

# A Cross-national Analysis of Gender Equality and the Shift from Collegiality to Managerialism in Higher Education Policy

**Barbara Bagilhole**

Professor of Equal Opportunities and Social Policy  
Department of Social Sciences  
Loughborough University  
LE11 3TU UK  
B.M.Bagilhole@lboro.ac.uk  
+44 (0)1509 223380

*This paper reports on part of a comparative eight-country study of higher education (HE) policy across Australia, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey, and UK. It explores the uneven shift from the traditional collegial to a new managerialist organisational form both between different countries and even within the countries. It provides an overview of each country's HE system and then analyses the gendered character of academic leadership. Finally, it comes to the conclusion that there is no indication that either the collegial or the managerial system is more conducive to gender equality. It is clear that the strength or absence of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action frameworks has a greater impact on gender equality in universities.*

**Key words:** higher education policy, collegiality, managerialism, gender equality

## Introduction

The first Western universities originated in the middle ages to provide the church and state with an educated priesthood and civil service, both of which were historically male monopolies. In the nineteenth century, HE expanded rapidly as increasing numbers joined the emerging professions and required training. Toward the end of the century, universities were gradually opened to women in most Western countries. However, for a long time it was mainly a small minority of more affluent families who could send their children to university. It was not until the 1960s when

the expansion of welfare states resulted in increased demand for educated employees, that HE became more widespread in the broader strata of society.

This shift from an elite to a mass HE system (Scott, 2000) forced universities to increasingly align with the democratic dynamics of society. Today Western universities are similarly structured. Traditionally, European universities were considered a “public good” and, in this sense, were much more closely connected with the state than American universities, which are usually dependent on private financing and tuition fees (Sundqvist, 2010). Recently, the

American model has in turn increasingly influenced European university systems, which have undergone structural changes oriented towards the market (Kogan et al., 2000; Reed, 2002).

### **The shift from collegial to managerial systems**

In the *collegial* model launched by Humboldt in the nineteenth century, the autonomy of researchers / teachers and the close connection between research and teaching are pivotal. This would ensure that research is not unduly influenced by non-scientific interests and that students benefit from the latest research in their training. To achieve this, the (full) professors (the highest position in the university) are next to irremovable. When new professors are recruited, evaluations from several peer experts are required. Quality standards in research and in teaching are upheld through collegial critical discourse at seminars and peer reviews (Sundqvist, 2010). Authority is given from *the bottom up* by teachers / researchers who elect someone among themselves to become their academic leader. Important decisions are taken by collegial assemblies.

Collegial leadership, the traditional model in universities, has been described as governance by a community of scholars, as opposed to central managerial authority. In the collegial model, the leader facilitates the process of decision-making by consensus and does not 'lead, direct or manage anything' (Meek, 2002: 254). Formal decision-making under the collegial model is through a collegial structure based on assemblies of academics which preserve their professional autonomy (Sundqvist, 2010).

In the *managerial* model, decisions are given from *the top down*. Collegial elections are replaced by appointments by the top leader (primarily the Rector / Vice-Chancellor). Professors' power is reduced and their employment conditions are like those of any other employee. Collegial influence is abolished or much reduced. The Rector / Vice-Chancellor becomes a Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and the university is turned into a business enterprise. Accountability, evaluations and economic efficiency are key words.

Currently, universities and senior managers in different countries and indeed in one and the same country can be positioned at different points in this development.

Western universities exist in a delicate balance between professional autonomy and political and economic forces. If the latter forces become too strong, the autonomy and quality of universities is questioned. On the other hand, democratic assemblies may be said to have a legitimate interest in auditing the use of the tax-payers' money in publicly financed universities. Now governments (and for Europe, in the last instance, the European Union assemblies) are the driving force behind the introduction of new public management in universities in an effort to enhance economic efficiency. The protests from within the system are concerned with the quality and autonomy of scientific work and teaching. It is claimed that universities are not like business enterprises.

In face of this increasing professionalisation of managers (Sundqvist, 2010), in the transition from collegiality to managerialism a de-professionalization of scholars may occur, as autonomy and control

of their work decrease (Hasselberg, 2009). The career of a managing academic may be more or less divided into two specialized careers – the scientific research and the managerial ones.

## **Analysis of the eight countries'**

### **HE systems**

#### ***Australia***

HE in Australia has become increasingly important to the country's economy, and the international student sector is now the third largest export earner after coal and iron-ore. However, HE has recently witnessed a significant decline in students from Asia, as well as a falling demand from China and countries like Vietnam. While the growth of domestic participation has exceeded the expectations, each place is funded below cost, leaving universities reliant on an expanding international education sector.

The Australian HE system consists of 41 universities (37 public institutions and two private). Universities receive most of their public funding from the Australian Government and have a reasonably high level of autonomy to operate within the legislative requirements associated with this funding.

There are three main groupings of universities, formed to promote the mutual objectives of the member universities: the Group of Eight (Go8 – the 'sandstone' universities, marketed as the oldest and more prestigious), Australian Technology Network (ATN), and Innovative Research Universities Australia (IRU Australia).

In March 2008, the Commonwealth Government initiated a review of HE to examine the future direction of the sector,

its fitness to meet the needs of the Australian community and economy, and the options for the ongoing reform. In response to its recommendations, the Government in 2009 announced that it would provide an additional \$5.4 billion to support HE and research over the next four years in order to:

- support high-quality teaching and learning;
- improve access and outcomes for students from low socio-economic backgrounds;
- build new links between universities and disadvantaged schools;
- reward institutions for meeting the agreed quality and equity outcomes;
- improve resourcing for research and invest in world class tertiary education infrastructure.

Since the 1990s, Australian HE has undergone a dramatic change. Harman (2003: 109) notes that these changes include:

- substantial increases in total enrolments and international student enrolments;
- a more market-oriented and competitive regulatory environment, with less institutional dependence on government operating grants and substantial increases in institutional generated revenue and more dependence on student fees;
- major expansion in research and research training, with closer university-industry research links;
- new quality assurance initiatives;
- and a more corporatist and entrepreneurial approach to institutional management and governance.

This transition to a mass HE system with a stronger emphasis on market mechanisms (Harman, 2003) has an impact on collegiality.

In Australia, collegial governance, according to Meek (2002: 255), has been subjected to government policy attacks and “collegial decision making and the professional authority of the academic has given way to that of the university manager” (see also Marginson, Considine, 2000: 9–11). Rectors / Vice-Chancellors have become CEO, and increasingly their role has an external focus (O’Meara, Petzall, 2005).

While the managerial model would appear to be clearly in the ascendancy in Australia, universities are not like public corporations or government departments. They are characterised by a complex set of interlocking relationships between managers and the academics they manage. There has been an ongoing discourse in Australia about the impact of managerialism on the autonomy of academic careers and a good deal of resistance from the academy (Winter et al., 2000; Meek, 2002; Marginson, Considine, 2000; Kakale, 2003; Thornton, 2008).

As managerialism permeates the University Executive, its trickle-down effect is often uneven within the organisation. Moodie (2002: 20) argues that Deans “are no longer primarily representatives of the disciplines but of senior management”. At the next level down, Heads of Schools (HOS) or Departments are defined as middle management and, in the Australian context, would typically have responsibility for supervising 20 or more staff and managing sizeable budgets (Moodie, 2002: 20–21). As Moodie (2002: 21) observes, they are still, however, collegial appointments. Yet unlike middle management in other areas, they are part-time and temporary appointments, with the incumbents expected to re-

turn to full-time academia after their term as HOS. Moodie (2002: 21) notes that if the schools they manage do not perform, managerialism will impose change.

## *Ireland*

Ireland has seven main publicly funded universities, and all but two date from before the foundation of the Irish state. In addition, there are several other HE institutions that were established with a different focus (applied knowledge) and a different name (regional technical colleges), and universities saw them as possible ‘feeder institutions’, as a prelude to university graduation, but they are now considered as being in a university-like ‘space’ (and provide a range of experiences up to PhD level).

With the introduction of mass HE, 60 per cent of the Irish cohort attend HE; in a context where students since the 1990s do not pay fees, the cost to the state is increasingly seen as prohibitive. Little attention has been paid by the state to universities for forty years. The seven universities are by no means homogeneous. Until the early 1970s, Catholics were not allowed to attend the oldest of them without permission from their bishop, reflecting the fact that it was considered a bastion of Protestant thinking. Its structures and the titles of the positions are completely different from to all other Irish universities.

The university system as a whole in Ireland is very much in a state of transition between collegiality and managerialism, specific universities being differentially located on that continuum. The net effect of various forces is to place current economic needs at the heart of the university mission, a project that O’Carroll (2008:

54) sees as doomed to failure even in terms of those current needs.

Recent developments in Ireland have seen the emergence of new structures of control and regulation in HE. These have included:

- the curricular and organisational consequences of the Bologna Agreement with its requirement that universities ‘compete in a global market place’ (O’Sullivan, 2005: 178, 168);
- the proactive development of quality assurance structures and processes;
- an increasing focus on restructuring and managerialism as reflected in the increased use of appointment rather than nomination to senior management;
- increasing stress on strategic plans and performance indicators as well as on performance development reviews as a mechanism for motivating faculty and staff as opposed to relying on professionalism and collegial decision-making structures (Skillbeck, 2001).

### ***New Zealand***

New Zealand has eight universities and a number of polytechnics in its HE sector. The establishment of universities has been limited by statute, and there has only been one significant change of status in the last 40 years: in 2000, the Auckland Institute of Technology became the Auckland University of Technology. There is now a moratorium on the creation of new universities. There are also a number of private providers of HE qualifications, but these tend to focus on very specific areas and are not part of the university system.

The New Zealand University system is based largely on the British one, al-

though it is increasingly being influenced by practices from the United States. The origins have importance in terms of career structure. The standard academic staff hierarchy is that of lecturer, senior lecturer, reader / associate professor, professor as in the UK.

The beginning of the legislative move from a collegial to managerial model for universities was the *Education Amendment Act 1990* which was an amendment to and extension of the Education Act 1989. This Act specifically talks about the heads of universities as CEOs. The Act provides that universities are to be governed by Councils made up of representatives and appointees and that the council’s first statutory duty is to appoint the CEO who is the legal employer of all staff. Previously, the Council as the governing body had been the employer of all the staff. The Education Act specifies the role of the CEO as managing the “academic and administrative affairs of the institution”. The *Review of New Zealand Tertiary Sector Governance* (Ministry of Education, 2003) has indicated that the CEO has an essential leadership, as well as management role to play, and they should work with the Council to achieve the strategic leadership of the institution. The majority of the eight New Zealand universities are moving towards a more managerial model with their Rectors / Vice-Chancellors acting as a CEO. While two of the six now have CEOs who were recruited from outside the HE sector, the accepted ethos is that they should have a research record and understand the specific academic role of the university rather than behaving as if the institution is just a business.

## ***Portugal***

Portugal has one of the oldest HE systems in Europe. Its first university was founded in 1290. With the democratic revolution of 1974, a binary system was introduced and new public universities and polytechnics emerged, opening the pathways to a mass system. From the mid-1980s, it experienced a rapid expansion with a growing number of public institutions and proliferation of private institutions (Amaral, Teixeira, 2000). There are now 118 HE institutions: 47 universities (14 public, 31 private and cooperative universities, one non-integrated university institution (the Catholic university), 65 polytechnics (15 public, 46 private and 4 non-integrated schools of polytechnic institutions) and 6 military and police HE institutions (4 military and police university institutions and 2 military and police polytechnic institutions) (MSTHE 2009).

The presence of the market and managerialism has been evident in Portuguese HE since the 1990s (Amaral, Magalhães, Santiago, 2003). Initially, its presence was mitigated and mainly translated at a rhetorical level (Carvalho, Santiago, 2009). However, in recent years, legal changes in the system (Law 62/2007) clearly indicate that it is now the main frame of reference driving HE policies and imposing narrow and coercive practices on increasingly corporate and entrepreneurial universities.

The new *Higher Education Act* (Law, 62/2007) reconfigures the traditional power architecture of HE, both at system and organisational levels. It imposes a new configuration on HE governance and management structures and a new institutional power 'architecture' substantially different

from those previously rooted in the collegial tradition. Among these changes are: the choice for institutions to opt for a public institute regime or for a public foundation (regulated by the private law) that only three public universities have adopted; the creation of a general council (replacing the previous collegial bodies) with an extended political and strategic power (even if the academic elected members remain the majority in this new governance body); the attribution of an executive dimension to Rectors / Vice-Chancellors; the creation of a management council; the reconfiguration of the 'academic-management' to line management structures (Deans and Heads can be appointed for a fixed-term position, instead of election depending on the model defined in each institution).

## ***South Africa***

South Africa is a country undergoing a significant transformation in its attempt to redress the social, economic and legislative imbalances inherited from the *apartheid* era (Shackleton et al., 2003). Universities in particular have been through a period of sweeping change since the first democratic election in 1994. In addition to the current pressures on universities internationally to become more market-driven and managerial in their approach, they underwent substantial structural and cultural changes.

Three inter-related factors have dominated HE since 1994:

- pressure on institutions to become more market-driven and managerial;
- restructuring of the HE landscape; and
- the need to address racial inequalities from the *apartheid* years (Shackleton et al., 2003).



The traditional belief that universities are the primary repositories of knowledge in society is currently under threat. Increasingly, publicly-funded universities are being required to justify their existence and, in particular, their expenditure. Terms such as 'corporate colonisation' and the 'new managerialism' are used somewhat disparagingly to describe the 'storming, capturing and occupation of the traditional hallowed corridors and ivory towers of academia by the unfettered forces of marketisation and corporatism' (Saunderson, 2002: 380). Saunderson explained that the purported benefits of managerialism were enhanced levels of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness but that the values underpinning this approach were fundamentally incongruent with the values of social justice with which HE was supposed to be concerned, and added that managerialism had effectively 'handcuffed equal opportunities in the academy' (Saunderson, 2002: 381). Meanwhile, the assertion about managerialism limiting opportunities is particularly relevant in South Africa where, due to inherited inequities, universities are expected to fulfil both a redistributive social function as well as play an economic role in training the next generation of professionals.

Rectors / Vice-Chancellors are selected by the institution, not the state, but the state has required increasing accountability from the institutions (Shackleton et al., 2003). This includes compiling and reporting against three-year rolling plans and the revision of the state-funding formula to ensure compliance with racial equity and quality requirements. Currently, state funding provides a portion of the operating

funds of universities, which can be as low as 40 per cent (Shackleton et al., 2003). Additional income is derived from tuition fees, fund-raising and research income. Even those institutions that have traditionally claimed to be research-led have experienced a significant shift towards increasing their research outputs, due in part to the re-admittance of South Africa into the circle of international scholars after years of politically-motivated isolation. A further incentive for universities to increase their research output has been the income derived from such activities. In short, research generates money, a distinctly corporate orientation.

Whichever side of the managerialism debate one adopts, the fact remains that in South Africa significant changes within institutions have been imposed and have impacted the content of work performed by academics and the context in which work is performed. Furthermore, a strong political need still exists to 'level the playing fields' by eliminating the resource distinctions between institutions, caused by differentiated funding by the *apartheid* government. This was pursued through state instructed institutional mergers and the transformation of institutions.

Pre 1994, South Africa had 21 public universities and 15 polytechnics. Universities traditionally employed a research focus whereas polytechnics enjoyed a strong teaching focus. With the advent of democracy in South Africa, it was clear that the system required complete restructuring (Shackleton et al., 2003). A new *Higher Education Act* was promulgated in 1997; it established the Council on Higher Education (CHE) to provide 'informed, consid-

ered, independent, and strategic advice' on HE issues to the Minister of Education (Council on Higher Education, 2001: 77). It was also made responsible for quality assurance through its sub-committee on HE Quality Control and disseminated knowledge and information on HE (Shackleton et al., 2003).

In June 2006, restructuring was finally completed. The total number of publicly-funded institutions was reduced from 36 to 23. This now includes: 11 traditional universities that offer theoretically-oriented university degrees, six universities of technology that offer practically-oriented diplomas and degrees, and six comprehensive universities that offer a combination of both types of qualification (South African Higher Education, 2006).

Traditional, research-focused universities continue to compete for research recognition as well as state and international funding. This is in contrast to universities of technology and comprehensive universities which historically had emphasized teaching over research. Consequently, many staff at these 'newer' universities held relatively poor research track records.

The merging of institutions and the reallocation of resources in a more equitable fashion have had a major impact on the working lives of staff within the institutions. While much of this restructuring has engendered great resistance to change from some quarters, for others the opportunities that previously did not exist were perceived. Many of these changes were rooted in the legislation aimed at redressing inequality throughout society.

## *Sweden*

Swedish universities are public authorities, and their Rectors / Vice-chancellors are appointed by government. Sweden has 14 publicly financed universities and 22 college universities ([www.Regeringskansliet](http://www.Regeringskansliet) 2010). There are also ten private HE institutes including research. Swedish universities were based on the Humboldtian idea of offering training in close connection with research. Professors combined these tasks, and their position was appointed by the government for life in order to guarantee academic autonomy.

Swedish HE expanded rapidly from the 1960s onwards, and the number of students has increased from 10 000 at that time to more than 300 000. Favourable study loans were made available for all students in the 1960s, independently of their economic situation, to attract students from all social strata. Today, one third of the cost is provided as a grant, and two thirds are reimbursed at a low interest rate. The great influx of students necessitated several changes. New positions were created primarily to teach (Sundqvist, 2010: 134). Thus, against Humboldtian principles, teaching and research are increasingly separated.

In the 1990s, many new regional colleges were established, some of which have later reached the status of university. They primarily devote themselves to teaching (Sundqvist, 2010). These two steps, new teaching positions and new colleges for teaching, were the first away from the Humboldtian model.

A further reform in the 1990s led to Rector / Vice-chancellors no longer being the chairperson of the university board and external members, politicians and industri-



alists, being appointed by the government to strengthen links between universities and society. This rule was later made optional, but universities have preferred to keep this practice.

More recently in Sweden a systematic reconstruction has begun to introduce a managerial organizational model deemed more efficient in controlling costs and quality. This has been resisted by universities. However, most of the changes became law from 1 January 2011 and radically shifted the power over and within universities.

Practically all power is vested in the Rector / Vice-chancellor, but another group that was given increased power was the first-line managers – the heads of departments. Mass education and new tasks, such as self-evaluations, have increased their work, and it becomes more difficult to combine this position with research and / or teaching. At the same time, the power over universities was centralised. Only two types of positions – professor and lecturer – are regulated. When a full professor is recruited, there should still be at least one expert evaluation.

### ***Turkey***

The foundation of Turkish universities was provided by reforms introduced by Atatürk in 1923. There has been a move over the last decade from Rectors / Vice-chancellors, providing a strong academic leadership, to universities becoming managed institutions and Rectors / Vice-chancellors becoming CEOs. The process began with the new HE legislation in 1981, which established the Council of Higher Education – a fully autonomous supreme corporate public body responsible for the

planning, coordination, governance and supervision of HE. It made provision for non-profit foundations to establish HE institutions. In 1981, there were 19 universities; by 2010 their number increased to 139 (94 state and 45 private universities). Only private universities enjoy financial and administrative autonomy.

The Rector / Vice-chancellor is appointed by the President of the Republic from among candidates holding the academic title of professor, selected by the teaching staff of the university. The term of office is four years, at the end of which they may be re-appointed for a maximum of two terms of office.

Rector / Vice-chancellors may select up to three of the university's salaried professors to act as Vice-Rectors. The Vice-Rectors are appointed for a period of five years. Deans are appointed by the Council from among three full professors nominated by the Rector / Vice-chancellor.

### ***United Kingdom***

UK Universities have generally been instituted by Royal Charter, Act of Parliament or an instrument of government under the Education Reform Act 1988, in any case, generally with the approval of the Privy Council. Only such recognised bodies can award degrees of any kind. Most universities in the country may be classified into six main categories:

- ancient universities – seven universities founded between the 12th and 16th centuries;
- the University of London, the University of Wales, Lampeter and Durham university which were chartered in the 19th century;

- ‘Red Brick’ universities – six large civic universities chartered at the turn of the 20th century before World War I;
- ‘New universities’ – chartered in the 1960s;
- the Open university – Britain’s ‘open to all’ distance learning university established in 1968;
- post-1992 universities – formed from polytechnics or colleges of HE.

There are 165 HE institutions in the UK (including England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) and 115 institutions that use the title ‘university’. Federal institutions, such as the University of Wales and the University of London, are counted

as one university. The term ‘HE institutions’ includes universities, university colleges, specialist HE institutions and other HE colleges. In addition, there are also a significant number of further education colleges at which HE students study.

The UK HE sector is now very diverse in terms of the institutions that offer HE and research opportunities. Whilst all universities undertake research and teaching, the mission focus and balance of activities vary. Some institutions, such as the post-1992 universities, concentrate primarily on teaching, while others are more research-intensive.

*Table 1. Number of UK institutions (August 2010)*

Country	Universities*	Higher education institutions**
England	89	131
Scotland	14	19
Wales	10	11
Northern Ireland	2	4
United Kingdom	115	165

Source: Universities UK website [www.universitiesUK.ac.uk](http://www.universitiesUK.ac.uk)

The vast majority of UK universities are government-financed, with only one private university where the government does not subsidise the tuition fees. As the universities are generally public institutions, there is less corporate influence, with UK universities receiving much smaller financial endowments in comparison to what many of the larger universities in the USA receive. Similarly, whilst certain universities retain ancient traditions, none are directly funded by religious organisations.

British undergraduate students and students from other EU countries who qualify as home students have to pay university

tuition fees. A government-provided loan is available, which may only be used towards tuition fee costs, and is paid back at a low interest rate when the student starts earning over a certain amount. Many universities also provide bursaries to students with low financial capabilities.

The UK HE sector has changed significantly over the past few decades for both staff and students. Expansion, changes in funding, widening participation, internationalisation, new technologies, a greater engagement with the wider world, an increased customer focus, and managerialism are a few of the many policy develop-

ments that make the sector more complex and more differentiated. These differences range from student participation rates and graduate outcomes to the segregated nature of many jobs and pay differentials.

## Gender equality in universities

Traditionally, universities have been male-dominated organizations. But today in the Western world there are more women HE students than men, and in many countries as many women as men gain PhDs. It is the intervention of politicians that has resulted in more women in leading positions, at least in Scandinavia. The famous glass ceiling has moved upwards, but it is still there. Although universities have now been open to women for a hundred years or more, there are still few women in leading positions. In most countries, no more than 15–20 per cent of the professors are women, and their share is growing very slowly. In senior management positions they are often even fewer. The average proportion of women

Rectors / Vice-Chancellors across the 27 European Union member states is nine per cent, in Romania, Austria, Slovakia, Italy, the Netherlands, Czech Republic, Belgium and Germany seven per cent, and in Denmark, Cyprus, Lithuania, Luxembourg and Hungary there are none.

Gender inequality in university positions is seen across all eight countries in this study, although the figures vary. Turkey has the highest percentage of women university professors – almost 30 per cent, but a considerably lower percentage of women university Rectors (only ten per cent) than, for instance, the Nordic countries. In Sweden, in contrast, the percentages are 18 per cent women professors and 43 per cent women rectors. Thus, it is clear that more is needed than a good academic background for achieving the goal of getting more women into leading positions. The interviews in this study confirm that being a professor is a necessary but not sufficient requirement for a position in senior management.

*Table 2. Percentage of women in senior academic positions in the eight countries (and the EU)*

Country	Rectors / VC	Vice-Rectors / DVCs	Pro-Rectors / PVCs	Deans	Exec Dir	Full professors
EU-27	9	–	–	–	–	19
Australia	18	36	40	38	32	21
Ireland	0	14	18	25	–	10
New Zealand	0	17	17	17	35	15
Portugal	7	27	16	23	60	
South Africa	22	30*	0**	28***	–	21
Sweden	41	35	55	30	48	18
Turkey	10	7	4	13		28
UK	8	6	21	20		18

Sources: Data for professors and Rectors for 2007 (EU-27, Portugal, Turkey, Ireland, UK: WiS database (DG Research); Higher Education Authority for Ireland. Cited from *She Figures* 2009. Rectors: Data not available for Portugal, Ireland and the UK in this source. Australia – UAEW, 2009; South Africa – collated from university websites; Portugal – collated from university websites. Data for Sweden from Sweden's State Calendar 2010.

\* Includes Vice-Principals.

\*\* Term only used in one university in South Africa.

\*\*\* Includes Dean of Students.

In Table 2, data for EU-27 have been added for comparison. As shown, there are very few women Rectors / Vice-chancellors in European member states, while the share of women professors is almost one fifth. In general, women are under-represented as full professors, while senior management positions in Australia and Sweden include a larger share of women, although still a minority. An exception is Pro-Rectors in Sweden where women are a majority. This is explained by the practice of appointing as Pro-Rector someone of the opposite gender to the Rector / Vice-chancellor position and therefore is an indicator of the male-dominance among Rectors / Vice-chancellors. Sweden, on the other hand, has a lower proportion of female professors, but a highest proportion of women Rectors / Vice-chancellors. This may be connected with the official gender equality goals which are more easily implemented in particularly visible positions in the public sector (Göransson, 2007), while lower positions may still be male-dominated. Thus, gender equality is not necessarily a question of time.

## Discussion and Conclusions

This paper has shown that there are differences in the organization of research and HE between, on the one hand, the UK and its former colonies where the managerial model seems to have settled more, and, on the other hand, the countries in continental Europe where remnants of the collegial system are still lingering.

However, there is no self-evident connection between either the collegial or the managerial system on the one hand and the recruitment of women to leading positions

on the other. So far, there are more women in senior management in the Anglo-Saxon and Swedish universities than in the Mediterranean type found in Turkey and Portugal. On the other hand, there are more women professors in Turkey than in most of the other countries, but generally the proportion of women professors is roughly the same in all investigated countries.

A recruitment base of many women professors seems to be a necessary but not sufficient criterion for achieving more women in leading positions in the universities.

It seems that the general discourse and equality laws on gender are more important than the organisational model for women's access to power positions in the universities.

In the debate about gender equality in universities, two theses are often used (Dahlerup 2010). One is the so-called *time lag thesis*, according to which it is only a question of time before women and men are equally found in top positions; the other is the thesis that the gender order will always be reproduced and that there will be a *glass ceiling* for women (Ryan, Haslam, 2004). Another metaphor is that of the *leaking pipeline* where women are seen to be seeping out on their way to the top (Allan, Castleman, 2001). The results of the empirical research are more nuanced; on the one hand, men still become professors to a much greater extent; on the other hand, there are many more women now than before as professors and in leading positions.

Male dominance comes in many forms and varieties. In the collegial system, male informal networks and homosociability may exclude women from leading positions. Under the managerial system, gen-

der equality will depend on the views of central management, and experience from business management in enterprises is not promising. Also, local governance has a history of being more negative to female competitors than, for instance, national governments (Göransson, 1988).

It is probably safe to conclude that the future of women leaders will depend on the pressure from public opinion and political forces which may induce colleagues as

well as top management to take action to include women in decision-making positions. The general conclusion of all previous international research is that women's chances of advancement are always better when recruitment processes are open and transparent. This will improve meritocratic promotion, while closed processes, whether in male networks or in the Rector's / Vice-chancellor's chambers, will not enhance the recruitment of women.

## REFERENCES

- Allan M., Castleman T. (2001). Fighting the Pipeline Fallacy. In A. Brooks, A. Mackinnon (eds.). *Gender and the Restructured University*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University.
- Carvalho T., Santiago R. (2009). NPM and middle-management: How do deans influence institutional policies? In: L. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, R. Santiago, T. Carvalho (eds.) *Changing Deans. Higher Education Middle Management in International Comparative Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Springer.
- Dahlerup D. (2010). *Jämställdhet i akademien – en forskningsöversikt*. (Gender equality in Academia – a research overview). Rapport 2010:1. Stockholm: Delegationen för jämställdhet i högskolan.
- Göransson A. (1988). *Från familj till fabrik. Teknik, arbetsdelning och skiktning i svenska fabriker 1830–1877* (From family to factory. Technology, division of labour and stratification in Swedish factories, 1830–77). Diss. Lund: Arkiv förlag.
- Göransson A. (ed.) (2007). *Maktens kön. Kvinnor och män i den svenska makteliten på 2000-talet*. (The gender of power. Women and men in the Swedish power elite in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.) Nora: Nya Doxa Bokförlag.
- Harman, G. (2003). Australian academics and prospective academics: Adjustment to a more commercial environment. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, Vol. 15, No. 3, p. 105–122.
- Ryan M., Haslam A. (2004). Obstacles beyond the glass ceiling: the glass cliff and the precariousness of women's leadership positions. presentation to ATN WEXDEV conference, Sydney.
- Hasselberg Y. (2009). *Vem vill leva i kunska-*
- pssamhället? Essäer om universitetet och samtiden* (Who wants to live in the knowledge society? Essays about the university and our times). Hedemora: Gidlunds förlag.
- Marginson S., Considine M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meek L. (2002). On the road to mediocrity? Governance and management of Australian Higher Education in the Market Place. In: A. Amaral, G. Jones, B. Karseth (eds.). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Amsterdam: Kluwer.
- Moodie G. (2002). Fish or fowl? Collegial processes in managerialist institutions. *Australian Universities Review*, Vol. 45, No. 2, p. 18–22.
- O'Carroll J. P. (2008). Higher education policy: Banishing a vital power? In: M. p. Corcoran, P. Share (eds.). *Belongings: Shaping Identity in Modern Ireland*. Dublin: IPA.
- O'Meara B., Petzall S. (2005). Vice chancellors for the 21<sup>st</sup> century? A study of contemporary recruitment and selection practices in Australian universities. *Management and Research News*, Vol. 28, No. 6, p. 18–35.
- O'Sullivan D. (2005). *Cultural Politics and Irish Education since the 1950s: Policy, Paradigms and Power*. Dublin: IPA.
- Saunderson W. (2002). Women, academia and identity: Constructions of equal opportunities in the 'new managerialism' – A case of lipstick on the gorilla? *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 56, No. 4, p. 376–406.

Skillbeck M. (2001). *The University Challenged: A Review of International Trends and Issues with Particular Reference to Ireland*. Dublin: The Higher Education Authority.

Sundqvist B. (2010). *Svenska universitet – lärdomsborgar eller politiska instrument?* (Swedish universities – fortresses of learning or political tools?) Hedemora: Gidlunds förlag.

Thornton M. (2008). Where are the women? The swing from EEO to diversity in the academy. *Working Paper No. 22* Canberra: Australian National University.

Winter R., Taylor T., Sarros J. (2000). Trouble at mill: quality of academic worklife issues within a comprehensive Australian university. *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 25, No. 3, p. 299–294.

## LYČIŲ LYGYBĖS IR SLINKTIES NUO KOLEGIALUMO PRIE VADYBIŠKUMO AUKŠTOJO MOKSLO POLITIKOJE TARPTAUTINĖ ANALIZĖ

**Barbara Bagilhole**

### S a n t r a u k a

Šiame straipsnyje pateikiama aštuonių šalių – Australijos, Airijos, Naujosios Zelandijos, Pietų Afrikos, Švedijos, Turkijos ir Jungtinės Karalystės – lyginamosios aukštojo mokslo politikos studijos dalis. Straipsnyje nagrinėjami nevienodi poslinkiai nuo tradicinės kolegialios prie naujos vadybinės organizacinės formos ne tik skirtingose šalyse, bet ir šalių viduje. Jame pateikiama kiekvienos šalies aukštojo mokslo politikos apžvalga, tuomet analizuojami lyčių skirtumai akademinėje lyderystėje. Straipsnyje parodoma, kad Jungtinėje Karalystėje ir jos buvusiose kolonijose vadybinis valdymo modelis labiau įsitvirtino, o žemyninėje Europoje vis dar išlieka kolegiali valdymo sistema. Anglosaksiškose šalyse bei Švedijoje daugiau moterų valdymo organuose nei Viduržemio jūros šalyse (Portugalijoje, Turkijoje). Tačiau moterų profesorių daugiausia yra Turkijoje. Bet vis dėlto moterų mažai ir tarp profesorių, ir universitetų valdyme. Daroma išvada, kad nei kolegiali, nei vadybinė sistema nėra palankesnė lyčių lygybei.

Kolegialaus valdymo sistemoje vyrų socialiniai tinklai išstumia moteris. Esant vadybiniam valdymui, lyčių lygybė labai priklauso nuo centrinės valdžios požiūrio, kuris nieko gero nežada, nes centrinės valdžios atstovai dažnai būna išeiviai iš verslo. Tampa akivaizdu, kad lygių galimybių ir skatinamųjų veiksmų struktūrų stiprumas ar jų nebuvimas turi didesnę įtaką lyčių lygybei universitetuose. Daroma išvada, kad moterų lyderystės universitetuose ateitis priklausys nuo visuomenės nuomonės ar politinio spaudimo, nepriklausomai nuo to, ar valdymo modelis vadybinis, ar kolegialus. Šis tyrimas patvirtina anksčiau gautus rezultatus, kurie rodė, kad moterų pažangą akademinėje bendruomenėje labiausiai skatina atviras ir skaidrus įdarbinimas. O uždari sprendimai, kad ir kur jie būtų priimami, ar tai būtų vyrų tinklai, ar rektoratas, neskatins moterų įdarbinimo.

**Pagrindiniai žodžiai:** aukštojo mokslo politika, kolegialumas, vadybiškumas, lyčių lygybė.

*Įteikta: 2011 11 30  
Priimta: 2012 01 20*