd, 2005). A positivist view of knowledge and learning permeates the Tertiary Education Strategy that is endorsed by the university in adopting the “knowledge economy” discourse of government and industry, with the goal of developing learners that can think and operate in a way that meets the economic, social and cultural vision of government. This view of knowledge conflicts with feminist epistemologies that embrace multiple ways of knowing related to the intimate reality of the self (e.g. Baxter, 2003; Lazar, 2005); recognising that the different experiences of women shape their world views.

- **Changing roles, expectations and contradictions**

A number of tensions were created for women by the changes, expectations and contradictions in the workplace. Communication, power and gender issues were identified that conflicted with women’s identities as teachers, researchers and administrators. As the pressure to produce research outputs has intensified, some women noted how this has impacted on collegiality within the institution, with opportunities for social interaction curtailed, in order to accomplish the work. Opportunities to discuss and explore collaborative research were also seen by some women as limited by the pressure of work. How favourably women felt about their workplace depended quite strongly on their managers; with more positive comments made if they felt supported by their management. Poor communication at work could create ambiguities in knowing the expectations of their managers and led to negative perceptions of the workplace, and this varied within individual institutions/departments.

Some women thought that there were gendered issues associated with management styles, consistent with the findings of Ozlanli and White (2008). Corporate styles of management that were seen as being more masculine caused problems for women who preferred negotiation and consultation, yet there were fears of being criticised as “weak” should they employ these methods. Workload, communication and management issues identified in this theme also linked with the tensions identified in the previous section as associated with organisational culture, highlighting the complex interconnectedness of the themes and narratives. For example, high workloads in specific areas such as teaching or administration compromised the time available for the research some women would prefer to accomplish.

- **Multiple roles, the culture of the individual and work/life balance**

Tensions created by conflict between women’s multiple roles, the culture of the individual and work/life balance were also complex and related both to the corporate discourses of economic productivity and managerialism, and to conflicts with societal

norms and expectations. There was consensus that work had impinged on life in many ways; for example high workloads, blurring of work/life boundaries through flexible hours and taking home work, all of which are consistent with workplace changes under Neoliberal policies (e.g. Bradley and Healey, 2008; Briar, 2009; Cheyne et al., 2008; Codd, 2006). Some women were happier to accommodate these changes than others. Most of the five women felt the need to compromise and juggle their priorities, but those who prioritised family and private life over work realised that this was at the expense of research and promotion. This fear has been supported by research both internationally (Mayer and Tikka, 2008) and in New Zealand universities (Adams, 2008; Doyle et al., 2004; Neale, 2009). Others struggled to manage the demands and felt that sacrifices in their personal lives needed to be made in order to accomplish the expectations of the workplace. The long-term implications of these issues, both for women's health and for the sustainability of the institutions themselves have yet to be examined.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

What do we have to do?

“The goalposts keep changing. First of all you’ve got to get published in international refereed journal. Then it’s that you’ve got to get international funding as well. And then it’s something else. It gets harder. It seems to get harder and harder to meet the expectations of being an excellent researcher.”

These words from one of the women who participated in this study clearly point to the main sources of conflict for many women academics. The question I chose for my research was: How have recent organisational changes in the tertiary education sector shaped tensions for academic women in New Zealand? In addressing this question, it is clear from listening to these women’s stories that differences in expectations and values/world views between those expressed by the women, and those embedded within the official discourses have contributed to constraining the choices women make. Conflict and tension often appeared when the values of these women rubbed up against the discourses of the academy in their attempts to meet the increasing expectations of their employers. Critical analysis of the institutional texts provided explanations for how these tensions have arisen or changed in response to rapid and profound changes in organisational structures in recent years.

Adoption of Neoliberal and managerialist strategies reflecting changes in the political environment has created within the university a corporatised and marketised view of knowledge, research and teaching. Implementation of this corporatised view is reliant on increased accountability in policies and practices that are themselves permeated by consensual and gendered assumptions of equality. The vision for universities outlined in the Tertiary Education Strategy (Ministry of Education, 2007), is one in which the discourse of the “knowledge economy” prevails, where “excellent research” is that which meets the needs of government and industry, and where “research-led” teaching develops graduates into future leaders of industry. The quotation above highlights the increasing pressures on academics to produce “excellent” research that has arisen as one consequence of the way in which universities are dependent on “research outputs” for their funding under the government’s Neoliberal agenda. Conflict arises for these women when their needs, values, and the choices they must make are constrained by this hierarchical and gendered institutional culture. One relevant aspect of a feminist post-structuralist approach, in contrast with the institutional vision, is that of seeing each woman’s lived experience as an individual interpretation formed from the diverse multiple realities of the social, cultural and political environment in which she lives and works (Baxter, 2003). Diverse though the lives of the women in this study were, in

talking with them about the tensions they experienced between the workplace and their lives, there were some common threads linking through their narratives, and in the choices they made.

In the preceding chapter the women's stories were grouped into three broad themes, reflecting sources of tensions and conflict. However, it became apparent in the early stages of my analysis that the sources of conflict were more complicated, and involved the interweaving and overlapping of many issues. These women were united in their professional commitment to their academic careers, yet being a woman in the academy meant being in conflict with the existing and gendered academic, societal and political norms. All of the women felt they needed to choose and to justify their positions – as teachers, as researchers, as professionals – to themselves and to others. The women often adopted the language and discourses of these policies in their justification of themselves as professionals and as researchers, showing that the discourse was well established within their consciousness, adding another layer of complexity to the cultural exchanges between the women and the academy.

The increased pressures that the Neoliberal management practices have placed on women's professional and personal lives have permeated their narratives. This was particularly apparent in the way the women talked about their research, their relationships with their colleagues and managers, and the added workloads associated with accountability practices. For example one woman found that demands for quick turn around of research "outputs" had led to a lack of time for planning collaborative research and for collegiality. This problem was highlighted in the previous chapter with her comment:

"Everybody is just so busy trying to get the research they know they can do done, and teaching, that there's no time to kind of have a think about the things you could do with other people because it takes the time away from the things you know you can do."

The problems associated with high workloads were alluded to by all of the women in this study, irrespective of their family or other circumstances, suggesting that this issue may be a wider one. However, there were additional concerns expressed about how managerialist strategies used to implement accountability practices, such as the PBRF, created problems that went beyond issues of workload to affect the nature of the research itself, causing tensions through constraining their academic freedom to research in areas and ways of their own choosing. There were also concerns expressed by these women that short-term research was supplanting longer-term quality work, consistent with the findings of Adams (2008). Women who prioritised teaching over research felt that they were disadvantaged by the devaluing of their teaching in promotional criteria (also reflecting the lesser status given to teaching in official discourses), creating yet another source of tension.

Poor communication between management and women academics created ambiguities in knowing the expectations of managers, which led in some instances to negative perceptions of the workplace and how it supports women. Stories of conflicts and inequities were aligned with communication issues identified between faculty and management in Australian universities (Kuo, 2009). Women were more positive about their career if they felt supported by their management, however, the extent to which this happened varied greatly among departments, creating further anxiety and perceptions of inequity.

Three of the women reported issues with the hierarchical male hegemonic environment of the university that seemed to be exacerbated by the corporate, managerial strategies. The women in this study reported both overt and subtle means of discrimination. Although merit-based rules, policies and practices are supposedly gender neutral, in fact the different ways of working between men and women can mean that the discourse of “equal opportunity” creates gender inequalities in promotion, thereby contributing to the disempowerment of women in the university. As noted by three of the women in this study, the university is a hierarchical and gendered environment in which the workplace expectations, attitudes, policies and practices create tensions in the personal and professional lives of women academics. Furthermore the experiences and expectations of women are often themselves gendered, as argued by Doyle et al. (2004) and Neale (2009).

Two of the women in the study felt challenged in their ability to compete on equal terms with their male colleagues for recognition and for advancement in their professional careers. Three women reported that they felt challenged in their abilities to cope with workplace expectations because of their roles as mothers, partners or carers, and/or because of the conflict that existed between their private lives as individuals and the demands of the academy, supporting these claims made elsewhere in the literature (e.g. Briar, 2009; Curtis and Phibbs, 2006; Neale, 2009). Three women reportedly felt exhausted because their high workloads intruded on their private lives, but were anxious to avoid being seen as not performing, so some of these women chose to prioritise their work and/or take work home in the evening. However, it was clear that these choices were often not made willingly. Where women had made a choice not to let excessive workloads interfere with their private lives, it was recognised that this was at the cost of promotion. For two women, participating in this study was acknowledged to be a rare and/or welcome opportunity to have space to reflect and talk about some of these issues. All these findings support demands for family friendly workplace practices and promotional opportunities based on equity (e.g. Briar, 2009; Dwyer, 2006; 2008; Mayer and Tikka, 2008)

The question then is can women resist or resolve these tensions, or do we need to find ways to challenge and remove them? Some of the conflicts among work/life balance

were not seen by the women as able to be readily resolved, and some women had developed strategies for “coping”, albeit unwillingly. The areas of priority differed for the women, as did the extent to which women felt constrained in their freedom to make choices for themselves or for their family. Yet there was common ground in that all of the women recognised there was a need to make choices and sacrifices, whether it was research, and/or teaching or personal issues in order to achieve balance in their lives. Because there exists this common ground, therein lies the potential for seeking approaches for resolution.

My first recommendation is that women need to collectively debate the direction the university is taking, whether this direction is in the interests of women and of society as a whole, and whether there are any solutions to be found. The debate is likely to be a lively one that will challenge the very individualistic norms for which academia is renown, as well as against the political discourses that shape the status quo. In framing such a debate, the implications for women of not making their stories heard, for themselves, their families and for society as a whole should be considered. These issues should be debated not just by the women themselves but also by the wider tertiary education sector as a whole. It is evident from these women’s stories that some responsibility lies with the academy as an employer to participate in and contribute to the resolution of these issues since some of these women’s narratives have suggested that workplace policies and practices may be contributing to issues that have serious implications for the long-term health of women and for the sustainability of the workplace, should they not be addressed.

A second recommendation could include establishing networks for ongoing debate, through which it might be possible to collectively challenge those systems and practices that are identified as contributing to the disempowerment of women in the academic workplace. This might include for example, establishing collaborative research and/or a vehicle for publication of writings or for making collective submissions. In particular provision of spaces by employers within tertiary institutions (including physical, temporal and financial resources) in which to meet, debate and talk about these issues would be a useful next step. Avenues should be found for collective debate between the hierarchies and women academics that allow their stories to be heard. Given that these women have reported the need to hide any factors that might be seen as compromising their ability to meet expectations of management, and have expressed anxieties surrounding their employment security, such avenues need to be seen as safe ones. This might explain, for example, some of the limitations of such networking systems. Some possible directions for continuing research are examined next.

Conversations with these women academics have revealed a complex interplay among the personal and professional lives of women and the gendered, hierarchical university workplace. These issues may yet be changing in response to the rapidly changing

social, political and workplace culture. One of the weaknesses of this study that was also one of its strengths was the small number of voices. While it is impossible to make generalisations from such a small number of participants, a few detailed interviews have the advantage of allowing personal voices to be heard in depth, and there is also strength in these findings when women from widely differing backgrounds experience common problems.

The study was limited in that my participants were women of primarily Western ethnicity working in the context of one university; other universities or stories from other cultural groups such as Maori and Pacific women were not examined in this research. This study could be extended to encompass nationwide research, to include a more diverse group of women, and/or to hear more voices from a wider range of different tertiary institutes and disciplines.

My interpretations have revealed that there may be tensions among academic staff at different levels of seniority in the university hierarchy, and between academic and administrative staff that are worthy of further study. Superimposed upon traditional hierarchies of power, gender and communication within the university culture, there appear to be changes in the relationships between senior management and faculty encompassing different values/ hierarchies of managerialism vs. collegiality, researching vs. teaching, positivism vs. post positivism. These newer narratives and relationships intersect with old hierarchies, reinforcing or transforming them, in such a way as to further disempower women working within the university system.

The modern university is operating increasingly like a large business corporation with managerialist values predominant, especially at the top of the hierarchy. Evidence from these conversations suggests that these values are not entirely shared by the academic community as a whole. Choices for women employees are constrained, creating tensions, many of which are harmful for the health of those women whose values do not coincide with the expectations of the corporate and gendered university culture. It is essential that the wider tertiary sector listen to voices from all levels of the university hierarchy, since there are clearly problems identified in this study that could have profound consequences for the sustainability of the sector as a whole. Women themselves (and institutions) need to collectively research, examine and debate ways in which those policies, structures and procedures that disadvantage women can be changed to provide a better environment for us all.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS OF TEXTS

1. CONTEXT

Sociocultural practices that influence power structures within organisation

Communication practices:

Who can say/write what to whom and in what situations?

Are there any gender biases?

Are there any practices that reinforce/diminish barriers to communication and power?

Power structures

How does an individual change their position within the organisation?

Are any members of the minority group in positions of influence? Do they adopt the majority discourse or attempt to challenge it?

Who are the 'elites' and how are they portrayed within the institution?

How do the elites influence the less powerful? e.g. is there "false consciousness" may lead the dominated group to act against their own interests.

Who are the "gatekeepers" of knowledge, information and power?

2. DISCOURSE PRACTICES (production, interpretation & dissemination)

What is the dominant ideology/ corporate discourse?

Who controls this in terms of access and production?

Who has access to/creates the forms or genres of discourse or to the means of its reproduction?

How is the discourse disseminated?

2. TEXT:

What are the dominant genres/language structures of the organization?

Has this changed over time and how?

Appendix 2: MASSEY UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

Massey University is an integrated multi-campus institution of higher learning that creates new knowledge and understanding; synthesises, applies and disseminates knowledge; develops advanced learning and scholarly abilities for a national and international student body; and promotes free and rational inquiry. We offer high-quality learning experiences that empower people and their communities to prosper in an increasingly knowledge-dependent and technologically advanced world. Massey University is driven by a spirit of community relevance and engagement, while maintaining intellectual independence. We will use our multi-campus structure to meet the needs of our constituent regional communities, while our flexible delivery and distance (extramural) education capabilities give a national and international reach to our educational programmes. Massey University recognises and respects the significance of mana whenua within its regions and the range of Māori organisations contributing to Māori development and advancement. We have demonstrated our commitment to Māori development by providing Māori academic leadership, research opportunities and educational qualifications that assist in the achievement of Māori aspirations. Our integrated academic structures and organisational arrangements enable and support interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary research and academic programmes. We pride ourselves on the relevance of our programmes; on our openness to students of diverse backgrounds spanning age, geographic location, educational background, ethnicity and culture; on the support we provide for our students; and on the relationship we have built with our alumni.

Source: Annual Report (2008)

Appendix 3: FRAMEWORK FOR CONVERSATION

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this conversation that is mainly about reflecting on working in tertiary education – about any issues associated with being a woman and working in the education sector, about work/life balance and how we deal with our multiple roles from day to day.

1. PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT

How would you describe yourself e.g. to a colleague? manager?, student?...e.g. as a person / parent / professional?

How came you here? Why did you choose to work here?

2. WORKPLACE

How has your day been? / How is your day?

How do you feel about work relationships/interactions e.g colleagues, line managers, students?

Have any of these things changed over the time you have worked here, if so how?
(Particularly interested in comments on communication practices & power structures & any gender issues).

3. WORK/LIFE BALANCE

How do you achieve balance between work and “other self” /home/family/...whatever?

How and why has this balance changed in the last few years?

Experiences of working women in the tertiary education sector

INFORMATION SHEET

You are invited to participate in a focused conversation that will form part of the above research project. The research forms part of my Master of Education (Adult Education), supervised by Dr marg gilling (Massey University) and Dr Sandra Grey (Victoria University). The aim of my project is to explore the experiences of working women in tertiary education through mix of methods that include personal narratives, reflection, and content (policy) analysis. The information from my research may raise awareness both within and outside the tertiary employment sector of any issues that may appear.

Participant Identification

Participants for this part of the research have been identified through either personal knowledge or through referral (snowballing) techniques. All participants are women who are or who have recently worked in tertiary education. A total of 4 to 6 women will be invited to participate.

Project Procedures

If you agree to participate, this will involve taking part in a focused conversation of approximately _ hour to 1 hour's duration, at a mutually convenient time and place that will be arranged. The conversation will cover topics relating to your experiences at work and to work/life balance issues.

Data Management

The conversation will be recorded and transcribed by the researcher. From the transcriptions, common themes will be identified and the findings will be summarized in a written report that incorporates reflections in the light of published national and international literature. Audiotapes will be kept by the researcher in a secure location for 5 years, and then destroyed. A brief summary of the project findings can be provided to participants on request.

Participant's Rights

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- ∞ Decline to answer any particular question;*
- ∞ Withdraw from participating at any time before the 31st August 2009;*
- ∞ Ask any questions about the study;*
- ∞ Provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used;*
- ∞ Ask for the audio recorder to be turned off at any time during the conversation;*
- ∞ Be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded.*

Project Contacts

You are invited to contact me and/or the supervisors at any time, if you have any questions about the project.

Researcher
Janet Webster
12 Rossport St
Johnsonville
Wellington

janwebster@xtra.co.nz
Ph 04 477 4602

Supervisor
Dr marg gilling
Senior Lecturer
College Education
Massey University
Palmerston North

mgilling@massey.ac.nz
04 801 2794x6

Supervisor
Dr Sandra Grey
Senior Lecturer
School of Social and Cultural Studies
Victoria University
Wellington

Sandra.Grey@vuw.ac.nz
04 463 5361

"This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor Sylvia Rumball, Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor (Research Ethics), telephone 06 350 5249, email humanethics@massey.ac.nz"

Experiences of working women in the tertiary education sector

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM - INDIVIDUAL

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I agree/do not agree to the interview being sound recorded. *(if applicable include this statement)*

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signature:

Date:

.....

Full Name - printed

.....

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1991). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organisations. In J. Lorber, and S.A. Farrell, (Eds.), *The social construction of gender* (pp. 162-179). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Adams, J. (2008). *Strategic review of the performance-based research fund. The assessment process*. Retrieved June 2008 from <http://www.tec.govt.nz>.
- Bagilhole, B. (1994). Being different is a very difficult row to hoe: Survival strategies of women academics. In S. Davies, C. Lubelska, and J. Quinn (Eds.), *Changing the subject: women in higher education* (pp. 15-28). London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Bakker, L. Boston, J. Campbell, L. and Smyth, R. (2006). *Evaluating the performance-based research fund. Framing the debate*. Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington: Milne Printers Ltd.
- Barker, C. (2002). Culture as a way of life. In *Making sense of cultural studies: Central problems and critical debates* (pp. 66-85). London: Sage Publications.
- Baxter, J. (2003). *Positioning gender in discourse. A feminist methodology*. Basingstoke. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Belgrave, M. (2004). Needs and the state: Evolving social policy in New Zealand history. In B. Dalley and M. Tennant. (Eds.), *Past judgement. Social policy in New Zealand history* (pp. 23-38.). Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women: feminism, leadership and educational change*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Blackmore, J. and Sachs, J. (2001). Women leaders in the university. In A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon (Eds.), *Gender and the restructured university* (pp. 45-66). Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., and Tight, M. (2006). *How to research* (3rd ed.). Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Boston, J. (2006). Rationale for the performance-based research fund: Personal reflections. In L. Bakker, J. Boston, L. Campbell, and R. Smyth (Eds.). *Evaluating the performance-based research fund. framing the debate* (pp. 5-32). Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington. Wellington: Milne Printers Ltd.
- Bradley, H. (1999). *Gender and power in the workplace: analyzing the impact of economic change*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Bradley, H. and Healey, G. (2008). *Ethnicity and gender at work. Inequalities, careers and employment relations*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Briar, C. (2009). Trapped in the ivory basement: Effort-reward Imbalances amongst non-career academics. In C. Briar (Ed.), *Hidden health hazards in women's work* (pp. 120-140). Wellington: Dunmore Publishing. Ltd.
- Briar, C., Munford, R. and Nash, M. (Eds.). (1992). *Superwoman where are you? Social policy and women's experience*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Burns, J., Dwyer, M., Lambie, H. and Lynch, J. (1999). *Homecare workers: a case*

study of female occupation: a research report. Wellington, NZ. Ministry of Women's Affairs.

Callister, P. (2005). *The changing gender distribution of paid and unpaid work in New Zealand* (38pp.). New Zealand Treasury Working Paper 05/07. Retrieved 2 January from <http://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/research-policy/wp/2005/05-07>.

Carroll, P. (2005). *Times of our lives: a longitudinal study of women and 'retirement'*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences. University of South Australia. Adelaide.

Cheyne, C. O'Brien, M. and Belgrave, M. (2008). *Social policy in Aotearoa New Zealand*. (4th ed.). South Melbourne, Victoria: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, J. (2001). Where are "women returners" returning from? Deconstructing domestication in the context of lifelong learning. *European Society for Research in the Education of Adults*, Gender Network Conference. Geneva. Online. Retrieved 20/04/2008.

Clough, P. and Nutbrown, C. (2007). *A student's guide to methodology* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Codd, J. (2006). The Performance-Based Research Fund and the production and commodification of knowledge. In L. Bakker, J. Boston, L. Campbell, and R. Smyth. (Eds.). *Evaluating the Performance-Based Research Fund. Framing the debate* (pp. 215-230). Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington. Milne Printers Ltd:

Codd, J. (2005). Education policy and the challenge of globalisation: Commercialisation or citizenship? In J. Codd and K. Sullivan (Eds.), *Education policy directions in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 3-17). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.

Codd, J. A. and Gordon, L. (1991). School charters: The contractualist state and education policy. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 26(1): 21-34.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New South Wales: Routledge.

Cotterill, P. and Waterhouse, R.L. (1998). Women in higher education: The gap between corporate rhetoric and the reality of experience. In D. Malina and S. Maslin-Prothero, S. (Eds.) *Surviving the academy: feminist perspectives* (pp. 1-17). Falmer Press, London..

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Curtis, B. and Phibbs, S. (2006). Body politics within the academy: Gender and the Performance-Based Research Fund. In L. Bakker, J. Boston, L. Campbell, and R. Smyth. (Eds.). *Evaluating the Performance-Based Research Fund. Framing the debate* (pp. 401-406). Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington. Milne Printers Ltd.

Dalziel, P. (2005). Rewarding individual research excellence in the PBRF. *New Zealand Journal of Tertiary Education Policy*, 1(2 April): 1-10.

Denzin, K. and Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Doyle, S., Wylie, C. and Hogden, E with Else, A. (2004). *Gender and academic promotion, a case study of Massey University*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for

Educational Research. September 2004. Retrieved 4 September 2009 from <http://www.nzcer.org.nz/pdfs/14033.pdf>.

Dwyer, M. (2006). *The economic rationales for narrowing the gender pay gap*. Report prepared for National Advisory Council on the Employment of Women (41 pp.). Retrieved 2 January 2010 from <http://www.nacew.govt.nz/publications/quality/women/section1.html>.

Dwyer, M. (2008). *Critical issues for New Zealand women's employment, now and in the future*. Report prepared for the for National Advisory Council on the Employment of Women (20pp.). Retrieved 2 January 2010 from http://www.nacew.govt.nz/publications/general/critical-issues/critical-issues_01.html. ISBN 978-0-478-33302-2

Easton, P. (2009). *Ageing workforce a major concern*. Higher Education. Dominion Post. Wednesday August 5, 2009, p. B3.

Evans, L. and Quigley, N. (2006). The Performance-Based Research Fund and the benefits of competition between universities. In L. Bakker, J. Boston, L. Campbell, and R. Smyth. (Eds.), *Evaluating the Performance-Based Research Fund. Framing the debate* (pp. 231-248). Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington: Milne Printers Ltd.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fitzsimons, M. (2004). Managerialism and the university. *New Zealand Journal of Tertiary Education Policy*. 1(June).

Fleras, A. and Spoonley, P. (1999). *Reviewing the past, rethinking the present. Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Gill, J., Matthews, M., Zannettino, L. and Carroll, T. (2008). Thesis writing as a feminist project. *Australian Feminist Studies*. 23(56): 249-261. DOI: 10.1080/08164640802068443.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. London: Continuum.

Hall, C., Morris Matthews, K. and Sawicka, T. (2003). Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF): Policy and practice. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, Victoria University, Wellington. 13: 79-104.

Heward, C. (1996). Women and careers in higher education: What is the problem? In L. Morley and V. Walsh (Eds.), *Breaking boundaries: Women in higher education* (pp. 11-23). London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.

Holly, M. L. (1997). *Keeping a professional journal*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

hooks, b. (2000). *Changing Perspectives on Power. Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: South End Press Classics.

Holmes, J. (2005). Power and discourse at work: is gender relevant? In M. Lazar (Ed.), *Feminist critical discourse analysis* (pp. 31-60). London: Palgrave.

Human Rights Commission, (2008). New Zealand census of women's participation. Human Rights Commission. Retrieved 23 December 2009 from http://www.neon.org.nz/documents/HR%20Women_screen.pdf.

- James, B. and Saville-Smith, K. (1994). *Gender, culture and Power: Challenging New Zealand's gendered culture*. (revised edition). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Jipson, J., Munro, P. Victor, S., Froude Jones, K. and Freed-Rowland, G. (Eds.) (1995). *Repositioning feminism and education: perspectives on educating for social change*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jorgensen, M. and Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kettle, J. (1996). Good practices, bad attitudes: An examination of the factors influencing women's academic careers. In L. Morley and V. Walsh (Eds.), *Breaking Boundaries: Women in Higher Education* (pp. 52-66). London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Knowles, M., Holton, E. and Swanson, R. (2005). *The adult learner: the definitive classic in education and human resource development* (6th ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Kuo, H-M. (2009). Understanding relationships between academic staff and administrators: An organisational culture perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 31(1): 43-54. DOI: 10.1080/13600800802559278.
- Labrum, B. (2004). Negotiating an increasing range of functions: Families and the welfare state. In B. Dalley and M. Tennant. (Eds.), *Past judgement. Social policy in New Zealand history* (pp. 157-174.). Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Larner, W. (1993). Changing contexts: Globalization, migration and feminism. In S. Gunew and A. Yeatman. (Eds.), *New Zealand. Feminism and the politics of difference* (pp. 85-102). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- Lauder, H. (1990). The New Right revolution. In S. Middleton, J. Codd and A. Jones. (Eds.), *New Zealand education policy today: Critical perspectives* (pp. 1-26). Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Lazar, M. M. (2005). Politicizing gender in discourse: Feminist critical discourse analysis as political perspective and praxis. In M. Lazar (Ed.), *Feminist critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-28). New York: Palgrave MacMillan Ltd.
- Liamputtong, P. (2009). *Qualitative research methods* (3rd ed.), Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Light, G., Cox, R. and Calkins, S. (2009). *Learning and teaching in higher education: The reflective professional*. (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Mackinnon, A. and Brooks, A. (2001). Introduction: Globalisation, academia and change. In A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon. (Eds.), *Gender and the restructured university* (pp. 1-11). Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Massey University. *Annual Report 2008*, (Retrieved 21 August 2009 from http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/about-us/council-management-and-strategic-plans/policy-guide/policy-guide_home.cfm).
- Mayer, A.L and Tikka, P.M. (2008). Family-friendly policies and gender bias in academia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 30(4): 363-374. DOI:10.1080/13600800802383034.

- Miller, K., Roderick, P. and Sawicka, T. (2006). Impact of the Performance-Based Research Fund on research management at Victoria University of Wellington. In L. Bakker, J. Boston, L. Campbell, and R. Smyth. (Eds.), *Evaluating the performance-based research fund. framing the debate* (pp. 287-300). Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington. Milne Printers Ltd.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *Tertiary education strategy 2007-2012 incorporation statement of tertiary education priorities 2008-2010. (TES/STEP)*. Retrieved 20 January 2008 from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/templates/standard.aspx?id=1183>.
- Ministry of Education. (2002). *Tertiary Education Strategy 2002-2007*. Wellington, New Zealand Retrieved January 2008 from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/upload/.../tertiaryeducationstrategy-2002-2007.pdf>.
- Ministry of Education and Transition Tertiary Education Commission (2002b), *Investing in excellence*. The report of the Performance-Based Research Fund Working Group. Retrieved 18 July 2009 from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/upload/.../pbrfworkinggroupinvestinginexcellence.pdf>.
- Munro, P. (1998). *Subject to fiction: Women teacher's life history narratives and the cultural politics of resistance*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Munro, P. (1995). Multiple "I's": Dilemmas of life-history research. In J. Jipson, P. Munro, S. Victor, K. Froude Jones, and G. Freed-Rowland (Eds.), *Repositioning feminism and education* (pp. 139-192). Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.
- Neale, J. (2009). Women and the politics of university careers. In K. McMillan, J. Leslie and E. McLeay (Eds.), *Rethinking women and politics in New Zealand and comparative perspectives* (pp.280-301). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Neilson, W. (2005). Disability: Attitudes, history and discourses. In D. Fraser, R. Moltzen and K. Ryba (Eds.), *Learners with special needs in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 9-21). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- New Zealand Council of Trade Unions. (2010). Women in the red – red bag day 2010 18.2.10. Retrieved February 2010 from <http://union.org.nz/news/2010/women-in-the-red-red-bag-day-2010-18210>
- O'Brien, V. (1996). *The fast forward MBA in business*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (2010). OECD StatExtracts. Retrieved 31 January 2010 from <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=ANHRS>
- Olssen, M., Codd, J. and O'Neill, A-M. (2004). The ascendancy of Neoliberalism. in *Education policy: globalization, citizenship and democracy* (Chapter 7, pp. 134-146). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- O'Neill, A-M. (2005). Individualism, enterprise culture, and curriculum policy. In J. Codd and K. Sullivan. (Eds.), *Education policy directions in Aotearoa New Zealand* (chapter 5). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.
- O'Sullivan, D. (2001). Maori education and principles of self-determination in the twenty-first century. *Waikato Journal of Education*. 7: 157-170.
- Overall, C. (1998). *A feminist I: Reflections from academia*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press Ltd.
- Ozkanli, O., de Lourdes Machado, M., White, K., O'Connor, P., Riorden, S. and Neale, J. (2009). Gender and Management in HEIs: Changing organisational and management

- structures. *Tertiary Education and Management*. 15(3): 241-257. DOI: 10.1080/13583880903073008.
- Ozkanli, O. and White, K. (2008). Leadership and strategic choices: Female professors in Australia and Turkey. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 30(1): 53-63. DOI: 10.1080/13600800701745051.
- Peters, M. (2001). Cultural studies and the future of "culture". *New Zealand Sociology*. 16(2): 26-47.
- Purnell, S. (1996). Meeting Maori learning needs: a Taiwi perspective. *Connections*. 45: 27-35.
- Ramazanoglu, C. and Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist methodology. Challenges and choices*. London: Sage Publications.
- Reinhartz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rudd, C. (1997). The Welfare State. In C. Rudd and B. Roper (Eds.), *The political economy of New Zealand* (pp. 237-255). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Sansone, C. and Harackiewicz, J. (2000). Rewarding Competence: The Importance of Goals in the Study of Intrinsic Motivation. In C. Sansone and J. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: the search for optimal motivation and performance* (Chapter 3). London: Academic Press.
- Stanley, L. (1990). Feminist praxis and the academic mode of production. In L. Stanley (Ed.), *Feminist praxis: Research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology*. (pp. 4-19). London: Routledge.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2001). *Gender and unpaid work, findings from the time use survey*. Retrieved 1 January 2010 from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/reports/articles/gender-and-unpaid-work.aspx>.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2008). *National family and household projections: 2006 (base) - 2031*. Hot off the press. (121pp.). Retrieved. 31 January 2010 from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/NationalFamilyAndHouseholdProjections_HOTP06-31projections.aspx
- Statistics New Zealand. (2009). *New Zealand income survey: June 2009 quarter*. Hot off the press. (16pp.). Retrieved. 2 January 2010 from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/work_income_and_spending/Income/NZIncomeSurvey_HOTPJun09qtr.aspx
- Tertiary Education Advisory Commission. (2001). *Shaping the funding framework: Fourth report of the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission*. Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission.
- Tertiary Education Commission. (2009). *The Performance Based Research Fund*. Retrieved 6 January 2010 from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/Funding/Fund-finder/Performance-Based-Research-Fund-PBRF-/>.
- Thomas R. (1998). Incorporation or alienation? Resisting the gendered discourses of academic appraisal. In D. Malina and S. Maslin-Prothero, S. (Eds.), *Surviving the academy: Feminist perspectives* (pp. 90-100). Falmer Press, London.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave McMillan.

- Wagner, K. (2005). *Finance for nonfinancial managers, 24 lessons for understanding and evaluating financial health*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Waitere, H. and Johnston, P. (2009). Echoed silences: In absentia: Mana wahine in institutional contexts. *Women's Studies Journal*. 23(2): 14-31. ISSN 1173-6615. Retrieved 31 January 2010 from <http://www.wsanz.org.nz>.
- Watty, K., Bellamy, S. and Morley, C. (2008). Changes in higher education and valuing the job: the views of accounting academics in Australia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 30(2): 139-151. DOI: 10.1080/13600800801938747.
- Web Research Ltd. Centre for Research on Work, Education and Business Limited. (2004). *Phase 1 evaluation of the implementation of PBRF and the conduct of the 2003 Quality Evaluation*. Retrieved 14 July 2009 from <http://www.tec.govt.nz>.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (2nd ed.), Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Weiler, K. (1999). Reflections on writing a history of women teachers. In K. Weiler and S. Middleton (Eds.), *Telling women's lives. narrative enquiries in the history of women's education* (pp. 43-59). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Whitty, G. and Power, S. (2002). Devolution and choice in three countries. In G. Whitty (Ed.). *Making sense of education policy*. (pp. 46-63). London: Paul Chapman.
- Willmott, H. (2003). Commercialising higher education in the UK: The state, industry and peer review. *Studies in Higher Education*. 28(2): 129-141.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. (2008). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn: A comprehensive guide for teaching adults* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse studies – Important concepts and terms. In R. Wodak and M. Krzyzanowski (Eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences* (pp.1-29). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications.