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Redefining the pipeline…

- «Leaky Pipeline» (Alper, 1993) and interrelated phenomena (Glass ceiling, Sticky floor, Matilda/Matthew effects, etc.), examining the progressive disappearance of women the higher we climb the scientific/academic career ladder.

- Pipelines are often seen as either career trajectories, or organizational career pathways that point to “leaks”, which are undeniably present in all our case-study institutions (see Dubois-Shaik & Fusulier, 2015).

- The moving away of women from the scientific or academic path, leading to higher positions does not happen so simply as one could imagine at first glance. (Grant et al., 2000; Le Feuvre, 2009; Fassa et al., 2012; Dubois-Shaik & Fusulier, 2016).

- Institutions rarely question the pipelines themselves, and sofar focused on career trajectories: what is a pipeline?
A composite perspective

A multi-level perspective:
- macro-level by looking at gender and welfare regimes, and comparative statistical data on leaky pipelines: WP3 and WP6
- meso-level by looking at organizational culture, structures and governance: WP4 and WP5
- micro-level by looking at experiences of early researchers and academics: WP4 and WP6;

A multi-dimensional perspective:
regimes, organizational systems, policy, scientific fields, governing units, sex, gender, stages of the career, work/life interference, relationships, power, discourse, cultures, contexts etc.;

and a comparative perspective:
across seven/six European countries, research institutions, SSH/STEM institutes, comparing women/men, comparing three different groups of researchers/academics
Gendered pipelines….

Proposition:

A gendered pipeline is composed not only of career trajectories across individual people’s lives, but establishes that these are situated in a specific gendered organizational context, in a specific institutional context and in a specific national and regional context. Cutting across all these contexts are also gender and welfare regimes, are new managerial regulations, are internationalization, are also professional networks and work cultures that cross national boundaries.
Transversal features across six country vignettes

Gender and Welfare Regimes:
Traditional or modified male breadwinner models; overall trend of full-time work

Gender Policy:
No implementation or only on discursive level; when existing, mainly on the doctoral level; financial measures and quota focus on hyper productivity-based criteria

Results of Quantitative Analysis:
Massification of students and feminisation in higher education, with exceptions in STEM.
A bottleneck with different intensities and slightly different points, after PhD or during/after postdoc.
A general rise of teaching assistants, non-tenured, who are female.

For more details see: Working Papers 1/3/4/5
Transversal features across six country vignettes

- **Results of Qualitative Analysis: Women Mover and Leaver**

  Sense of regret and lack of support/ constant accountability/ hyper productivity, infringe upon family life. Lack of PhD recognition in terms of status and salary, especially in STEM, engineering.

  **Mobility** crucial factor for career success and advancement: less mobility possible for women.

  **Networks and mentors** essential for recruitment and professional advancement: less support for women, lonelier in SSH/ male lonlier in STEM: SSH males are most collaborative and have most “cooptation” possibilities.

  **Fundraising capacity:** crucial for career progression

  **Confidence:** difference in the way women and men speak about moving away from academia.

  (for more details see Working Paper 11)
Transversal features across six country vignettes

- Organisational features/modalities

Funding plays a major role in shaping careers: SSH lesser funding, more women, STEM more funding, lesser women.

There is in all country cases a constant bid for funding experienced on all early career levels (docs, postdocs, newly tenured): time-consuming.

Women have a harder time obtaining funding.

There is generally, in all country cases less assistance for teaching, whereby there are more women teaching assistants.

There is a lot of administrative workload upon early researchers and academics, which adds to overwork and shifting balance of work away from other, more valued and necessary tasks (research).

There is in most country cases an important glass ceiling in terms of the presence of women in management and leadership positions, and in recruitment and promotion committees.

Tension existing between recruitment criteria perceived by candidates and used in recruitment processes by evaluators (Nomination vs competition criteria).
Three types of Gendered Pipelines

**Type (1) “Persisting in precariousness” career path and “Mandarin” organisation with High cumulative costs;**

Linearity and non-flexibility of the career path, vast power of gatekeepers, particularly stringent glass ceiling and long period of precariousness, instability, high parental ambivalence with less societal support systems.

**Type (2) “Persisting in uncertainty and ambivalence” career path and “University institution” organizational model with Moderate level costs;**

Funding systems, competition culture, parental ambivalence, non-transparency and ambiguity of recruitment criteria, ambiguity between internationalization and strong local org. culture.

**Type (3) “Winning in competition” career path and “market-driven” organization with Specific Costs;**

Strong embeddedness and logic of international market, idealized “all round academic”, stringent glass ceilings for leadership, persisting omnipresence, elitist institution, very few academic positions.
A typology of costs: an institutional and policy tool

Three levels of costs that incur in Gendered Pipelines:

- the level of costs that the individual and particular academic/scientific career involves; for the individual

- the level of costs that the institutional and organizational conditions, demands and work culture/organization involves; for the institution

- the level of costs that science as a product and overall missive of research and teaching involves; for Science
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three levels of entities/Costs</th>
<th>Type 1: “Persisting in precariousness” career path and mandarin organisation with High Cumulative Costs</th>
<th>Type 2: “Persisting in uncertainty and ambivalence” career path and “University institution” organisation with Moderate Costs</th>
<th>Type 3: “Winning in competition” career path and “market-driven” organisation with Specific Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Macro level entity: science   | - Important scientific exchanges and development between teaching and research may suffer, as teaching is undervalued both on meso- and micro-levels.  
- Increased short-term knowledge production contracts, with lesser funding of fundamental research.  
- Less depth of research undertaken: short-term contracts, with more deadlines and hyper-productivity in terms of publications: The temporariness of research affects the quality of research outputs and the type of knowledge elaborated in academia.  
- Lesser diversity in research and teaching in terms of gender, fewer female role models, persistence of masculine-based scientific research work model  
- Brain-drain for academia and other sectors: feminised higher education, but little career chances in academia and conversion of PhD in SSH  
- Decreasing the purpose and value of the PhD: accepting many doctorates, but with what aim.  
- Scientific organisations contributing to a work/family contradiction.  
- Persisting gender stereotypes in SSH and STEM fields. | - Persisting gender stereotypes for STEM: few women/fewer men in SSH  
- Student attraction for funding reasons: less teacher/student ratio, despite rising number of students: more degrees, with lesser quality of teaching programmes.  
- Lesser governmental funding, especially in SSH  
- Scientific production governed by funding structures: lesser fundamental research, lesser SSH research  
- Gender stereotypes persist in favour of males in STEM. | - Scientific production governed by funding measures: competitive criteria  
- Research and Teaching continue to be produced by an elite, more homogenous group of researchers/academics  
- Gender stereotypes persist in favour of males in STEM. |
Mesol level entity: institution

- Large number of non-stabilized, “floating” not fully integrated research body and assistantship teaching staff.
- Teaching remaining undervalued: non-academic assistantship staff assuming main load of teaching, whereby teaching is not a main concern or passion; seen often as necessity for career progression.
- Slower career climb and high vertical glass-ceiling for women in leadership and management for both teaching and research.
- Co-optation logics, old boys’ clubs, high importance of gatekeepers and “following” a mentor more possible for men, less female “role models” and less support from gatekeepers for women.
- No effective childcare and elderly support system in society at large, and at institutional level not taken into consideration.
- Institutional ambivalence and discrepancy of and during recruitment procedures.
- Linear, non-flexible career paths for researchers/academics.
- Value of PhD other than in academia for SSH questionable.
- Value of PhD in terms of salary and status in other sectors not guaranteed.

- Funding systems: closed envelope/point systems: Universities, research and teaching units, bid for funding according to student numbers: competition and student attraction.
- Per student rate for STEM 3 times higher than for SSH, however more SSH students.
- More funding for STEM PhDs, and less for SSH: more male PhDs in STEM, and less so in SSH, so double disadvantages, and reinforcing gendered budgeting.
- Co-optation logics, old boys’ clubs, high importance of gatekeepers and “following” a mentor more possible for men, less female “role models” and less support from gatekeepers for women.
- Tensions between internationalization/standards in “excellence”, and local institutional criteria, codes, embeddedness, power of local culture, of committees, and networks.
- Lesser funding for researchers/academics: bidding and competition culture on institution, institute and individual level reinforced. Funding harder to obtain for women academics, and researchers.
- Competition rather than collaboration amongst and academics and within/between research groups.
- Non-transparent recruitment processes: attracting the “wrong” type of researchers/future academics: lonely heroes/lonely heroines, non-integrated, focussed upon research rather than also teaching, due to focus and discursive resources of recruitment criteria of competition.
- Recruitment committees haphazard in terms of gender policy, especially in STEM: gap between formal and informal criteria.
- Value of PhD in terms of salary and status in other sectors not guaranteed (STEM engineering for example).

- Less attractiveness of academia within the job market.
- Very narrow bottleneck after PhD and postdoc, very few positions and few chances of obtaining permanent positions.
- Side effects of existing gender equality measures: recruiting “excellence” that is still based on hyper-productivity and omnipresence (being constantly available) based criteria (high level and number of publications in renowned journals, mobility); reinforcing competitiveness.
- Policy orientated toward internationalization: tensions with local recruitment, local culture and institutional codes.
- Gender stereotypes persist in favour of males in STEM.
- There is a vertical glass ceiling the higher we climb, especially ordinary professorships and management positions.
- Local over international funding in favour of tenure-track: importance of local embeddedness and
- an overall institutional (all-round academic) implication, that is less often the case for women.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro level entity: individual researcher/academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Career instability, precariousness and uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Postdocs not as official employees, lesser social scheme and institutional benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High dependence on existing network and mentors: women have lack of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of PhD conversion towards other sectors, mainly for SSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of institutional recognition and full membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Slower career progression for women, glass ceilings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of guidance, strategic for career building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of guidance, for professional (research and teaching) development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Burnouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Work/life imbalance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parental ambivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renouncing parenthood, for women mainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No effective childcare and elderly support system in society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| - Career instability and uncertainty             |
| - Parental ambiguity                             |
| - High dependence on existing network, existing mentors: women have lack of both |
| - High dependence on supportive private network, especially partners (for men, part-time work of partner, for women, partner assuming care too, but mostly also in full-time): availability and assuming of care, of mobility |
| - Ambiguity on level of work/life balance - more for women: guilt expressed in women about time away from work, and time away from children. |
| - Omnipresence, overwork, hyper productivity, CV “bodybuilding” for career |
| - PhD conversion not easy for SSH (value, salary, status, job satisfaction, opportunities) |
| - Leavers women: lack of distance, regrets about not “having succeeded” |

| - Very narrow bottleneck after PhD and postdoc, very few positions and few chances of obtaining permanent position. |
| - Omnipresence, overwork, hyper productivity as source of stress, anxiety and ambiguity, in terms of work/life balance and health |
| - Precarious balance of keeping the winning position, or of being able to juggle tasks, hyper productivity and criteria for recruitment and progression. |
| - ‘Self-driven’ work and double edged flexibility: not being able to separate work and private life due to the nature of work, and also the passion for work, being able to do it everywhere and anytime. Especially infringing upon family life for women. |
| - High dependence on supportive private network, especially partners, who are available for care. |
| - Not enough support for postdocs, especially women, as gender equality measures and mentoring programmes are more geared toward ongoing PhDs. |
The institutional/policy use of a Gendered « Cost » Typology

- There is a **major and varied institutional impact of gendered pipelines**: membership, stabilization and professionalization, teaching as a mission and structure, funding systems and logics, collaboration instead of competition, criteria of excellence and « what is a good researcher/academic », diversity.

- Individuals are affected in **different life spheres** by gendered pipelines: professionally and in private life.

- Institutions can **counteract towards reducing these cumulative and specific costs**, and that they **take their share in responsibilities about career opportunities, professional development** and what becomes more significant, in the **organizing of work**.

- Conceptualization of **gender policy and especially programmes** that take into account multiple institutional and individual levels.

- **THANK YOU!** For further details see: Working Paper 12!