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Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to briefly examine Australian and American perceptions on the success of affirmative action (AA) legislation in the United States compared with Australia. This research originated as a doctoral project exploring the perceptions of 24 top women academics/academic managers located in Australia and the U.S. and provided a snapshot of life at the top during 1998-2000. Among the topics covered were the successes and barriers these women encountered and the impact of balancing family and work, strategies for succeeding in a male-dominant organisational climate, the influence of networking and the impact of EEO/AA initiatives on their careers.

One of the important themes to emerge during this qualitative study was the stated importance of EEO/AA initiatives for these women both at the outset of their careers and also at a later stage when they entered the more senior levels. Whilst some of the women at presidential/vice-chancellor level acknowledged that it was easy to dismiss this type of assistance as possibly tokenistic, all acknowledged that opportunities such as initial membership of various boards, often as the sole female representative, provided them with opportunities otherwise denied them. Another important factor stemming from EEO/AA initiatives in both countries was the recognition that previously taken for granted sexist attitudes and stereotyping of women and other minorities were no longer tolerated.

Another interesting finding arose from a comparison of recent Australian and American statistics by academic rank and gender. An important divergence was evident where the U.S. statistics conformed to the conventional labour market gradation from junior to senior ranks, however, the Australian figures suggested the operation of guided tokenism at the very top echelons of Australian universities.

Australia has disproportionately lower numbers of women in the professorate (the traditional feeder group for top academic positions) than America coupled with a higher percentage of women in the vice-chancellor and deputy vice-chancellor positions. America seems more successful at increasing the percentages of women throughout the academic pipeline whereas Australia has a higher percentage of women in top university positions.

Introduction and Overview

Despite the obvious under-representation of women in senior positions within Australian and American universities there is a tendency to dismiss this as a problem of the past. Allen & Castleman (1995: 20) suggest that “In recent years there has been a tendency among a number of commentators on higher education to argue that the barriers to access and problems that women have experienced have virtually disappeared.”

Studies as recent as Brooks et al (2001) found that gender balances still remain unequal with women clustered in the less prestigious and lower-paid positions in both academic and administrative staff.


Similar patterns of under-representation of women in executive, academic and administrative positions are evident in the United States (see Welch (ed.) 1990; Nidiffer & Bashaw (eds.) 2001).

After more than 20 years of equal opportunity and affirmative action legislation in Australia and the United States, the EEC countries and indeed globally, the situation of women’s under-representation in senior management is still unsatisfactory and from a social-justice perspective is both unfair and unacceptable.

To facilitate an understanding as to why there are so few women in the most senior positions within organisations an in-depth exploration of the careers, trajectories, critical success and barriers facing women in top-management positions in Australian and American universities was undertaken (Tilbrook 2005).3 Semi-structured interviews were used to elucidate the thoughts, perceptions and experiences of 24 top women managers and academics. Universities were chosen for the study due to their putative position as leaders and shapers of social ideas and also because of their demonstrated commitment to EEO/AA initiatives.
The research problem was to examine the career experiences and critical success and barriers facing a group of senior/top women university managers in order to elucidate the reasons why the predicted pipeline of women rising into senior positions has not eventuated to the extent that was initially predicted.

**Background**

More than two decades after Australian and American universities first responded to the requirements of the EEO/AA legislative framework, women remain marginalised and seriously under-represented in these countries’ universities.

It is argued that the small number of senior women in universities leads to the marginalisation of the very organisational actors with a vested interest in promoting managerial flexibility, new organisational scripts and excellence in customer service provision to increasingly articulate, demanding and diverse student bodies (Tilbrook 1998).

Nevertheless EEO and affirmative action in both Australia (Bacch 1990, 1993, 1996; Burton 1990, in Kouzmin et al (eds.) 1991, 1992; Noble & Meares, 1997, in Oppenheimer & Murray (eds.) and the United States (Bacchi 1996) has played a pivotal role and this was affirmed by the participants in this study. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s the concept of the "pipeline" gained currency. The pipeline hypothesis was that more women would follow the pioneering steps of their female predecessors in middle management into senior/top positions and underrepresentation would be rectified by time (Powell 1988; Halfway to Equal Report 1992).


In Australia to date there is little in-depth analysis of the complex reasons that lead to the under-representation of women in top positions in universities, which are arguably comparatively benign environments in comparison with the private sector. Notwithstanding Treleaven's (unpublished Ph.D. 1998) excellent analysis of the masculinist culture of a post-Dawkins Australian university it is argued here that most universities are characterised by a higher percentage of staff committed to progressive ideologies than is usually the norm for private enterprise.

Traditional encouragement of individualism, and critical thinking had made universities in Australia and America leaders in EEO and AA initiatives. Whether this relative tolerance for diversity is being threatened by the "new" managerialism/corporatisation and global trends towards small government is still unresolved (Prasser 1990, in Kouzmin and Scott (eds.); Yeatsman 1990, 1995, in Payne & Shoemark (eds.); Dixon et al 1998; Kouzmin & Dixon, in press).


Although not entirely devoid of women, its norms, and its culture (Still, August 1992,1995, in Limerick & Lingard (eds.),1996) and traditions suit middle to upper-class, white males (Kotter 1990, Kets de Vries 1995, see Chapter 10; Sinclair 1994, 1998, 2003, in Davis & Pratt (eds.)).

In such an alien (Loden 1985; Marshall 1984) environment the voices (Hegelson,1990, reprinted 1995) and values of women are easily overridden, if they are heard at all.

An additional difficulty for the “new” female vice-chancellors/presidents, is that the Australian and American university systems are currently confronted by a more complex environment characterised by a policy of increasing deregulation and government withdrawals from traditional financial support (Miller 1995; Scott 1995; Smith & Webster (eds.) 1997; Marginson & Considine 2000) leading to staff downsizing, higher student/staff ratios, more social and political expectations (see Bloom 1988; Maslen & Slattery 1994; and contributors to Ehrenberg (ed.) 1997), and enormous stresses on libraries and from decaying infrastructure at the very time when the staff in these institutions are waiting to see and evaluate the products of female leadership (Conway 2001). See Jill Ker Conway (2001), A Woman's Education: The road from Coosan leads to Smith College for a marvellous portrayal of the rigours and joys she experienced as president of Smith College in the U.S.

**Universities and the Management of Diversity**

Australian universities, like their American and British counterparts were some of the first institutions to implement equal employment opportunities/affirmative action legislation and are widely perceived as, and even lauded for, having in place strategies, policies and structures to encourage the participation of women and other minorities in senior management, organisational development and in the provision of educational programs (DEETYA 1997).

Universities’ “espoused values” (Argyris & Schön 1978) are reflected in various well-documented strategies to encourage the participation of women, Koori people, and other minorities in management by measures such as the encouragement of gender/ethnic balance on key university committees, increasing the proportion of women on governing bodies, and a wide repertoire of human resources policies targeted to ensure diversity and gender/ethnic balance which will in turn encourage excellence and innovative practice (Kanter,1983, reprinted 1995).
The public perception that tertiary institutions are committed to equity initiatives in comparison to other public/private sector organisations, coupled with their formal reporting requirements under the federal government Department of Education Science and Training (DEST) and EEO/AA legislative requirements (DEOPE) has resulted in relatively few follow up extended studies.

Published in 1983, prior to the complete adoption of the EEO/AA legislative framework in Australia, Cass et al. (1983), Why so few?: Women academics in Australian universities found that academic women were seriously under-represented in senior positions (defined very broadly as those of senior lecturer or above), that they were clustered across the lower, mostly teaching levels, that they were often in untenured positions, and were predominantly affected by short-term contract employment.

As Cass et al. (1983) argued, the position of women academics in universities mirrored the occupational segregation of the Australian workforce, with women academics undertaking the less prestigious tasks of teaching and routine administration; in other words they were mainly restricted to the roles of helpers and assistants.

Other barriers to the participation of women academics include; sexual discrimination and harassment, marked gender divisions, stereotyped views of women and the prevailing masculine culture and norms pervading Australian universities (Cass et al 1983).

Since 1983, the few follow-up surveys that have been done on the demographic profiles of academic women have revealed a steadily increasing female participation, although women are still heavily under-represented at senior levels (Bacchi 1993; Everett 1994; Tharenou 1994).

In fact, so few women reach senior academic and managerial ranks in Australian universities, that the traditional “glass ceiling” is referred to as a “brick wall” (Bacchi 1993).

The under-representation of female senior academics means that there is a shortage of women role models for senior academic and executive positions and so inequity is perpetuated. Data collected in Everett’s (1994) paper on Sex, rank and qualifications at Australian universities, indicates that the phenomenon “think manager — think male” (Schein 1976, Schein, et al 1989, cited in Schein 1994, in Davidson & Burke (eds.)) translates equally well into the university sector as does “think professor, think male” (Tharenou 1994) and this researcher would add “think vice chancellor, think male” (Tilbrook 1998).

The performance of Australian universities with reference to the numbers of Australian women vice chancellors/university presidents in 1997 was 12.5 percent (AVCC 1997; Affirmative Action Agency 1997) and has doubled since then to 25 percent in 2004 (EOWA 2004, DEST 2004).

Despite this doubling in the most senior echelons of universities, there has only been a small change over the last decade in women’s participation levels in senior academic levels (senior lecturer and above).

Limited Access: Women’s disadvantage in higher education employment (1995) by Castleman et al and published by the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU) outlines little progress in its survey of payroll statistics for 10 universities in South Australia and Victoria. Similar to other prior investigations, Limited Access concluded that:

Women in both academic and general employment in higher education have been shown to hold lower level positions and, generally, to be employed under less favourable conditions than their male counterparts. Much earlier research has undermined or refuted explanations which account for this gender disparity in terms of factors such as women’s domestic responsibilities, historical legacy, low staff turnover or differences in men’s and women’s levels of qualifications and experience. However, it is difficult to persuade many in the industry that there is still a problem for women because of the strength of the view that discrimination is a thing of the past and that improvements in women’s status in the industry are steady and irreversible (Castleman et al.1995: 24).

The Larger Context: Comparisons with American Universities

Allowing for slight discrepancies in senior academic classifications; the Australian and British university sectors lag significantly behind their United States counterparts.

During 1996 in the U.S., 16 percent of chief executive officer positions in U.S. colleges and universities were held by women — the equivalent of 453 CEOs (El-Khawas 1997:xii, in Eggins (ed.); Eggins 1997:133, in Eggins (ed.)).

Twenty years ago the American proportion was 10 percent and 30 years ago it was 3 percent which was the equivalent of Britain in 1996 (El-Khawas 1997, in Eggins (ed.)). Australia’s proportion of women vice-chancellors in 1997 (12.5 percent) was only slightly higher than the U.S.A two decades ago. It is also interesting to note that the number of Australian women vice-chancellors only increased from three (1991-6) to six in 1997, to 10 in November 2004.

A comparison of the Australian and American statistics on gender and academic rank reveals a surprising disparity in the numbers of professorial women. The United States figures reveal a gradual vertical segmentation in the figures where women are entering the lower academic ranks in almost equal numbers to men, however, the percentages of women decrease towards the top. This is evidenced by comparing the respective percentages for the three lowest academic levels — lecturers, instructors and assistant professors. In contrast, the top-ranking positions reveal a polarisation between the comparative advantaged position of academic men.

The Australian figures mirror this trend only at the lower academic levels. There is a very low percentage of female professors coupled with disproportionately higher percentages for vice-chancellor and deputy vice-chancellor positions, when compared to the feeder professorate positions. This anomaly suggests the possibility of what might be called guided tokenism at the top in Australian universities. This phenomenon suggests that Australian universities might be actively
Table 1: Australian University Academic Staff by Gender and Rank (DEST 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>Dep. VC</th>
<th>Level E</th>
<th>A/Prof. Level D</th>
<th>S.Lec. Level C</th>
<th>Lecturer Level B</th>
<th>Tutor Level A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>545.0</td>
<td>904.0</td>
<td>2966.0</td>
<td>5690.0</td>
<td>3719.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3060.0</td>
<td>3122.0</td>
<td>5852.0</td>
<td>6576.0</td>
<td>3287.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>127.0</td>
<td>3605.0</td>
<td>4026.0</td>
<td>8820.0</td>
<td>12266.0</td>
<td>6986.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females %</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males %</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Customized information from data requested from DEST by the researcher.

Table 2: American University Academic Staff by Gender and Rank (U.S. Dept. of Education 2001-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant/-Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Other Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>37,051</td>
<td>47,774</td>
<td>65,158</td>
<td>48,969</td>
<td>10,106</td>
<td>30,325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>126,415</td>
<td>81,924</td>
<td>80,320</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>8,859</td>
<td>37,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163,466</td>
<td>129,698</td>
<td>145,478</td>
<td>92,781</td>
<td>18,965</td>
<td>67,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females %</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males %</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Customized information from data requested from the American Council of Education (ACE) by the researcher. Note: Data on U.S. presidents from ACE, no separate breakdowns available on vice-presidents.

compensating for the under-representation of women in the professoriate by employing a seemingly disproportionately larger percentage of women in top positions than this feeder group would suggest. Possibly this is an attempt to increase the representation of senior academic/executive women in Australian universities by employing more females at the very top to rely on a top-down as well as a trickle-up effect.

The Implications of EEO/AA legislation in the United States and Australia

Semi-structured interviews with 24 top women in Australian and American universities were carried out to explore amongst other topics the impact of EEO/AA
initiatives on their careers (Tilbrook 2005). These interviews were carried out in a qualitative framework informed by feminist methodology as a reliance on purely quantitative statistics does not uncover the “rich”, “thick” (Geertz 1973: 3-30) data behind the statistics.

Probably the most significant structural changes impacting most senior women in the study were the social and political initiatives, in America in the 1960-70s and then in Australia during the 1970-1980s that spawned the equal opportunities and affirmative action legislation in both countries.

Whilst academic feminists continue to debate the efficacy of the various legislation (see Poiner & Wills 1991; Burton 1991, 1992, 1995, in Payne & Shoemark (eds.); Bacchi 1996, 1998, in Galens & Mackinnon (eds.) 2001, in Brooks & Mackinnon (eds.)), all of the women interviewed for this study (Tilbrook 2005) emphasised the importance of these initiatives in encouraging women to enter senior jobs and also in promoting improvement in the organisational climate of universities.

As a result of legislation and various parliamentary inquiries, both the United States and Australia encouraged women into senior positions and onto the boards of large organisations. Consequently, many of the older university vice-chancellors and presidents enjoyed their first experiences on various high profile government committees and boards as “token” women (Interviews: AUS 2: 7; AUS 10: 2; AUS 12: 49; US 1; US 3).

As the Australian vice-chancellor of a regional university commented, until the 1970s being a woman was a “huge disadvantage” but “then as EEO started to swing in people couldn’t solely stack everything with men”. Then things improved for competent, ambitious women (Interview: AUS 12: 48-9).

These successful women accepted this tokenism with happy equanimity and as several suggested that they did not stay on these committees merely because they were women, but because they became valued members of the committees which became the forerunners of other board memberships (Interviews: AUS 2: 7; AUS 7: 31-2; AUS 9: 4-5; AUS 12: 48-9; US 3).

Despite the limitations of EEO/AA legislation (see Poiner & Wills 1991; Burton 1991, and Bacchi 1996 for extended treatments) and initiatives, all the women interviewed (Tilbrook 2005) stated, either directly or by implication, that these equity initiatives had been enormously important to their lives and careers and had continued importance to their female and minority students.

Many of the women felt consciously indebted to the EEO/AA initiatives existing in universities and believed that these had provided them with opportunities that may not have occurred otherwise. This view was most strongly held by the older (50 and over years) women, who all believed that they had a debt to EEO/AA initiatives which had provided them with opportunities on boards or policy groups that would otherwise have occurred only much later in their careers (Interviews: AUS 2:7; AUS 12: 48).

Appreciation of EEO initiatives was very apparent in the women at chief executive level within universities in both the U.S. and Australia. Even the youngest Australian vice-chancellor interviewed (at the time in her early 40s) reflected that, although some of the boards she had joined early in her career were influenced by her non-traditional academic field, much of her subsequent success at networking was due to EEO initiatives (Interview: AUS 10: 1-2).

None of these women at CEO level were daunted by any aspect of tokenism in initially gaining influential board and policy making memberships earlier in their careers (Interviews: AUS 10: 2; AUS 12: 48) because as an Australian vice-chancellor acknowledged:

I AM SURE I AM SURE I AM SURE 032 YOU KNOW YOU GET INTO THESE JOBS BECAUSE THEY ARE LOOKING FOR WOMEN BUT YOU DON’T STAY IN THEM BECAUSE YOU ARE A WOMAN (Interview: AUS 2: 7).

Although membership of these influential boards led to more invitations as they proved their value and competence, and this in turn facilitated access to networks, better opportunities, higher visibility and executive opportunities, there were also negative consequences (Interview: US 3: 52-3; US 5).

For women of colour, as a double-minority group, aspiring women may be interviewed for positions merely as part of an “acknowledgment” or quota of minorities to meet EEO requirements (Interview: US 5: 11) and then become more disadvantaged as word spreads that they were not successful in gaining positions that were never really open to them (Interview: US 5: 11, 28; see Brooks 2001: 25, in Brooks & Mackinnon (eds.).)

This misuse of EEO/AA by university senior management can lead to growing cynicism and disillusionment for these women (Interview: US 5: 11, 28). Sometimes it also incites a male backlash (Faludi 1991, reprinted 1992) against EEO/AA initiatives in more economically difficult environments (see Cockburn 1991; Currie & Thiele 2001, in Brooks & Mackinnon (eds.).)

Nevertheless for just under half of the 24 women interviewed, EEO/AA initiatives coupled with gaining a tertiary education had given them upward mobility so that they now enjoyed middle-class opportunities and advantages. An Australian dean of a large faculty in a sandstone university passionately stated her disagreement with some more recent suggestions that Australian “soft” (Bacchi 1996) EEO initiatives are mainly assisting already comparatively privileged middle-class women (see Burton 1991; Poiner & Wills 1991; Bacchi 1996):

I MEAN THERE WERE HARDLY ANY BOOKS IN MY HOUSE (GROWING UP)...NOW THERE ARE SO MANY YOU CAN’T WALK IN THE DOOR...WHAT IS MIDDLE-CLASS?...NOT WHERE YOU START, IT’S WHERE YOU END...AND TO SAY THAT EEO IS WHITE MIDDLE-CLASS WOMEN, MY ANSWER IS...YOU DO OTHER THINGS TO ASSIST WORKING-CLASS WOMEN AND ABORIGINAL PEOPLE AND NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING BACKGROUND. IT IS NOT ONE POLICY FOR EVERYONE (Interview: AUS 3: 8).

This comment typifies the critique and unpacking of the practicalities of EEO initiatives for many of the women. Primarily their understanding of EEO/AA was pragmatic rather than theoretical and in some cases, when the women were in leadership positions, it was tempered by conscious feminist practice (Interviews: AUS 2: 11-12; AUS 6: 13). As an Australian vice-
chancellor, who was also a founding member of women’s liberation, and her state’s first women’s advisor on education stated: “I’ve been interested...in educational equity, and it’s gone right through my career” (Interview: AUS 2:10). Another Australian former vice-chancellor, when detailing her difficulties in appointing the first university’s equity officer during the 1990s, stated emphatically that she repeatedly informed her senior executive group:

I kept saying that I’m not in for affirmative action...We have affirmative action for white, middle-class males...I want to go for equal opportunity (Interview: AUS 6:13).

This same vice-chancellor was compelled to battle her senior executive group to make the campus safe at night after lobbying by concerned female staff and students: “I said to the registrar when rape happens on campus I’ll hold you personally responsible” (Interview: AUS 6:13).

Even when it was not directly acknowledged or attributed by the women in the study the impact of EEO/AA in modifying aspects of the organisational culture within universities was clear. For example, when male deputy-vice-chancellors encouraged academic women to apply for senior positions (Interviews: AUS 1; AUS 2; AUS 11) or coached them in strategies for obtaining positions (Interview: AUS 1; US 1) it seems possible that they were scouting for new talent and were also possibly motivated by their equity commitment, or at the very least in Australia, by their DEOPE statistical returns. Both a professor and a pro-vice-chancellor employed in the same Australia university of technology, independently and spontaneously commended their male-vice-chancellor’s commitment to equity and success in encouraging a work environment where women felt valued (Interviews: AUS 1; AUS 8).

Likewise a senior vice-president of administration in an American east coast Ivy League university referred to her male president’s championing of diversity in his influential “bully pulpit” as a spokesperson on American social issues (Interview: US 7). Although it is for other researchers and studies to evaluate how successful EEO/AA initiatives have been in changing the “malestream” organisational cultures within universities it is evident in this study that EEO/AA initiatives had an extremely significant positive influence on the women’s careers (Interviews: AUS 1; AUS 2; AUS 3; AUS 4; AUS 5; AUS 6; AUS 7; AUS 8; AUS 10; AUS 11; AUS 12; US 1; US 2; US 3; US 4; US 5; US 8; US 9; US 11).

Conclusion

Despite the difficulties in operationalising EEO/AA initiatives, due to the increasingly difficult external environment of declining public funding and infrastructure coupled with rising enrolments (Miller 1995; Scott 1995; Slaughter & Leslie 1997; Smith & Webster (eds.) 1997; Marginson & Considine 2000), EEO initiatives remain on the policy agendas in American and Australian universities.

To some extent the Australian policy preference for a “soft” rather than “hard” interventionist EEO/AA framework (see Bacchi 1996 for an excellent summary of the major differences between the U.S. and Australian approaches) has cushioned Australia from a significant public backlash against EEO/AA initiatives.

Unfortunately this has not prevented several forays by the current Australian government to reduce the influence of the federal agencies responsible for monitoring the legislation (Summers, 28 April 2003: 11, cited in Beck & Davis 2003: 6, in Davis & Pratt (eds.)) and also embracing the mainstreaming strategy of using “diversity” rather than EEO (Bacchi 2001, in Brooks & Mackinnon).

This follows the American popularity of mainstreaming diversity rather than highlighting differences amongst target groups (see Thomas 1990; 1991; Jackson et al 1992) and championing the business economic benefits rather than a social justice agenda (Burton 1991; Poineer & Wills 1991; Bacchi 1996).
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Appendices


FOOTNOTES
1. Nevertheless the proportion of women to men is still hugely under-represented in the top positions in universities.

2. Hede and Rawson (192:14, cited in Sinclair 1994:5) suggest that if the previous rate of improvement continues in Australia it will take 30 years to reach equal representation at executive level across public and private organisations.

3. Concern at the Australian under-representation of senior women in universities has been a preoccupation of the Australian Vice-chancellors Committee which has initiated a series of reports and executive training to address this issue. Desire for widespread structural reform on gender issues also characterises the activities of the U.S. Office of Women in Higher Education (OWHE), formed in 1972 by the foremost higher education organisation, the American Council of Education (ACE).

4. This is not to discount Valerie Braithwaite's perspicacious analysis of the EEO 'doublethink' that sometimes characterises senior management and academics within universities: "These days, within universities, senior academic staff invariably display exemplary compliance with such rules, but sophistication in linguistic practices has not been accompanied by equally sophisticated insights into the barriers facing women in academic environments (Braithwaite 1998: 110-111, in Gaines and Mackinnon (eds.).")

5. According to a U.S. president of a private East Coast university, tokenism always occurs "when you are the first woman" in a position (Interview: US 3: 52) and as part of this you are "also making a hold for the next person" (Interview: US 3: 53).

6. As these and other EEO/AA commentators have noted, these reforms depend for their efficacy on a revolution in the re-allocation of domestic roles between men and women, that at this stage, seems highly unlikely. "Where domestic work, paid work, and political work are so profoundly gender-divided, legislation about equality can touch only that minority of situations where women's lives are like men's; it leaves out those, more important areas where men's and women's lives divide." (Fascall 1988: 33, cited in Bacchi 1999: 169).

7. As Noble and Mears (1997: 429, in Oppenheim and Murray) cynically suggest: "It is ironic that the issue that most blatantly represents the "failure" of EEO from the perspective of the EEO Coordinators, the lack of senior women, is also the factor that apparently has lowered the resistance of some senior men."