

GENDER-BASED CHALLENGES AND COPING STRATEGIES IN  
ACADEMIA IN TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ECE YILMAZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

JUNE 2019



Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Tlin Gen z  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Ay e Saktanber  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Be pınar  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assist. Prof. Dr. Aylin  akıro lu  evik (TEDU, SOC)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Be pınar (METU, SOC)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ay e İdil Aybars (METU, SOC)



**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last name: Ece Yılmaz

Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **GENDER-BASED CHALLENGES AND COPING STRATEGIES IN ACADEMIA IN TURKEY**

Yılmaz, Ece

M.S., Department of Gender and Women's Studies

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar

June 2019, 169 pages

This study aims to reveal gender-based individual, social, institutional and structural challenges academics face in their careers in Turkey. The theoretical framework was shaped by feminist standpoint theory which allowed a critical perspective to the traditional conceptualization of ideal worker. The data were collected through semi-structured in-depth interviews from 10 male and 10 female academics working in Ankara, the capital of Turkey. The findings revealed four main themes. Firstly, some differences were found in how male and female academics experience, conceptualize and perceive success. Women were found to have to make some concessions to look successful and fit in the ideal worker stereotype. There were also gender-based differences self-promotion patterns. Secondly, double standards for male and female academics, gender stereotypes that affect these processes, and male networks were found to influence gender inequalities in hiring and promotion. Thirdly, women experienced work-life conflict more seriously than their male colleagues. In addition, this study revealed that women face sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing more in academia. As to the coping strategies, some gender-based differences were

discovered. To fit in a system organized around male norms, women had to make more self-sacrifices and work harder to become successful and reconcile work and life. These findings were discussed as individual, social, institutional and structural level challenges and the relations among these different levels were highlighted. As gender inequality in academia has different and interconnected levels as shown, this study calls for a systematic and multi-level approach to combat gender inequality in academia.

**Keywords:** gender equality in academia, work-life balance, coping strategies, norm of ideal worker, Turkey

## ÖZ

### TÜRKİYE’DE AKADEMİDE CİNSİYET TEMELLİ ZORLUKLAR VE BAŞA ÇIKMA STRATEJİLERİ

Yılmaz, Ece

Yüksek Lisans, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar

Haziran 2019, 169 sayfa

Bu çalışma Türkiye’de akademisyenlerin karşılaştıkları cinsiyet temelli bireysel, toplumsal, kurumsal ve yapısal zorlukları incelemektedir. Çalışmanın teorik çerçevesi ideal çalışan kavramının eleştirel olarak ele alınmasına izin veren feminist bakış açısı teorisi tarafından şekillendirilmiştir. Veriler yarı-yapılandırılmış mülakat formu aracılığıyla Ankara’daki üniversitelerde görev yapmakta olan 10 kadın 10 erkek akademisyenden toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizi 4 ana tema ortaya çıkarmıştır. İlk olarak, kadın ve erkek akademisyenler için başarının nasıl kavramsallaştırıldığı ve algılandığı üzerine farklılıklar bulunmuştur. İdeal çalışan stereotipine uyabilmek için kadınların kadınlıklarından taviz vermek zorunda kaldıkları da bulgular arasındadır, kadın ve erkek akademisyenlerin kendi başarılarından bahsetmelerinde de cinsiyet temelli farklılıklar bulunmuştur. İkinci olarak, kadın akademisyenlerin işe alım ve yükseltme süreçlerinde çifte standartlarla karşılaştıkları, bu süreçlerin cinsiyet stereotiplerinden etkilendikleri ve erkek ağlarının varlığının işe alım ve yükseltme süreçlerini etkilediği bulunmuştur. Çalışma aynı zamanda kadın akademisyenlerin cinsiyet temelli mobbing ve cinsel tacize daha çok maruz



kaldıklarını bulmuştur. Başa çıkma stratejilerine gelindiğinde ise yine cinsiyete bağlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Erkek normları üzerinden tanımlanmış bir sisteme adapte olabilmek ve iş hayat dengesini kurabilmek için kadın akademisyenler kendilerinden daha çok taviz vermek zorunda kalmaktadırlar. Tüm bu bulgular, bireysel, toplumsal, kurumsal ve yapısal boyutlarda tartışılmış ve bu boyutlar arasındaki ilişkiler ortaya konmuştur. Bu farklı boyutlar düşünüldüğünde bu çalışma akademide cinsiyet eşitliğinin sağlanması için sistematik ve çok katmanlı bir yaklaşım önermektedir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** akademide cinsiyet eşitliği, iş hayat dengesi, başa çıkma stratejileri, ideal çalışan normu, Türkiye

To the greatest woman that I know, Aysel Yılmaz

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To begin with, I am grateful to my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar who provided me with detailed feedback and motivation while writing this thesis. I never felt lost thanks to her, and her continuous guidance made this study possible.

Secondly, I would like express my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil Aybars and Assist. Prof. Dr. Aylin Çakıroğlu Çevik who willingly participated in my thesis defense and shared their valuable comments with me. Their feedback helped me a lot to enhance my research.

I would also like to thank my mother Aysel Yılmaz, who has always believed in me. She has never allowed me to give up in life, she has always been there to motivate and encourage me to do my best when I face difficulties in life. I am proud of being her daughter.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues who agreed to participate in this study and provided me with new contacts to conduct interviews. For the anonymity of the participants, I cannot put their names here, but I should state that without their help this study would not be possible.

Lastly, I want to thank my friends Peyman Yüksel, Anıl Koçkar and Özkan Özkara who supported me in every stage of this thesis writing. They also provided me with their valuable feedback after listening to my long thesis defense presentation practice on a Saturday evening. I also would like to thank Füsun Yazıcıoğlu who helped me in editing process. Their friendship is priceless.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION .....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	x
LIST OF TABLES .....	xiii
CHAPTER	
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Research questions .....	3
1.2 Assumptions of the study .....	4
1.3 Arguments of the study .....	4
1.4 Significance of the study .....	5
1.5 The theoretical framework .....	7
1.6 Research design.....	12
1.7 Limitations of the study.....	13
1.8 The structure of the thesis .....	13
2.REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON WOMEN IN ACADEMIA.....	16
2.1 Feminist standpoint theory .....	17
2.2 Gender inequality in academia .....	22
2.2.1 Gender inequality in academic hiring and promotion .....	23
2.2.2 Work-life balance in academia.....	27
2.3.3 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment in academia .....	31
2.3 Gender inequality in academia in Turkey .....	36
3.METHODOLOGY.....	45
3.1 Design and Methods.....	45
3.2 Research Procedures.....	48

3.3 Key Characteristics of the Respondents .....	52
3.4 Ethical Permission.....	57
3.5 Data Analysis .....	57
3.6 Strengths and Limitations of the Study .....	58
4.GENDER INEQUALITY IN ACADEMIA .....	61
4.1 Gender differences in experiences of success and productivity.....	61
4.1.1 Definitions and perceptions of success and productivity .....	62
4.1.2 Female concessions to fit in the ideal worker stereotype.....	66
4.1.3 Gender differences in self-promotion .....	69
4.2 Gendered hiring and promotion processes in academia.....	72
4.2.1. Working in male and female dominated academic fields .....	72
4.2.2 Gender equality and positive discrimination in academic hiring .....	76
4.2.3 Women's absence in top academic management positions .....	79
4.3 Work-life balance in academia.....	83
4.3.1 Gender issues in work-life balance .....	84
4.4 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment .....	91
4.4.1 Gender issues in mobbing and sexual harassment .....	91
4.5 Challenges and coping strategies .....	97
4.5.1 Ambitious success and productivity criteria .....	98
4.5.2 Gendered hiring and promotion processes .....	101
4.5.3 Work-life conflict.....	103
4.5.4 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment .....	106
5.POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GENDER EQUALITY IN ACADEMIA .....	109
5.1 Academics' institutional and structural expectations.....	110
5.2 Policy recommendations .....	117
5.2.1 Redefining ideal worker and success criteria.....	117
5.2.2 Gender equality in academic hiring and promotion .....	120
5.2.3 Work-life balance in academia.....	123
5.2.4 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment .....	125
5.2.5 Other policy recommendations .....	127

6.CONCLUSION .....	129
REFERENCES .....	140
APPENDICES	
A. APPROVAL LETTER FROM METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE .....	150
B. CONSENT FORM FOR DATA COLLECTION.....	151
C. INSTRUMENTS .....	152
D. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	156
E. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU .....	169

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2.1. The Numbers of Male and Female Academics in Turkey.....	39
Table 3.1. Gender Distribution in the Universities where the Interviewees Work...	53
Table 3.2. Summary of Interviewee Profiles.....	56

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

When I started working as a language instructor in one of the universities in Ankara six years ago, one of the very first things that I realized was the numerical dominance of female instructors in the institution. However, despite this numerical dominance, the department head or the director of the school was a man. At the beginning, it was very surprising for me to find that even in a school where female instructors outnumbered male instructors, it was men who were supposed to make the decisions. Later, I found that although the number of female academics in Turkey is quite high with 43.06% (The World Bank 2015 Data, 2019) women are almost invisible when I look at the Presidents of the universities. In 206 universities in Turkey today, there are only 18 female Presidents (Birgün, 2019). What these numbers and percentages tell us is that numerical equality does not necessarily signify gender equality in practice. In addition, while the numbers of male and female academic staff in the research or teaching assistant positions are quite close to each other with 24584 female assistants and 23882 male assistants, these numbers dramatically change when the numbers of male and female professors are compared. At all universities in the country while the number of male professors is 18139, the number of female professors is 8386 which is less than the half of male professors (The Council of Higher Education, 2019). These numbers may be telling us that the road which takes an academic from assistantship to professorship does not have the same challenges and difficulties for male and female academics.

The literature on gender inequality at universities also present other problems regarding women academics' position. Related to gender stereotypes, Henley (2015)



mentions gendered hierarchies at universities and claims that these hierarchies stem from accusing of women's abilities and disinterest, gendered recruitment and promotion patterns and subjective evaluations of women's success and productivity. In line with these studies, Mayer and Tikka (2008) underlines the fact that women concentrate in lower positions in lower paying disciplines and especially in social sciences. Regarding women's position at universities, there are also other studies which focus on women's marginalization in academic conferences (Eden, 2016), sexual harassment and gender discrimination (Jagsi et al., 2016). Apart from these studies which highlight the social and structural aspects of gender inequality, there are also studies which focus on the consequences of these aspects on the individual woman. For example, Savigny (2014) suggests that women may embody socially accepted gender stereotypes as their own characteristics and may lower expectations from themselves. From this example, we can understand that a problem that is social or structural may be individualized by the person being stereotyped.

Similar problems are also found in the studies that were conducted in Turkey. One of the main themes that has taken up a huge place in literature regarding female academics in Turkey is traditional gender roles and women's domestic responsibilities. Özkanlı (2007) claims that women's careers in academic life are seriously under the influence of the role conflicts that women experience. Similarly, Başarır and Sarı (2015) analyzed women's perceptions regarding being a female academic through metaphors. While most of these categories revealed women's multiple roles as women, mothers, wives and researchers, the "someone nameless" category revealed their absence in the decision-making positions at universities. In addition to women's multiple role conflicts that hinder their career advancement and their absence in key-decision making positions, the literature also presents other challenges to these women's careers. For example, Ergöl et al. (2012)'s study also revealed another problem regarding women's work conditions. Some participants of the study reported sexual harassment by mentioning the disturbing behaviors of men around them. Moreover, Çögenli and Döner (2015) reported that female academics experience mobbing more often when compared to male academics.

All these studies mentioned here reveal some problems regarding gender inequality at universities. What can be inferred from these studies is that quantitative presence of women in academia is not a solution to gender inequality, and even when there is quantitative equality it is important to investigate where this quantitative presence accumulates. As in our case in Turkey where the numbers accumulate in the lower positions of academic rank, it is important to search for the reasons that keep women away from career advancement. Therefore, I find it necessary to investigate how male and female academics experience their career journey on this road which runs toward professorship, what kinds of challenges they come across and what kinds of coping strategies they develop. Taking all these into consideration, this study aims to understand what individual, social and institutional challenges that female and male academics face and how these different levels are connected to each other. In addition to these, this study also aims to investigate coping strategies with these challenges while presenting some educational policy recommendations with the aim of making universities more woman-friendly workplaces.

### **1.1 Research questions**

The research questions of the study are as follows:

- What are the personal, social, institutional and structural gender-based challenges academics face in their career progression at universities in Turkey and how are these challenges related?
- What are the coping strategies of academics with these gender-based challenges to increase their success and productivity?
- What can be some policy recommendations to decrease gender-based challenges experienced by academics through their academic careers at universities in Turkey?

## **1.2 Assumptions of the study**

As mentioned previously through the comparison of the numbers of female and male research assistants and professors, as one goes up in the academic hierarchy, a dramatical decline in the number of female academics becomes clearly visible. Therefore, the way female academics experience this academic career journey and the way male academics experience the same journey must be different so that we can explain the loss of dramatical number of women in this process. Therefore, this study starts with the assumption that academic men and women experience academic careers and academic career advancement differently. Secondly, considering that individuals' own preferences are not as personal as they may seem, and they are usually shaped by social and familial expectations and pressures (Sandberg, 2013), this study was shaped by the assumption that the career journey differences are caused by some individual, social, and institutional factors. Thirdly, as mentioned by Sandberg, if social factors have the power to influence the seemingly individual differences, this study also assumes that these individual, social and institutional factors do not work independently of each other, but they work together to create different experiences for academic men and women. Fourthly, this study also assumes that facing different challenges, male and female academics develop different coping strategies with these challenges. As a consequence, keeping all these assumptions in mind, this study aims to investigate these differences as they are symptoms of gender inequalities.

## **1.3 Arguments of the study**

This study argues that universities are gendered organizations and women face different challenges in their career journey because of their gender when compared to male academics. Universities and their work conditions are still organized around the traditional definition of ideal worker, who has no domestic or care-related responsibilities (Williams, 1989; Lynch, 2007). However, gendered division of labor in the society leaves academic women with many responsibilities related to home and

care while distancing women from the definition of ideal worker and creating gender inequality in the workplace. In addition, to fit in this ideal worker definition, women sometimes have to make some concessions, abandoning their female traits, outlook among other things. Despite these concessions, there are still differences in the perceptions of how a successful male academic and a successful female academic should be. Being successful does not have the same meaning for these two groups; and indeed, it is something more difficult to achieve for female academics. Similarly, this study argues that female academics are invisible in the top management positions at universities. Moreover, in academic hiring and promotion processes women are at a more disadvantageous position. This study also argues that although quantitative equality is not a cure to gender inequality in academia, it is quite necessary for a pluralist work environment and it is also necessary for the expectation that there will be less cases of sexual harassment in a work environment which is not dominated by men. Furthermore, academic women do not have enough and beneficial solidarity networks, and despite their marginalization as a group, they strive to survive on their own. Female academics experience work-life conflict more than male academics. Another argument of this study is that although women are at a disadvantaged position in academia due to its gendered organization, they develop some coping strategies, which is as a result of their agency. Most importantly, this gender inequality has multiple levels which include individual, social and institutional levels and they work dependently of each other.

#### **1.4 Significance of the study**

This study is significant because it fills a gap in the literature related to Turkish Higher Education and work conditions of academic staff by presenting an investigation of multiple layers of gender equality which are individual, social and institutional levels. In addition, by highlighting the interconnectedness of these multiple levels in production and reproduction of gender inequality in higher education, the findings of this study call for a more systematic approach with multiple layers to combat this problem.

Secondly, the findings of this study bring the discourse of personal choice into question through an emphasis on social and institutional grounds of gender inequality in higher education. Beddoes and Pawley (2014) maintain that “the discourse of choice” is not a cure to women’s underrepresentation in science, technology, engineering and mathematics fields and this discourse can be dangerous due to two reasons. Firstly, it masks the need for social and structural changes and it exempts educational leaders from their responsibilities to provide gender equality in the educational workplace. To make it clearer, the claim that “it was your choice to have kids” de-problematizes underrepresentation of women in the academy while putting the blame on the person rather than structural inequalities. Consequently, the authors argue that the concepts of “choice” and “agency” need to be re-contextualized within bigger neoliberal modernization discourses because as Sandberg (2013) suggests that individuals’ own preferences are not as personal as they may seem, and they are usually shaped by social and familial expectations and pressures. As a consequence, another significance of this study stems from this discussion, and the findings and related discussions of this study will remind educational leaders and policymakers of their social and institutional responsibilities for gender equality in higher education which are ignored or trivialized within the discourses of personal choice and responsibilities.

Thirdly, the findings of this study are significant to be taken into consideration to ameliorate the working conditions of academic staff as they bring the definition of ideal academic worker into question. The male definitions of success, productivity, and academic leadership are questioned in this respect. The previous research demonstrated that the organization of paid work is according to a male ideal worker who is without any domestic responsibilities including care-work (Williams, 1989), and it was also revealed that female routine was not compatible with this male-oriented organization due to women’s unpaid domestic labour (Bradley, 1994). These conditions have consequences for the male definitions of working hours, work success, and productivity as well as academic leadership. To exemplify, Roebuck, Smith and Haddaoui (2013) investigated the effects of work-life balance perspectives

of women from different generations on women's opportunities for leadership in the workplace. They conducted their study with 161 women who were full time workers in different sectors. The results of their study revealed that work-life balance is a concern for all women no matter what age they have and this concern mainly originates from their caregiving responsibilities and majority of women prefer not to obtain leadership positions if they think that this will harm their work-life balance. Another example can be limitations on women's academic mobility due to familial childcare responsibilities and organization of conferences based on male norms without opportunities for childcare. Consequently, it is clear that male organization of academic life harms women's opportunities for better work, better work opportunities and better work conditions.

All in all, this study is filling a gap in the literature by concentrating on multiple levels of gender inequality in higher education institutions in Turkey as well as making some systematic policy recommendations for educational leaders and policymakers. In this way, this study aims to augment work conditions of both male and female academics.

### **1.5 The theoretical framework**

The theoretical framework of the study is shaped by feminist standpoint theory. The reasons for the choice of theoretical framework are its compatibility with the aim, assumptions of data analysis of the study. The aim of this study is not to reach the absolute and universal answers regarding the problems of women in Turkish Higher Education but to proceed with the assumption that knowledge is partial (Hekman, 1997) as put forward by feminist standpoint theory. Another assumption of the study maintains that subjects who participated in this study are constructed by relational forces as mentioned by Hekman (1997). This means that this study starts with the assumption that the experiences of the subjects of the study will be shaped by some other relational factors including their gender, age, title, the university they work at, and etc. Furthermore, the study rejects the definition of knowledge and truth as

complete and universal, and advances with the assumption that all knowledge is situated and contextual (Hekman, 1997). The researcher in this study is quite aware of the fact that the findings of this study will be as a result of experiences of male and female academics at different universities which are located in the city of Ankara, and will be limited in presenting and reflecting the experiences of male and female academics working at universities of in small cities. Lastly, as an answer to the question of how to select the perspectives and standpoints which are beneficial to us if we accept that there are multiple realities and standpoints, feminist standpoint theory assumes that the subject of any analysis in feminist research is shaped by the interests of the researcher (Hekman, 1997). According to Hekman, the values and political goals of the researchers motivates them to study certain subjects, and with this comes the relationship between knowledge and politics. In this way, knowledge and politics become connected in Hekman's words.

Other aspects of feminist standpoint theory that concern this study are also mentioned by Hartsock (1983). Hartsock claims that material life serves as a limit to how individuals perceive social relations. Similarly, Wylie (2003) suggests that how individuals perceive the world around them is shaped by social location which is defined by structures in that individual's position in hierarchically built power relations. For this study, this social location, material life in Hartsock's terms, is determined by gender-based differences which cause men and women to have access to different pieces of knowledge regarding the world around them. Therefore, it becomes vital to access both of these pieces of knowledge for this study.

As put forward in the previous two paragraphs, if there are multiple realities and standpoints according to the feminist standpoint theory, it becomes essential to start by questioning the definition of ideal worker. Williams (1989) presented a critique of gendered structure of wage labor by challenging the concept of ideal worker who does not have any domestic responsibilities. Williams also presented a critique of "choice" and claimed that when women "choose" to become non-ideal workers, this meant that all workers have two inadmissible choices: either choosing the

conventional male life order, or choosing the conventional female economic vulnerability. Williams argued that work does not have to be organized around these two options. Similarly, Lynch (2006) presented a critique of academic world by claiming that neoliberal policies require that individuals take their own responsibilities in terms of public services which include housing, transport and care work. In this trend, efforts are employed to privatize these services, therefore, citizens will need to buy them with their market values rather than the efforts to provide them as state services (Lynch, 2006). Despite this fact that care work responsibilities are not realized by the state but by the individuals themselves, this situation did not change the definition of ideal worker, as presented by Williams (1989). Likewise, Lynch (2007) depicted ideal workers as the ones who do not have any kind of care work responsibilities either through detachment from dependency relationships, or through delegation of work to others, or through commands to others to do their dependency work. Similarly, managerial work in higher education was “care-less” work as defined by Grummell, Devine and Lynch (2009). The authors mentioned that these positions in higher education favor those who do not have any care work responsibilities, and those, therefore, usually refers to men. They discussed the impacts of neoliberal policies in higher education together with their consequences in terms of gender and managerial work. The results of the study showed that care work was seen as a women’s problem, and career breaks or job sharing was considered as a suitable moral choice for women as part of being a good mother. However, such a moral choice was out of the question for men. In addition, in the study, academic work was defined as a long-hours work, which did not allow individuals to set strict boundaries between work and life. In this long-hours work, women’s absence from certain positions were seen as women’s choice, although one senior manager underlined that the work environment -not women- needed some changes to accommodate women in these positions. Grummell, Devine and Lynch (2009) conclude that the efforts to accommodate women in senior management positions will be useless unless women’s “care-full” lives are ignored through neoliberal policies.



Having an ideal worker definition also hinders seeing the gendered aspects of academic work environment as it provides a single definition of success. Henley (2015), on the other hand, challenges and criticizes the traditional definition of success in that this definition remains insufficient to take into consideration gendered publication and citation patterns as well as the gendered contributions made by male and female academics to the academic world. Henley mentions gendered hierarchies within science which stem from accusing of women's abilities and disinterest, gendered recruitment, job evaluation and promotion patterns in addition to the subjective evaluations of women's success and productivity.

This ideal worker whose definition has been criticized here and its role on masking the gendered organization of universities need to be analyzed at individual, social and institutional levels by keeping in mind that all these levels are interconnected and have consequences for each other. For example, investigating cultural sexism in academia, Savigny (2014) suggests that gender marginalization at work which functions on the social and institutional levels also may also have individual level consequences for women and cause a withdrawal from nominating themselves for promotions and senior positions. Furthermore, some social and institutional level problems can be masked through individualization of the problem. For instance, Savigny (2014) mentions childbearing. When the social organization of unequal division of labor at home and the institutional and structural organization of disproportionate allocation of paternity and maternity leaves for child care are considered together with childbearing, this kind of thinking leads to the assumption that childcare is a women's problem. In this way, social and institutional level solutions become trivial by relieving the society and institutions although this is not a problem which can be solved on the individual level. Therefore, understanding the interconnectedness of all these levels in the production and reproduction of gender inequality is of the great importance.

Another example of the interconnectedness of different levels of gender inequality in academia is also visible in the efforts to increase the number of women in academia.

There are some studies to this end, and one of them is conducted by Mayer and Tikka (2008). Mayer and Tikka investigated the assumption that more effective family policies in the country will end in better representation of women in tenure-track academic positions. To this end, leave policies of Sweden, Finland and the United States were analyzed and the expectation was to find higher representation of women in academia in Finland and Sweden where there were more generous parental leave policies with the assumption that these more generous policies will allow women to compete better with academic men. However, the results of their analyses did not show an appreciable difference between these Nordic countries and the United States in terms of female representation in academia. It is argued that although generous leave and family policies in these countries exist, they serve more to enhance children's welfare rather than enhancing women's careers. The authors also mention the work-related penalties women face due to child care responsibilities and gender stereotypes. Lastly, Mayer and Tikka (2008) conclude that augmented family policies are essential but insufficient to enhance female careers in academic life, and they must exist together with efforts to provide a wider social transformation to bring gender equality. Going back to the interconnectedness of different levels of inequality, what is clear from this study is that it is not really possible to come up with gender equality in academia only through institutional and structural reforms unless they are supported by transformations on the social level.

When all these discussions are considered, it is clear that higher education institutions and their gendered organizations set some challenges to academic women's careers. However, Çağlayan (2015) states that in accordance with the changing life conditions in the world, women's academic success in science and universities has started to become prominent in addition to their contributions to social and economic life. Similarly, in Turkey the contributions of women in the scientific area have reached a level that cannot be ignored. Regarding this situation, Çağlayan concludes that this success leads to needs for increasing number of women in the academic field, improvements in their work conditions and support for them. As a consequence, when these needs are considered, more studies which focus on gender inequalities in higher

education institutions are required to reveal the challenges mentioned. All in all, taking the different levels of inequality and their interconnectedness into consideration, one aim of this study will be focusing on the interconnectedness of these different layers of gender inequality which can be observed in higher education institutions in Turkey.

## **1.6 Research design**

In the design of this study, feminist research approach was adopted and qualitative inquiry was selected to understand how male and female academics conceptualize the meanings in terms of success and productivity, how they perceive and experience the challenges and difficulties that they come across in the course of their careers, and what kinds of coping strategies they develop. Qualitative inquiry also allows the researcher to understand the implications of individual, social and institutional levels of gender inequality and it becomes easier to reveal the connections among these different levels of inequality. When the aims and design of the study was considered, the most appropriate way to collect data was through qualitative interviewing. Therefore, the data was collected through qualitative interviewing. After the preparation of a theoretically informed interview instrument, this instrument was evaluated through two pilot interviews which allowed the researcher to make some changes and additions to the interview questions. When the instrument was ready, the ethical permission from the Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee (Appendix A) was taken to collect data between the dates April 5<sup>th</sup> 2018 and June 30<sup>th</sup> 2019. The study aimed to reach academics in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, and convenience sampling was exploited to find interviewees. 10 male and 10 female academics were the participants of this study and the data collection process started in April 2018 and ended in February 2019. To analyze the data, the interviews were read in detail and a list of emerging key words and word groups were determined. In the second step, key words and word groups were placed under broader themes that emerged during the study. After this thematic analysis, the findings were discussed in the light of existing literature.

## **1.7 Limitations of the study**

The main limitation of the study is that the participants of the study are all located in Ankara, in the capital of Turkey and they work at the universities which are quite similar to each other. They are all reputable universities in Turkey. Therefore, this study remains limited in presenting the experiences of male and female academics who work at different parts of Turkey. This limitation should be underlined on the grounds that in small cities which are economically less developed and at their universities, conservatism and patriarchy are supposed to be stronger when compared to the capital city, and therefore gender inequalities could be felt stronger. As a result, this study has limitations in representing academics' experiences with stronger forms of conservatism and patriarchy. However, this study is still important because it reveals gender inequalities even in the best universities of the country and in the capital city. In addition, related to the design of the study, Gerson and Horowitz (2002) claim that participants' ability to recall past, comprehend the present and consider the future is a determiner of the depth of interviews. Therefore, the depth of the interviews could be affected by such individual differences among participants. Lastly, the specific focus on gender could mask other power relations that are going on at universities.

## **1.8 The structure of the thesis**

The current chapter of the study aimed to present an illustration of gender inequality problem at universities in Turkey. It also introduced the research questions, assumptions and arguments of the study, the significance of the study, the theoretical framework of the study, related methodology together with its limitations. Lastly, this part of the chapter presents the flow of the study.

The second chapter starts with the presentation and discussion of feminist standpoint theory which was chosen as the theoretical framework of the study. In this part, the importance of listening to women's stories is underlined in that the workplace expects

them fit in a structure that was not originally planned by taking into consideration their needs. Therefore, the concept of ideal worker is introduced and criticized in this part. This chapter continues with a discussion of gender inequality in academia. Under this title, the issues of gendered academic hiring and promotion processes, work life balance experiences of academics, and gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment in academia are discussed. The literature review part ends with the current discussions regarding gender equality at universities in Turkey.

The third chapter is about the methodology chosen for the current study. In this chapter, the research approach exploited and the design of the study is presented in more detail. This detailed presentation includes the research questions, ethical issues in the research, sampling and data collection procedures, data analysis in addition to the strengths and limitations of the study.

The fourth chapter presents the findings of the study, by diving them into themes. The themes that are discussed in this chapter are the perceptions of success and productivity in academia, hiring and promotion processes in academia, work life balance experiences of academics, and gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment in academia. This chapter also presents some quotations from the participants in line with the objectives of the study. Furthermore, gender is treated as a variable and gender differences in the findings are also discussed in the light of the existing literature. Apart from these, this chapter offers a discussion of coping strategies with the challenges faced in academic careers.

The fifth chapter presents academics' institutional and structural expectations to ameliorate their work conditions and makes some educational policy recommendations based on the findings presented in the previous literature. These policy recommendations were mainly shaped around the themes and discussions that emerged in this study. The aim of this study is to make some suggestions to make universities gender-friendly workplaces.

The last chapter of the study presents a more holistic approach to the aims, methods and findings of study. It offers a general overview of the study and summarizes the findings. Also, the policy recommendations that are presented in the previous chapter are summarized in this last chapter.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON WOMEN IN ACADEMIA**

This study aims to investigate individual, social, institutional and structural challenges academic men and women face in their academic careers in Turkey while revealing the relations among these different levels of inequality. In addition, the present study also aims to reveal men's and women's coping strategies with these challenges to increase their success and productivity and make some policy recommendations to turn higher education institutions in Turkey into better organizations in terms of gender equality. Although universities in Turkey just like other workplaces are mostly known to be gender-neutral, this study starts out from the assumption that universities just like most other work places are gendered institutions as work itself is a gendered concept. This argument reveals itself in the fact that work is organized around a male ideal and workplaces are designed according to this ideal. Being organized around male concepts and ideals and still being claimed to be gender-neutral opens a way to blame women if they stay behind although they are left behind. This blame put on women turns social, institutional and structural problems into personal ones, relieving the policymakers from their responsibilities to create women-friendly workplaces as there is nothing wrong with the organization of work but women and their choices. Therefore, a theoretical framework that is supposed frame this study should be well aware of the relations between knowledge, power and politics while giving access to female voices. Listening to and learning more about women's stories give the researchers and policy makers access to various perspectives which are not readily available to others on the grounds that it is women who have to face gendered challenges in their daily lives and at work. Keeping all these in mind, therefore, this study utilizes the feminist

standpoint theory which is obviously political and social epistemology (Wylie, 2003) allowing our feminist investigation to use women's experiences as a starting point.

## **2.1 Feminist standpoint theory**

The literature concerning feminist standpoint theory goes back to 1970s and since then different scholars have brought different explanations regarding what a standpoint is and how to approach different standpoints as the theory has brought a different perspective to the feminist epistemology. In fact, the feminist standpoint theory has meant a paradigm shift in the concept of knowledge which signals a change both in the feminist theory and in the epistemology (Hekman, 1997). These changes came with the awareness of the limitations of dominant male perspectives in sociology in reflecting and revealing women's experiences. Criticizing the dominant male perspective in sociology with this awareness, Smith (1972) argues that although women also participate in doing this world, the methods, concepts, and theories of sociology depend on and constructed upon male social life. Accordingly, Smith suggests that an alternative sociology should seek to create the capacity that can be a way to understand lived experiences of women. Smith calls women as "native speakers" of this new world, and thinks that women can explain what female world implies conceptually as they may know it before somebody else says it.

The questions if women's life activity can be a base for a distinct standpoint and if it can fulfil the criteria for a feminist standpoint are answered by Hartsock (1983). She bases her discussion on sexual division of labor -she uses the word sexual in order not to reduce the discussion to only a social dimension-, claims that women sell their labor and play a role in the production of commodities and surplus value in addition to their contribution to the production of use-values at home. Therefore, unlike men, women's contribution in terms of sexual division of labor has two aspects regarding production for wages and production for home. Hartsock also claims that women work more than men, they spend more time on the production of use-values when compared to men, and lastly, women's production requires completion of repetitive



tasks which are different than men's. When these differences in the material life activities are taken into consideration, Hartsock suggests that material life experiences of women should be a ground for feminist theories in addition to being part in the political endeavor which is necessary to improve areas of social life based on these experiences.

Taking Hartsock's arguments into account, it becomes necessary to investigate the differences in the work experiences of men and women. Acker (2011) defines the concept of work day as adjacent number of pre-determined hours, and the ideal worker as a gendered concept in that ideal worker is someone who is burdenless and always accessible for work. According to Acker, this heteronormative model of the division of labor stems from the conception of man as breadwinners in the ruling position and women as homemaker in a subordinate position. The historical background to this separation is as follows: After the industrial revolution, the workplace gained its own presence away from the household. This caused separation of work and life, which were entirely blended previously. This separation also led to a division of labour between men and women, in which men became dominant in the workplace and women shouldered the domestic responsibilities such as cleaning and child-care to sustain health and efficiency of working men. Progressively, through the support coming from home and community, the workplace, the source of economy, was systematized over life. In this time, women's unpaid domestic work was, on the other hand, downgraded because it is unpaid although women undertake these responsibilities in addition to paid work (Rao, Stuart & Kelleher, 1999). Furthermore, women's paid work was also realized in low paying and gender segregated jobs during the early periods of industrialization. The working women were usually single, and there were only few women who worked outside the home since married women were not supposed to work and have financial freedom. Consequently, women's social position was defined in relation to her husband's social position which was determined by his occupation. Men did not support their wives' entry into the labour market on the grounds that this entry could lower their wages. However, in 1940s, technology and war facilitated women's entry in the

labour force and in 1960s and 1970s, women's temporary employment opportunities gave their place to more permanent employment opportunities (Cleveland, Stockdale & Murphy, 2000). Although it has been a long time since the entry of women into the labour force with permanent jobs, the division of labour between men and women have remained almost the same in that the organization of paid work is still made around an ideal worker who does not have any domestic or care-work responsibilities (O'Connor, 1993). Bradley (1994) illustrates this androcentric organization in the traditional work hours. According to her, male life routine is compatible with working from nine to five every workday and having the weekend off. Nonetheless, female life routine is not at all compatible with these hours on the grounds that women are responsible for taking care of children which includes providing food, clothing and necessary arrangements to take them to school. When she is free, she needs to go to shops and banks (Bradley, 1994). Time budget studies, mentioned in Delphy and Leonard (1994), also support the examples above. These studies have demonstrated that women still spend twice as much time as their husbands on domestic tasks in all Western and Eastern bloc states, and this situation does not change when they are in paid employment. The authors claim that although husbands' help have had an impact on women's freedom to choose any employment, women still lack something that men have: "A right to time off". This is valid even when women have other domestic workers, servants, due to the fact that these servants also mean extra work for women in that they need to be hired, disciplined and supported (Delphy & Leonard, 1994). Being a capable coordinator of daily family life is not required from men who can indeed run huge companies (Polkowska, 2014). As a result, O'Connor (1993) concludes that increased participation of women into the labour force is possible at the expense of a doubled work day, increased reliance on state institutions especially in the public sector and the acceptance of gender-segregated jobs.

This heteronormative model of division of labor mentioned by Acker is better understood when gender stereotypes are considered because compliance with gender stereotypes about how women should behave makes it more difficult for women to fulfil the requirements of being an ideal worker (Reskin, 2010). In addition to this

stereotype gap between women and ideal worker, working women also face negative stereotypes which put them in a more marginal position away from the position of an ideal worker. Cleveland, Stockdale and Murphy (2000) regard it surprising to find negative stereotypes about working women when women's existence in the workforce is considered. These negative stereotypes include being not involved in their job, showing no commitment, looking for a husband if they are single and young, an unhappy middle aged, older woman who has lost interest in men, a spinster, or a career-oriented woman who has no interest in men or relationships, or having children. Moreover, what is expected from working mothers is less involvement in their jobs, and being less reliable; or what is expected from them can also be less involvement in their children (Cleveland, Stockdale, & Murphy, 2000). Negative stereotyping against working women was exemplified in one study conducted by Rubini and Menegatti (2014). Rubini and Menegatti investigated linguistic bias in academic personnel selection, and the analysis showed that women were assessed with more negative adjectives when compared to men. Men were assessed with more positive adjectives and negative action verbs, even when they were rejected, which meant that women's negative characteristics and men's positive characteristics were regarded as a constant across different contexts and situations while men's unfavorable acts were context-specific.

These explanations regarding women's experiences and the concept of ideal worker show how material life both shapes and restricts how people understand social relations as mentioned by Hartsock (1983). If this material life formed two different groups, it is possible to expect that the vision available to each group is a reverse version of the other. In this case, the vision of the dominant group will be both "partial and perverse" although the vision of each ruling class, gender in our case, is expected to shape the material relations, and these material relations are imposed on all parties, and so the vision of the ruling class cannot be easily named as false. What this means is explained by Wylie (2003). Wylie argues that one of the most fundamental awareness the feminist standpoint theory brings lies in this inversion thesis. According to this, groups upon whom the marginalizing and oppressive concepts of

the dominant groups have been imposed may indeed have an epistemological privilege in some major aspects of the discussion. Thanks to what they usually experience, they may have access to different pieces of knowledge, or they may know better than the ones who are both politically and socially privileged, and feminist standpoint theorists argue that gender as one aspect of our social life differentiation can lead to a such difference (Wylie, 2003). Here comes the importance of listening to “native speakers” of these experiences as they may be sources of knowledge that is otherwise unavailable to the researcher.

Despite these advantages mentioned in previous paragraphs, the feminist standpoint theory was not without criticisms. For example, Hekman (1997) questions how it can be possible to conduct a coherent analysis, how we can choose the useful standpoints to work on, and how we can conserve the political ability to talk about different categories of women. Borrowing Weber’s ideal type, Hekman endeavors to bring solutions to these problems. Accordingly, no perspective is complete, and knowledge is situated causing different pieces of knowledge to arise from different localities, and just like the ideal type women’s life experiences are also structured by shared concepts. In addition, as to the questions of which standpoints to use, she claims that this will be shaped by the interests and values which motive the researcher to explore some issues. Wylie (2003) is another scholar who addressed the questions of situated knowledge thesis, and multiple standpoints. According to Wylie, it is possible to determine a unique standpoint which has an epistemological advantage when the mutuality of location and experience gives rise to an oppositional awareness about the impacts of the social location, revealing the incompleteness of the dominant knowledge, bringing a new perspective to the old question and leading to new questions for scientific exploration (Wylie, 2003).

Wylie (2003) argues that standpoint theories should not assume these two things. Firstly, they should not fall into the trap of essentialism by bringing essentialist definitions to social categories or collectivities. Secondly, they should not assume an automatic epistemological privilege, meaning that these theories cannot claim that

oppressed or marginal groups know more and better just because of their social location. Taking into consideration these two warnings, Wylie redefines objectivity to display that a standpoint theorist can have an epistemological privilege without assuming essentialism or an automatic privilege. Consequently, taking all these characteristics into account, this study starts out women's experiences, aims to learn more about gendered lives of women by questioning the social power relations. As to the criticisms to the feminist standpoint theory regarding its objectivity, Wylie's (2003) interested researcher definition will be used on the grounds that the researcher would like to use the epistemological advantage that being in the oppressed group provides. Lastly, as mentioned earlier, listening to women's stories of the great importance to break the male dominated sociology, to challenge existing power relations and to develop policies that will give women better working conditions instead of pushing them to fit into the structures which were not originally built for them, and at this point the feminist standpoint theory becomes a significant guide.

## **2.2 Gender inequality in academia**

When one looks at the numbers presented in the introduction part, one can claim that the inequality problem in Turkey does not seem to be directly related to quantity problem, i.e. the proportion of female academics. Peterson (2011), for example, suggests that achieving quantitative equality is not enough to achieve qualitative gender equality although the former is a significant prerequisite for the later while underlining the importance of gender-mix policy in breaking male domination. A similar conclusion was also reached by Monroe and Chiu (2010). According to these authors, the discrepancies between the number of female assistant professors and full professors, and the discrepancies between the number of men and women both signal an issue in advancement rather than absence of qualified workforce. Women continue to work at lower levels of academic careers and earn less than men. Therefore, the authors highlight the fact that increasing the number of qualified women in academia is not enough on its own to fight gender inequality, and they underline the importance of other more systematic and focused policies to this end. This study presented by

Monroe and Chiu (2010) is quite important for the departure point of the present study in that it shows us that although the number of qualified women increases in the U.S. academia, gender inequalities in pay, title and position do not automatically disappear and they call for more systematic approaches to understand inequality which signals an issue in women's career advancement in academia. Therefore, gender equality should not only be about quantitative equality but also about qualitative equality.

To this end, it becomes essential to define gender inequality in academia. Acker (2006) defines inequality in organizations as systematic differences among institutional participations in control over institutional goals and results, decision-making processes, in the chances of career advancements, positions and pay, in pleasures that result from work, and in being free from harassment. Acker's definition of inequality makes it clear that why only quantitative equality cannot solve the inequality problems in organizations. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, Acker's definition of inequality in organizations will be used.

### **2.2.1 Gender inequality in academic hiring and promotion**

Gender inequalities can be seen in the practices of hiring and promotion, therefore these processes need to be evaluated carefully. In academic hiring and promotion, many gendered practices which include double standards, male and female stereotypes in academia, and the presence of male networks and which have their reflections in the academic recruitment processes are masked by the ideology of meritocracy (van den Brink, Benschop & Jansen, 2010). Although the interviewees in van den Brink, Benschop and Jansen's (2010) study thought that transparency and gender equality is not in harmony with the goal of choosing and hiring on account of merits, the main problem here is that meritocracy and success criteria are set according to the standards of male ideal worker, which is also underlined by van den Brink, Benschop and Jansen calling for a transformation in the male standards of quality. Although this meritocracy approach makes underlying gendered processes invisible and

legitimizes the choices, gender inequality becomes obvious when the gendered nature of success standards is revealed.

Meritocracy as a selection and promotion criterion was also criticized by van den Brink and Benschop (2011). In their study they concentrated on the hiring and selection processes of full professors by using empirical data from the Netherlands. The results showed that there was a focus on lengthy publication track records when compared to teaching and management regarding the professional qualifications of a full professor. The authors argue that although women had less time to conduct research and had non-linear career paths, these were not considered in the decisions to call the candidates for an interview. Secondly, what disadvantaged women here was that excellence was attributed to men, and modesty was attributed to women. Thirdly, men were encouraged more to apply, recommended more and nominated more for positions. The connection between gender and excellence brought higher criterion for women, making them have to “have it all”. At this point, gender-blindness of meritocracy to make gendered approaches invisible and legitimate was criticized.

Although meritocracy and more formal transparent selection cannot simply solve the gender inequality problem in academic hiring and promotion, subjective and informal measures make the situation worse. Cleveland, Stockdale and Murphy (2000) define two types of selection criteria. The first criteria to make hiring and promotion decisions is comparatively objective criteria which include test scores, credentials and seniority. The second one is more subjective criteria in that interviewer's impression, a manager's recommendations about the person to be hired are used to make the hiring or promotion decision. Cleveland, Stockdale and Murphy argue that hiring and promotion decisions which are based on comparatively subjective criteria are usually more open to criticisms regarding gender discrimination. A similar argument was also put forward by Carvalho and Santiago (2010). They tested the hypothesis that it is harder for women to be recruited when the recruitment process consisted of informal procedures. The results of their study showed that recruitment

and selection were gendered by their nature and they were not gender-neutral processes, and informal recruitment processes make it more difficult for women to be recruited as they make the process more closed and gender biased.

In addition to these meritocracy and transparency discussions, evaluator gender is another point of discussion about gendered hiring and promotion in academia. For example, a discriminatory pattern was found male elite faculty's employment patterns by Sheltzer and Smith (2014). These researchers explored women's underrepresentation in biology by collecting data about the formation of biology laboratories in outstanding academic institutions by using data from publicly accessible sources in the United Kingdom. The findings displayed that the number of female graduate students employed by male academics were fewer than the number of female graduate students employed by female academics. In addition, the elite male faculty whose studies were funded, who got academic awards, and who were selected to the National Academy of Sciences were also found to educate fewer number of female students when compared to male academics. However, a gender discrimination pattern was not found in the employment patterns of elite female academics. Still, the laboratories in which assistant professors were trained had a large number of male postdocs. The authors argue that exclusion of women from highly prestigious laboratories prevent them from accessing resources and networking opportunities, being visible. All of these later accumulate to hinder women's professional development (Sheltzer & Smith, 2014).

Another study about the evaluator gender was conducted by Bosak and Sczesny (2011). They studied the possible effects of leader-role information, type of selection and evaluator gender on gender discrimination in a hiring simulation context. Leader-role information was provided through an online application in which the imaginary applicant was put either as a leader or non-leader. The non-leader description is about the absence of leader information. The selection had two types which involved the short list, and the hiring condition. The findings showed that participants revealed a greater certainty to select the applicants described as leaders compared to the applicants described as non-leaders. As to the type of the selection, participants



showed more certainty to select the applicant in the short list condition when compared to the hiring condition. As to the evaluator gender, the female participants displayed a similar level of certainty to recruit male applicants for the leadership role when they were described as leaders. For the non-leader group, female evaluator's certainty levels were also similar for male and female participants in both contexts. On the other hand, evaluator gender created some differences for male and female non-leaders when the evaluator gender was male. When the applicant was described as non-leader, male applicants and female applicants were shortlisted by male evaluators with the similar degree of certainty. However, in the hiring context, they hired male non-leader applicants with a higher degree of certainty when compared to female non-leaders. This research showed that gender discrimination in hiring can occur in the later stages of the process when the decision to hire was made. The authors argue that this situation can lead to the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions.

As can be seen in these two examples, women's career opportunities are limited by these gendered processes. As one solution to this problem, a blind review was suggested by Jones and Urban (2013). They tried a blind review of applicants while they were looking for an assistant professor for the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Department at the University of Connecticut. In their article, they shared their gain from this experience. They removed all references to gender and race in the applications before the review although it was quite hard to detect all gender and race markers. Their experience showed that in the initial phase the committee members could guess the gender of the applicant by 42%; and after the exclusion of reduction errors this percentage was 67. Also, three of the four committee members could not guess the gender of the applicant significantly better than random chance. These results, according to the authors show that even when the redaction errors were there, nearly 60% of the participants were evaluated blindly. They argue that gender biases lower the value of the work done by women, so it is necessary to formulate guidelines for gender-blind recruitment processes at universities. They think that although gender-blind reviews are not the only cures for gender inequality, the

process makes them more aware of the gender biases that they have already had. However, one point that needs further discussion here is the limited advantages of blind reviews if success continues to be defined in male standards. Therefore, as also mentioned by Jones and Urban (2013), gender blind review cannot be only cure to gender inequality problem in hiring and promotion and will remain as a superficial solution unless underlying systemic inequalities are solved.

To sum up this part briefly, it can be concluded that the concepts like meritocracy, blind-reviews, transparent evaluations may not always help to prevent gendered hiring and promotion processes. The reason for this is that men and women are subject to the same meritocracy criteria although they do not experience the whole career journey in the same way. Female life experiences are different from male life experiences but success continue to be defined through male norms. In this way, these male norms of meritocracy continue to favor male success and existing structures of gendered hiring and promotion processes are perpetuated. Therefore, ideal worker needs to be defined and reconstructed again in a way to open a space for women in this definition. It is in this way that we can enjoy the promising impacts of a gender-balanced group in academia as mentioned by van den Brink, Benschop and Jansen (2010).

### **2.2.2 Work-life balance in academia**

Problematizing the heteronormative division of labour both in the family and in the labour market is unavoidable to understand work-life balance better. Before moving into the analysis, “work” needs to be defined in work-life balance. Traditionally, work has been defined as something people do to earn money in public sphere separate from domestic and social lives, and its exchange value connotated with production of various sorts of services. In this tradition, work has been standing as a representative of masculine domain while home and family has taken part in the construction of femininity (Pringle, 1992). However, Pringle (1992) also adds that this sharp distinction between work and home has gone through various changes so

far. At present, it is clear that home and work are not mutually exclusive terms for women. The author claims that rather than providing a break from work, home is just another “workplace” for women.

Therefore, although it is significant to recognize women’s both paid and unpaid work as “work”; for the purposes of this study, the definition provided by Cleveland, Stockdale and Murphy (2000) will be used. Accordingly, the terms “work” and “employment” in this thesis covers one’s activities undertaken to earn money. To define work-life balance, on the other hand, Yadav’s (2014) definition is used. In accordance with this definition, work life balance covers workplace practices which recognize the necessity of creating a balance between family (life) and work on the part of employees. Work-life conflict, on the other hand, refers to the cases where this balance is not achieved.

The doubled work day is a reality shown by different studies in the lives of academic women. O’Laughlin and Bischoff (2005) examined the effects of gender and tenure on being a parent and having an academic career. While the results of the study did not show any differences between groups regarding tenure, or the interaction between gender and tenure; it revealed differences regarding gender. In fulfilling the parenting needs of children, women in this study disclosed less partner support in comparison to men. Women reported spending more time for house and child-care related tasks when compared to their partners. In addition, women academics were found to receive less institutional support to create balanced parenthood and academic careers.

Women’s ambitions may be negatively affected if work-life balance is lost. Baker (2010) combined the results of qualitative research from New Zealand and from overseas to reveal gendered choices and limitations regarding academic careers. The results of the study uncovered that long-established academic gender gap is reflection of how work and family responsibilities are perceived as well as being reflection of institutional expectations which value ambition, long working hours and high number of publications and being productive in all stages of academic career. However,

women are more likely to take responsibility of housework and childcare, which sets limitations to their time and energy which are necessary for professional careers. The author argues that this situation shapes women's ambitions, productivity and rank at retirement. In the study, women tend to diminish their ambitions, work part-time to fit housework and childcare into professional life, take some time off, take care responsibilities related to other relatives, move with their partners due to the partner's job, and admit guilt as they think they cannot spend enough time with their families. Another study regarding women's ambitions and upcoming career plans was conducted by Crabb and Ekberg (2014). They studied the impacts of gender on the upcoming career plans of Australian postgraduate research students. The data come from a questionnaire with the participation of 249 students. Women were found to see an academic career less interesting when compared to men. The authors claim that this can be because of the conflict between motherhood responsibilities and an academic career. According to the authors, enhancing opportunities for women to help them get the senior positions in the academia would both ameliorate the situation of academic women and it would change the perceptions of undergraduate students as to their career plans. Similarly, Polkowska (2014) aimed to find out female scientists' work life balance strategies in Poland and revealed that academic women have re-adjusted their career goals by lowering their ambitions to enjoy small things. Women in this study claimed that ignoring both family and research did not give them full satisfaction though they could sometimes unite both. However, these women highlighted that they learnt to acknowledge this situation and they developed the strategy of small steps which recognizes the importance of both publishing an article and witnessing the youngest child's first cycling. This lowered ambitions to enjoy small things can be argued to be as a result of being part of a structure that was organized according to male norms, with an ideal who did not have any responsibilities other than work (Acker, 2011). This ideal does not represent female lives (Bradley, 1994) although the expectations from women are shaped according to this ideal in the workplace. The cost of aiming to fit in this gendered workplace can sometimes be lowering ambitions to reconcile work and life as suggested in the study by Polkowska (2014). Therefore, in fact the aim of lowering ambitions and

enjoying small steps here is to alleviate the negative impacts of a doubled work-day on women's lives and careers.

Facing these challenges, women develop some strategies to balance work and life. Woodward (2007) studied work-life balancing strategies of women managers at British modern universities. In their daily commute, most tried to arrive at work early to avoid traffic congestion and having some silent time to work before other people arrive at work. As to trips away for regional, national or international conferences, one day event required careful planning on the part of the women if they had a dependent child, and overnight events was even out of the question unless their partners agreed to compensate for their absence. Female managers without dependent children had more flexibility to add some leisurely elements to their trips, but still there were reflections of gender issues in this flexibility, arousing fear about the personal security in the public place. As to recreation and well-being, leisure time activities took several shapes including other family members and alone activities. In addition, both temporal and spatial boundaries were used to put work and non-work in different places, but these boundaries were shifted when necessary to favour work. Women managers without dependent children tended to reset boundaries in the cases where arrangements were necessary to favour work.

In addition to these studies which obviously reveal the adverse effects of heteronormative division of labor, we need more studies to understand other social and structural issues that cause inequalities. Morley (2013) argued that although gendering of caregiving responsibilities is one explanation for women's absence in academic leadership positions, it does not fulfil the need for a better explanation on the grounds that women without children or women who are not married also do not compensate for the absence of women with caregiving responsibilities. While strengthening the conventional binary systems of gender roles, they also do not consider the social and cultural capital differences such as class, age, sexuality and disability among women. When the focus is on this explanation, it can mask the structural inequalities in the workplace (Morley, 2013). Therefore, we need to be

Careful while using heteronormative division of labor and caregiving responsibilities as an explanation for workplace inequality. In other words, although heteronormative division of labor can be one explanation for the absence of women with caregiving responsibilities in academic management, it is not enough to explain absence of women who do not have any caregiving responsibilities. This means that together with the heteronormative division of labor, there are also other sources of gender inequality in this context. As also found by this study, these other sources include but not limited to strong and close male networks, double standards in hiring and promotion, the definition of success considering the male norms. As a consequence, the investigation of these other sources inequality which keep women including single ones and ones without care-giving responsibilities away from better career opportunities is necessary and to this end, the next section continues with gender based mobbing and sexual harassment in academia.

### **2.3.3 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment in academia**

As mentioned earlier, one of the issues that help to perpetuate existing gender and power relations in academia is psychological terror which will be used interchangeably with bullying and mobbing for the purposes of this study and sexual harassment. To start with, psychological terror or mobbing is defined as a systematic unfriendly and immoral way of communication by one or more individuals toward one individual who is forced into a helpless position and being kept in this position as a result of continuous mobbing acts (Leymann, 1996). According to this definition, Leymann adds that these mobbing acts occur frequently, in other words, at least once a week; and over a certain a period of time, in other words, at least for six months. As the duration is quite long and the frequency is quite a lot, these acts result in significant psychological, psychosomatic and social agony. In this definition, temporary conflicts of the workplace are excluded. Leymann says that rather than physical acts of terror, mobbing involves more complex behaviours which may involve social isolation of the victim. Salin (2003) adds that what is mostly highlighted in the definitions of bullying in the workplace is the issue of power, in

other words, power differences. According to this view, what Salin argues is that gender differences in workplace bullying can be better comprehended through the disclosure of the complex interaction between gender, power and victimization.

Therefore, there are many different levels that need to be considered in the study of bullying, which include organizational, social and personal levels. Salin suggests that a closer examination of bullying reveals complex patterns as to gender and the position of the victims and bullier. With these purposes, Salin investigated gender differences in bullying in a business world which is dominated by men and aimed to reveal the connections among gender, bullying and victimization. To study these complex patterns, Salin used both qualitative and quantitative data from the randomly selected members of The Finnish Association of Graduates in Economics and Business Administration, which is a national organization for employees who have a degree in business. In the study, bullying was defined as the perpetual adverse acts against one or some individuals in the workplace, which turns the workplace into a hostile environment. According to this definition, the person who is targeted in this case has issues in self-defense, and as a result, the act of bullying is not a struggle between individuals of equal power. The findings of the study showed that women reported cases of bullying and sexual harassment significantly more when compared to men. While women were bullied by both superiors and individuals of the same hierarchal level and subordinates, men did not report being bullied by subordinates. Similar findings were also found academia (Howe-Walsh & Turnbull, 2014). Howe-Walsh and Turnbull investigated the reasons for absence of women in academic management positions in science and technology fields in the UK. They found that bullying was one the reasons. Women who participated in the study claimed that they were exposed to bullying behaviors by their male colleagues and they provided examples regarding their experiences. They also stated that these behaviors had an influence on their self-confidence. The authors argued that this had adverse impacts on women's duration of work in the institution and their rise to management positions. It was also mentioned that in such situations women's main concern was surviving in the daily requirements of the work day. Therefore, in these studies it is

clear that workplace bullying, gender-based mobbing in our case, has serious impacts on women's career opportunities in academia.

For the purposes of this study, mobbing will be named as "gender-based mobbing". In an ILO report, while defining gender-based violence, Cruz and Klinger (2011) stated that the term gender-based is used to highlight that violence against women was an incident related to not only the gender of the victim but also the gender of the perpetrator. Therefore, the same rule was applied for the selection of the term gender-based mobbing in this study. Considering the gender of the victim and the perpetrator, Sert and Akkoyunlu Wigley (2012) aimed to answer why women are the natural victims of mobbing and stated that the reason is how women are perceived in society. They said that gender-based behavior expectations continue in the workplace, women's failure to stop mobbing by using violence (luckily) and men's efforts to preserve their male identities and male power in the workplace are one factor that increases mobbing. Similarly, Çögenli, Asunakutlu, and Türegün (2017) argued that gender is a significant factor in mobbing. Referring to the patriarchal societies, they claimed that it is hard for women to occupy a space in the work life. They added that trivializing the work women do, not finding them worth of considering are the ways that give start to the mobbing behaviors. Therefore, gender-based mobbing here refers both the gender of mobbing victim and mobbing perpetrator. As can be seen in the studies presented previously in this part, gender-based expectations have a role in mobbing behavior.

As to sexual harassment, it is defined as any intentional or persistent acts including sex-related, unfriendly, abusive and humiliating behaviors which are not wanted by the recipient (Fitzgerald, 1993). According to Fitzgerald, sexual harassment is not always physically violent, but it is reflection of forceful, intimidating, unwanted sexual attention from which there is not usually a practical flee. Fitzgerald argues that men usually have more limited definitions of sexual harassment and being harassed when compared to women. Hoffman (1986) also agrees with this idea and adds that sexual harassment of men and women is not really the same thing in that the sexual



harassment of women is more systematically produced in the workplace through definitions of male and female sexuality which are socially constructed, gender stratification and hierarchal distribution of power and authority. According to Hoffman, this is achieved through decision making and control mechanisms which are in bureaucratic forms. These bureaucratic forms strengthen gender status differences between men and women, and sexual harassment is not the unpredictable result of these systems, but it also serves to strengthen their functioning, and female access to resources, strength and authority is restricted by gender stratification. (Hoffman, 1986). One example of this can be found in the study by McLaughlin, Uggen and Blackstone (2012). They investigated how supervisor authority, nonconformity to gender, and sex ratios in the workplace affect sexual harassment by using qualitative data from the Youth Development Study. The findings of the study revealed that occupying a supervisor position caused women to be exposed to sexual harassment in a male-dominated industry. Women reported being despised for being a woman in this position; and also, they thought they were the targets of sexual harassment because they were the only women there. The results of the study highlighted that the sexual harassment experiences of women were more complex than the classical sexual harassment scenario of a male boss and female subordinate. The authors argue that the same power relations which exclude women from managerial positions continue to function after women get this supervisor authority. This research also revealed that female supervisors were more susceptible to sexual harassment in male dominated industries when compared to the female dominated industries. While this study exemplifies the fact that the same power relations continue to affect women's careers even after they get better positions, another important issue implied by this study is the importance of quantitative equality which was discussed at the very beginning of this chapter. Looking at the last argument that women are more susceptible to sexual harassment in male dominated industries, we can conclude that although quantitative equality is not the only solution to gender inequality, it is still dramatically important for women.

As to the consequences of sexual harassment, it has negative impacts on women's psychological well-being and work relations. Jagsi et al. (2016) studied sexual harassment and gender discrimination in the lives of academic medical faculty. To this end, they did a postal survey of individuals who had got career development awards from the National Institutes of Health from 2006 to 2009 after getting an informed consent from University of Michigan. The study revealed that women were more likely to report sexual harassment, among these women, 40% reported experiences of more severe forms, 59% reported an adverse effect on self-confidence, and 47% reported that these experiences affected their career advancement badly.

All in all, higher education institutions are bureaucratic structures where power and authority stem from the managerial elite. The decision-making processes are rationalized, and the workplace communication is depersonalized, which helps to reinforce centralized control (Hoffman, 1986). Therefore, Hoffman puts that women should confront these structures and the assumptions of power and privilege which put them in a disadvantaged position on the grounds that formalized stratification, centralized control places the power in the hands of a few and deteriorate the working conditions and environment for many. For prevention of sexual harassment and the necessary social change, Fitzgerald (1993) suggests that women should move to the jobs which are traditionally male-dominated as well as top management positions, gender discrimination practices in hiring and training should be removed, and pro-family and pro-woman policies should be introduced.

What all these things reveal is that being free from harassment in workplace is directly related to gender, power relations and gender status differences, which plays a role in the perpetuation of gender inequality in organizations being both the cause and result of this cycle. They are systematic because they are produced through gendered hierarchies just like other dimensions of gender inequality which has been discussed so far.

### **2.3 Gender inequality in academia in Turkey**

The welfare state in Turkey has focused on the roles of women as mothers and wives as their main roles in society up to now (Dedeoğlu, 2012). According to Dedeoğlu, this situation has some consequences for the participation of women in the workforce and for the structural inequalities that have occurred between men and women in the society. Dedeoğlu finds inequality policies insufficient unless they are supported by other policies which aim to challenge current patriarchal norms and roles in the society. She claims that gender inequality is still a concern in Turkey, and despite some political reforms to ameliorate the inequality concerns, the female labour force participation in Turkey is the lowest among the OECD countries, constituting a quarter of the labour force. Dedeoğlu claims that female labour force participation in Turkey can be improved to an important degree if the burden of domestic care work is diminished especially through childcare facilities. She further criticizes absence of support policies to reconcile work and family life for working women and absence of positive discrimination and quota policies to increase the number of women in the labour force. All these things that are about the conditions of working women have also their consequences for the women in academia. To present a better illustration of the gender roles shaping academic women's lives, I find it necessary to give a brief historical background about the issue.

Women's participation in Turkish universities as both students and faculty members does not have a long history. Therefore, it is important to have a historical insight into the issue to have an understanding of how women gained their right to university education. Such an analysis also helps to understand the historical background leading to current gender-related inequalities in Turkish academia. For the purposes of this paper, the late Ottoman period will be taken as the starting point for such an analysis.

Firstly, having conventionalism as one of the main characteristics of its regime, Ottoman Empire was traditional in its approach to women. However, Tanzimat

Period, which started in 1983 with The Imperial Edict of Reorganization, is seen as a milestone in turning from inequality to equality in that we came across various pieces of writing on gender equality for the first time (Alkan, 1990). Kurnaz (1991) states that women started to receive formal cultural and vocational training in this period. As a continuation of Ottoman junior high schools which were called as “Rüştiye”, foundation of “Teacher Training School for Girls” provided women with a new occupational arena. Çakır (2013) acknowledges that this teacher training school was the only educational institution for women to go after the completion of high school as universities were only for men, and women did not have the right to higher education at that time.

After these first steps which took women to formal education, Zihnioğlu (2013) claims that Ottoman-Turkish women started to raise their voice with a demand for freedom. One of these freedom demands was women’s participation in education. Çakır (2013) states that Ottoman-Turkish women’s such demands can clearly be seen in the journals of the time. In Kadınlar Dünyası, which was published from 1913 to 1921, women’s right to education was also handled as a problem in its all respects. Ensuring the participation of women from all segments of the society, women started a struggle for women’s right to higher education. Soon enough they obtained some results of their struggle, and at the beginning of 1914 conferences for women were organized at Darülfünun, and a girl’s university, İnas Darülfünunu, was opened at the end of 1914 (Çakır, 2013).

This period when women gained access to higher education was named as Young Turk Period (1908-1918). Toprak (1991) states that women’s participation in education was also supported by the nationalist establishment of the time on the grounds that Turkish nationalist ideology regarded the emancipation of women as one of the most important prerequisites of a larger social revolution (içtimai inkılap) which was brought to the agenda following the 1908 (Young Turk) political revolution. As a result, women and family in particular became the main items of concern during this period.

According to Berktaş (2001), search for women's participation in public sphere was one important common point for Turkish nationalism and Ottoman feminism. However, a closer look at the demands of both groups reveals different intentions regarding women's education. Berktaş adds that women were both encouraged to participate in the public sphere and also restricted by the state in this freedom due to fear of an uncontrolled emancipation. This fear continued even after the foundation of Turkish Republic. White (2003) maintained that the definition of modernity owned by Turkish state regarded marriage and children as a woman's national responsibility. Therefore, the ideal Turkish woman of the period was an urban citizen, a social reformist and devoted to her home at the same time. This type of feminism which was adopted by the state assigned great importance to women's freedom in the public sphere, but it did not show much concern about women's private lives. On the part of the reformers, Westernizing aspect of modernization was something to fear on the grounds that women's increasing individualism in society could cause rejection of familial duties, which would cause moral collapse of the society. Nonetheless, being good mothers and wives was not the only aim for women who wanted to claim their right to education indeed. Demirdirek (1998) claims that women also asked for their right to education to show their presence and confront men for equality. What they intuitively know was that women could gain the self-confidence that they had not been able to have until that time.

Together with women's late entrance to higher education, this differentiation between the approaches to women's education from women's and the state's perspectives reflects gendered division of labor in Turkish academia even today. However, although the state wanted to educate women for them to be firstly good wives and mothers, women soon started to follow careers in academia, and in this period both the number of female faculty members and the number of female university students showed a stable rise (Abadan-Unat, 1991). To illustrate, Abadan-Unat (1991) emphasizes that in 1932, which was a time of reorganization of universities in Turkey, the country had only one female faculty member. She adds that 50 years later after this reorganization, there were 77 universities in Turkey, and they employed

approximately 6000 female faculty members. When the World Bank Data (2019) showing the percentage of female faculty members in Turkey are analyzed, it is possible to see that this percentage was 22,73 in 1971; 24,6 in 1981; 31,7 in 1991, and 42,78 in 2014. However, despite these high percentages gender equality in academia has not been fully achieved. The detailed analysis of the table below demonstrates a dramatical loss of female academics in the academic journey which starts in the research assistant position and ends in professorship. While the numbers of female and male academics in the lowest stages of the hierarchy are quite close to each other, starting from assistant professor position, the numerical gender gap starts to open, and when the numbers of male and female professors are examined, it is seen that the number of women is less than the half of the number of male academics in this position. Therefore, looking at this table, it can be concluded that male and female academics do not experience the academic career journey in the same way in Turkey. The academic life is organized around male norms which ignore any kind of domestic work and care-work responsibilities, and this type of an organization seem to favor men in their career journey according to the Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1

*The Numbers of Male and Female Academics in Turkey*

Academic Title	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Professor	18139 (68,4%)	8386 (31,6%)	26525
Associate Professor	9351 (60,5%)	6101 (39,5%)	15452
Assistant Professor	22406 (56,6%)	17168 (43,4%)	39574
Lecturer	18231(49,8%)	18344 (50,2%)	36575
Research Assistant	23882 (49,3%)	24584 (50,7%)	48466
Total	92009 (55,2%)	74583 (44,8 %)	166592

Note: Summary Table for Numbers of Academics. Retrieved from <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr> on May 6, 2019.

Related to gender inequality in academia in Turkey, the most common theme that has been discussed is the heteronormative division of labour as both presented by

Dedeoğlu (2012) and the historical background presented in previous paragraphs and these play a negative role in the careers of academic women for several reasons. Gönenç et al. (2013) conducted a quantitative study to investigate the relationship between traditional gender roles and academic careers at Hacettepe University. Socially constructed gender roles were found to be active in the lives of academic women, and resulted in the unfair distribution of work in the private sphere. Women were responsible for daily home-related tasks such as cooking and cleaning in addition to the child-care. Related to home, men undertook weekly or monthly tasks such as shopping and paying the bills. Therefore, women had more problems related to work life balance and negotiating their personal and professional responsibilities. According to the authors, all the reasons mentioned above caused women to advance slower in their academic careers when compared to men, and caused women to put a lot more effort to obtain a commensurate level of success with men (Gönenç et al., 2013). What is more about this role conflict is that women also felt that they need to make a choice between their careers and family as well as making self-sacrifices, and they felt tense due to the conflicting roles at work and at home (Bakioğlu and Ülker, 2018). Work-life conflict was found to be one of the areas that best deciphered gender discrimination in academic life (Poyraz, 2013).

This type of division of labor assigning care-giving responsibilities to women also cause some breaks in academic women's careers. While women gave breaks in their careers more than three months due to pregnancy and child-care, men gave breaks in order to travel abroad and progress in their careers (Gönenç et al., 2013). A similar argument was also put forward by Bakioğlu and Ülker (2018). According to their findings, a career break, mostly came after giving birth to a child. The problems that women mentioned after a career break were the income loss, extending retirement age, foreign language attrition as it was not used, and adaptation problems when they were back to work. Some participants in their study also stated that they would like to be born as men since they did not have to career breaks (Bakioğlu and Ülker, 2018). Other difficulties related to career breaks included not being able to work in projects; therefore, pregnancy was found to hinder women's access to equal opportunities

when compared to their male colleagues (Demir, 2018). It can be concluded that due to heteronormative division of labour, women in academia in Turkey have to take more careers breaks when compared to their male colleagues.

As can be seen in the literature presented above, the role conflict caused by the work-life conflict put women in a situation where they need to make a choice between their careers and family, or cause them to give breaks in their careers. What should be questioned in these choices is if they are real choices or not. As mentioned by Sandberg (2013), individuals' own choices are not as personal as they seem, and they are usually shaped by social and familial expectations. These expectations sometimes can ruin individuals' preferences and aspirations for their own lives. Therefore, one needs to be careful while using "choice" in this context as this choice does not have to be a personal preference. The persistence of choice explanation has two adverse impacts on gender equality. The first one is that it masks the need for change, and secondly it removes the necessity for social and structural level changes to this end. To exemplify, the claim that women choose to give breaks in their careers de-problematizes the work-life conflict women experience as it sees these breaks as women's personal choices. However, knowing that both social and structural factors affect these personal choices creates a need for a social and structural transformation. Therefore, choice in this context need to be approached cautiously.

In the related literature another impact of heteronormative division of labour on women's careers in academia in Turkey was absence in academic management positions. Poyraz (2013) highlighted that traditionally women were expected to fulfil their home-related responsibilities firstly, and this was also true for academic women. This requirement made their participation in academic management positions more difficult (Poyraz, 2013). Demir (2018) supported this view and claimed that the equality of opportunities and participation in academic and scientific management are the issues that make the lives of academic women more difficult. The author claims that very few women participate in academic management and these women prefer to stay away from these positions and the number of women academics



concentrates around the assistant professor position. Due to child care responsibilities women experience delays in their career advancements (Demir, 2018). Karakuş (2016) also concentrated on the reasons for women's late slow development and women's non-permanent status in the academia rather than women's entrance problems to academia. The reason for this was the numbers that show the presence of women in the lower status or entrance positions of academic life and the numbers that show their underrepresentation in the upper level academic positions. Demir (2018) concludes that the patriarchal culture and male-dominated structures are supported by women's absence/avoidance in academic management in higher education institutions in Turkey.

Another issue discussed together with division of labor was the absence of support for women. Bakioğlu and Ülker (2018) studied the obstacles female academics face in their career advancement in public universities in Turkey. The majority of the participants claimed that they did not receive enough support from their institutions although a smaller group appreciated this type of support. As to the family support, most women with children claimed that the familial support they got from their partners was lessened when they gave birth to their babies; and in this way, there was an increase in the home-related responsibilities of academic women. The participants who shared home-related tasks with their partners saw themselves luckier, but not being inhibited by a partner was also regarded as a form of support.

The heteronormative division of labour also hindered women's academic mobility. Karakuş (2016) claimed that the results of her study show that female academics have to arrange their academic mobility depending on their family lives and that this family-bound academic mobility weakens academic networking opportunities and creates a weaker academic capital for women. Demir (2018), on the other hand, revealed the interaction of motherhood, age and gender in the study whose results show that motherhood was not seen as an obstacle by women who are young and in the initial stages of their academic careers, but for those who were in their later ages,

motherhood was found to be an obstacle for academic mobility as a claim that they could not participate in academic meetings abroad or out of the city for a long time. However, for the male academic the things worked differently and Poyraz (2013) found that the majority of those who claimed that they attend academic international conferences and did not have any problems in academic mobility by the help and cooperation of their partners were men.

Karakuş (2016) highlighted the relationship between gender stereotypes and women's absence in academic management positions. This study revealed that women are unwilling to lead at universities even when the situations that create this unwillingness are removed. Apart from the role conflict between the home-related roles and work-related roles, the worry about showing one's self, the common belief that having a female manager is not a good idea, and the idea that women reflect their emotions in the jobs they do were among the reasons that kept women away from these positions. Men also did not want to see women among themselves considering that they could work better among themselves. Likewise, Altınoluk (2017) aimed to understand if there are any transformations in masculinity discourses of male academics -who have gone through a socialization process with male social norms- after they enter a more egalitarian workplace which is "academia". To this end, Altınoluk conducted 11 semi-structured interviews with male academics. The findings of the study showed that male academic produced the sexist discourses in their speeches even when they claimed that they did not do so thanks to their status and high education level. It was clear in the study that male academics consciously or unconsciously produced sexism through speech. Male academics also claimed directly or meant indirectly that they wanted to see male managers in the workplace. The characteristics of the manager they mentioned matched with the characteristics that were attributed to male gender. Moreover, it was clear that when a female manager was unsuccessful, the reason for this failure was the gender of the female manager. In daily conversations, also, there were masculinity discourses among male faculty members, which were not mentioned in the presence of female academics. Altınoluk (2017) concludes that male academics who have an attainment of high-

level education are not exempted from the reproduction of patriarchal values and the reconstruction of masculinities. Therefore, it is possible to claim that gender stereotypes continue to shape gendered academia in Turkey today.

As to gender inequality in academia and being free from harassment, Softa et al. (2016) conducted a study to investigate mobbing experiences of academic staff on certain variables, one of which is gender. The results showed that women's mobbing scores were higher than male academic staff. Similarly, Çögenli and Barlı (2013) conducted research to investigate if the academic staff at Atatürk University (Turkey) is exposed to mobbing behavior, and found that female academic personnel are more subjected to mobbing behavior more than the male. About mobbing in Turkey, Sert and Akkoyunlu Wigley (2015) claimed that mobbing has become a serious problem in academia in Turkey and when it is not stopped, it causes exhaustion, anxiety disorders, low self-confidence in the lives of the victims and these devastating effects were especially seen on women. Therefore, these studies clearly show that gender inequalities in academia have also consequences for female academics' right to be work in an environment which is free from any kind of harassment.

The literature presented so far reveals that academia in general is a gendered institution despite the common perception that the concept of work and workplaces are gender-neutral. This common perception only serves to mask the gender inequalities by forcing women to fit into a structure which is not organized around their needs and life styles and by leaving them behind if they cannot manage to fit properly into such a structure. Therefore, listening to and learning more about women's stories give the researchers and policy makers access to various perspectives which are not readily available to others on the grounds that it is women who have to face gendered challenges in their daily lives and at work. Keeping all these in mind, therefore, this study utilizes the feminist standpoint theory which is obviously political and social epistemology (Wylie, 2003) allowing our feminist investigation to use women's experiences as a starting point.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This study was conducted to explore the gendered aspects of career progression for academics who work at universities in Turkey. This study also aimed to present a deeper understanding of academics' perceptions of success, productivity, female leadership; and the challenges they face in these areas, and their coping strategies. To this end, this study aims to understand, if there are differences in male and female academics' conceptualizations of academic success, academic productivity; their perceptions of academic success criteria as imposed by their institutions and the Council of Higher Education; their perceptions and experiences of academic mobility, their perceptions of absence of women in the academic leadership positions. In addition to the objectives mentioned above, this study also aims to suggest policy-related changes to facilitate the lives of academics on the social, institutional and structural levels through participants' own thoughts and perceptions. To conclude, this study aims to understand the personal, social, institutional and structural challenges academics face in their career progression at universities in Turkey, their coping strategies with these challenges to increase their success and productivity, and also aims to make some policy recommendations in line with the challenges experienced by academics through their academic careers at universities in Turkey.

#### **3.1 Design and Methods**

The starting point of this research is the researcher's own experience in academia. Setting the departure point as her own experience is a method to explore the society, rendering the researcher a locus that fully belongs to her (Smith, 1972). Therefore,

taking into consideration Smith's (1972) arguments, the researcher in this study starts from her own experience to explore the society and aims to listen to "native speakers" of female experiences, female academics in our case, in an academic world which was designed previously and primarily for men, and to hear their stories without imposing the concepts and terms of male world on them. Hartsock (1983) continues that the vision of the oppressed group must be strived to be obtained, and this vision is important firstly because it helps to see what is invisible behind the visible social relations, and secondly it necessitates the education which can only stem from endeavor to challenge these relations. The understanding of the oppressed group with an interested vision and a standpoint will have an historically liberatory role in the lives of the oppressed. As a consequence, the previously mentioned well-intentions to challenge existing power relations becomes impossible without access to the vision available to members of the oppressed group. For the ones who take the benefits of inequality, gender inequalities are not usually visible while the ones who are in a disadvantaged position can more clearly see these inequalities (Acker, 2011). In these explanations, the relations between knowledge, power and politics become obvious. Without access to the knowledge which will be presented by the oppressed, it becomes useless to struggle for liberation. That is why, hearing women's voices and learning more about their experiences and stories are critical in the design of this study.

The investigation of gendered lives is also necessary for the theoretical framework of the study. As mentioned earlier, feminist standpoint theory assumes multiple realities and standpoints (Hekman, 1997). How people understand social relations is both shaped and restricted by material life, and this makes knowledge available to both the oppressed and the ruling class "partial and perverse" (Hartsock, 1983). Hartsock adds that the vision to the oppressed group must be strived to be reached, which can make the what is invisible under the social relations visible. However, the vision of the dominant group will also be both "partial and perverse" despite the fact that material relations are expected to be shaped by the vision of each ruling class, gender for our study, and these material relations are imposed on all parties, so the vision of the

ruling class cannot simply be regarded as false. Therefore, it becomes an advantage to add a gender dimension to the design of this study, ask for both male and female experiences and opinions.

When the research questions and the theoretical framework adopted in this study were considered together, qualitative inquiry was the most appropriate design for this study. Patton (2015) mentions seven contributions of qualitative inquiry to the research and evaluation process. Accordingly, firstly, qualitative research allows researchers to work on how meanings are conceptualized. Our research also aims to how male and female academics conceptualize success and productivity and aims to understand the implications of these conceptualizations in their career paths. Secondly, Patton claims that qualitative inquiry is beneficial in understanding the way things work by listening to people's stories about these ways. This contribution is also important for our research because it is necessary to understand how universities work and if these working ways have any different outcomes for different genders. Thirdly, learning about people's perspectives and experiences through their stories is another contribution made by qualitative inquiry, according to Patton. Since our research aims to understand people's experiences, reveal what male and female academics think and how they perceive the way universities work, this third contribution is also of the great significance. Fourthly, qualitative inquiry allows the researcher to elicit how systems work and the consequences of their functioning. There are many systems and policies working simultaneously at universities. To reveal any gendered consequences stemming from these seemingly gender-neutral policies and systems is at the heart of this research. Another contribution made by qualitative inquiry to our research is revealing the contextual factors leading to gender issues at universities and the reasons why they matter, in Patton's words. The last two contributions by qualitative method to our study is, as mentioned by Patton, the discovery of unexpected outcomes and making comparisons between different cases. Both are very important for this research on the grounds that policies and systems also have unexpected consequences in human experience. Most importantly, they may lead to different consequences for male and female academics at universities.

Through these contributions, qualitative inquiry allows us to disclose these consequences and make comparisons of similarities and differences in male and female academics' experiences regarding their career journeys.

The most appropriate method to the aims and design of this study was qualitative interviewing. The explanation for this comes from Legard, Keegan and Ward (2003). They claim that the interviewing method is generative because it allows the interviewee explore the thoughts they have never thought before as well as producing ideas and suggestions related to the problems in hand. Moreover, Legard, Keegan and Ward (2003) also state that interviews allow the researcher to capture the meanings as they are conceptualized by the interviewee. Patton (1990) argues that the purpose of interviewing is to uncover what is in a person's mind and reach the person's perception of the world. Therefore, the data that need to be collected for this study must have had depth and detail. To this end, open-ended in depth loosely structured interviews were designed in this study.

### **3.2 Research Procedures**

After the research design and methods were clarified, the interview questions were written. Gerson and Horowitz (2002) suggest that the success of an interview depends on "prior construction of a theoretically informed and user-friendly interview schedules (questionnaires)" (p.205). According to Gerson and Horowitz, this allows the researcher to clarify what type of information to gather. Therefore, for the interview instrument to be theoretically informed, a literature review and emerging themes in the literature related to the research questions were noted down. Depending on these themes after the clarification of what information to collect, the interview questions were formulated. Gerson and Horowitz also claim that pre-evaluation of this instrument is very important for a successful interview. This evaluation stage was also realized through two pilot interviews with female academics, at the end of which there were some changes and additions to interview questions. These interviews showed that there were a few questions in the instrument which were not clear to the

respondents and did not contribute to what they were supposed to ask, the researcher made some revisions on these questions. In addition, depending on the progression of the interview, several other questions were added after the first two pilot interviews. After these revisions, the researcher accessed to the respondents of the first two pilot studies and re-asked the revised questions and asked the newly-added questions. After these pilot interviews, the last version of the question set for the female academics was ready. To prepare the question set for the male academics, the questions directly related to female experience were deleted. To exemplify, questions that directly ask for female experiences like if their gender makes it more difficult for women to have a successful academic image, if women sometimes have to abandon the characteristics of their gender in order to have a successful and productive image, and how women cope with sexual harassment and mobbing. After these questions were deleted, the question set for male interviewees was ready and one pilot interview was conducted with a male academic. This interview did not lead to any changes in the question set, therefore, both sets of interview questions were ready to conduct the study.

After the preparation of question sets for male and female interviews, the data collection process started. This process started in April 2018 and ended in February 2019. In the data collection process, the study aimed to access academics working in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, as respondents. To determine the interviewees, purposive selection was used to reveal the challenges academics face and their coping strategies. To this end, lecturers and instructors with Ph.D., assistant professors and associate professors with the assumption that professors may have forgotten these challenges and the way they coped with them. After this selection, the contacts with interviewees based on convenience sampling. Ritchie, Lewis and Elam (2003) defined convenience sampling as the sampling process in which researchers select their sample according to the respondents' ease of access. As the researcher is working one of these universities in Ankara, most of the respondents come from this network. Therefore, I firstly contacted the academics in my own network through phone calls and text messages, and arranged a meeting time and place. I reached some



of the interviewees through my first level connections. The communication with these respondents and the arrangement of the meeting time for the interviews were realized sometimes through our mutual contacts, and sometimes through e-mails. As a meeting place, I visited all of the interviewees in their offices at the university except one interviewee. This one interviewee was working at Hacı Bayram Veli University which was separated from Gazi University. It was during this mobilization process that she accepted to give an interview to me and their building was under construction, therefore her office was not available at that time. Therefore, I met her at university and we went to one of the cafeterias around the school. While arranging the time to meet, the main restriction that female academics experienced was the school time of their children. Some of them explained that they had to finish the interview at a certain time because they had to take their children from their schools. Therefore, I find it important to highlight that while arranging the interview times, picking up their children from school was one concern for female academics. After the meeting place and time were set, I visited the offices of the academics at universities. The interviews were recorded, and transcribed; but one male and one female respondent did not want their voices to be recorded so during their interviews note-taking was used to write down what they said as answers to the questions. The interviews lasted about sixty-five minutes on average. For the data collection process, academics from 4 public universities and 1 foundation university were visited.

Ritchie, Lewis and Elam (2003) claim that there is a point in which very little or no new evidence is obtained from the interviewees in the process of interview data analysis, and while determining the sample size, the researcher's intention was to reach this situation where any increase in the sample size does not contribute to the data. Before the start of the data collection process, the number of interviews foreseen was 20, in other words, 10 interviews with male academics and 10 interviews with female academics. When these numbers were reached, it was clear for the researcher that these numbers were enough as there were no more emerging themes and patterns in the data. Therefore, in February 2019 the data collection process was completed.

This data collection process which lasted from April 2018 to February 2019 was a very significant experience in my life and has also left me with several questions that I had never thought before these interviews. I define myself as a young female academic who is in the initial stages of her career, and in this study my task was to conduct interviews with female academics who are in the middle stages of their careers about the challenges they face. At some points what I came across was that these people were experiencing the concerns I hold my future career. Therefore, listening to their personal stories, experiences, and challenges made me question what I would have done if I had been in their shoes. I entered the interviews with a set of questions and left the interviews with another set of questions in my mind.

Secondly, in this data collection process I also realized that I was not alone. When I was a high school student, we were supposed to choose our departments. My family and my teachers told me that becoming a teacher was a really good idea because at the end I was going to be a woman with responsibilities for home and children. At that time, I was only 18, and I did not know anything about gender roles. These roles were so internalized by me that I thought these suggestions were sensible and agreed to study teaching. I was very successful, I ranked 4<sup>th</sup> among 34.945 students at the national university entrance examination and entered Boğaziçi University, the school that turned me into a feminist. In fact probably that is why I am writing this thesis today not in the department which I graduated from but in a Gender and Women's Studies program. Thanks to this study, contacting with academics from different departments and learning more about gender distributions in their departments and faculties, I can understand that -just like what happened in my personal experience- gender roles have shaped and restricted the lives and careers of many people. Nearly after each interview, I said that I was not alone.

Thirdly, in this process I was transformed as a researcher. For example, at times I had to remind myself that I am in the researcher position to protect my neutral position during the interviews. I think I could succeed this although at times I found it quite difficult. I always reminded myself that I did not have to agree with what the

interviewees had said, but I was responsible to create a safe and welcoming environment for them to give utterance to what they really thought.

### **3.3 Key Characteristics of the Respondents**

The target group of this study was academics with at least a Ph.D. degree and academics working at universities in Ankara. Academics who hold professor positions at these universities were excluded because reaching the highest rank in academia, their perceptions of the challenges they have faced in their careers and the coping strategies they utilized until they reach that point may become blurred. This study focused on the challenges of academic journey, and professor title is last achievement in this journey. As to aim is to understand the challenges and difficulties of the journey, including professors was going to lead to the distinction between the interviewees who are currently experiencing difficulties and interviewees who have experienced them previously. The difference between these two is significant as mentioned by Kahneman and Riis (2005). They make a distinction between the self who experiences the event, and the self who remembers the event. According to Kahneman and Riis, the difference between these two selves is important due to the possible errors in remembering events. For example, they give the example of peak/end rule, which underlines that how one feels at end of an experience rather than in the process shapes the evaluation of the events and how they are remembered. Therefore, if professors had been included in the study, they would have been the remembering selves while the interviewees in the lower other academic positions who are working to advance in their careers would have been the experiencing selves. As there reaching the professor title is a happy experience, this end could have produced some bias in how the past challenges and difficulties were evaluated. As a result of all these possible bias in remembering experiences and events, this study aimed to collect data from the experiencing selves. Therefore, the respondents of the study are lecturers and instructors with Ph.D., assistant professors and associate professors who have not reached the highest position of their academic journey yet. Only one research assistant was included in the study, and the reason was that the

respondent was waiting to receive associate professor title soon, and waiting in the doctor research assistant position because assistant professor post was not given to the department by the university and the Council of Higher Education. All in all, the female participants of the study came from three different public universities and one foundation university in Ankara. The male participants of the study, on the other hand, came from two different public universities in Ankara. The table below presents the gender distributions in the universities where the interviewees work.

Table 3.1

*Gender Distribution in the Universities where the Interviewees Work*

Title	METU		HACETTEPE		ANKARA		UFUK	
	M %	F %	M %	F %	M %	F%	M%	F %
Professor	63,5	36,5	47,4	52,6	57,2	42,8	63,2	36,8
Associate Professor	55,3	44,7	42,2	57,8	51,9	48,1	42,9	57,1
Assistant Professor	54,7	45,3	37,8	62,2	46,3	53,7	37,0	63,0
Lecturer	24,8	75,2	37,6	62,4	42,7	57,3	27,3	72,7
Research Assistant	50,7	49,3	39,1	60,9	42,1	57,9	45,1	54,9
Total	47,4	52,6	40,9	59,1	48,3	51,7	44,3	55,7

Note: University-based Numbers of Academics. Retrieved from <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr> on May 6, 2019.

As can be seen Table 3.1, the gender distribution at these universities are not totally in line with overall Turkey percentages. For example, at Hacettepe University, the percentage of female professors is higher than the percentage of male professors. However, when we look at the general trends in the gender distribution at these four universities, we see that the percentage of female academics decline as one goes up to the higher position titles. Also, gendered aspects of disciplines that universities have are supposed determine the percentages of female and male academics. For example, at Middle East Technical University (METU) which is a technical university with the dominance of engineering and science departments, there is a dramatic decline in the percentages of female academics as one reaches the professor title from the research assistant or lecturer titles. However, at Ankara and Hacettepe Universities, there are also a dominance of social sciences and medical science

disciplines, which are supposed to affect the gender distribution. The presentation of these universities in the sample is important to show that even at the universities where there is a numerical gender equality in terms of the percentages of gender distribution, gender inequalities still exist even at these universities. When compared to these three big public universities, Ufuk University is a smaller foundation university, in which it is also possible to see the dramatical decline in the percentage of female professors although in associate professor and assistant professor positions the percentages of female academics are higher. All these give us information about the universities that the interviewees work at.

As to the interviewees, as mentioned previously, 10 male and 10 academics participated in this study. At the time of the study, 5 female academics were working at Hacettepe University in the faculties of engineering, education, arts and school of foreign languages. Their titles included instructor with PhD, lecturer with PhD, assistant professor, and associate professor. One female academic was working at Hacı Bayram Veli University, in the faculty of Communication Sciences. She was a research assistant with PhD. 2 female academics were working at Middle East Technical University, in the faculties of education and engineering. They were both assistant professors. Lastly, 2 female academics were working at Ufuk University which is a foundation university. They were both working as assistant professors in the faculty of education. The ages of female academics ranged from 34 to 48 at the time of the interviews. The ages of instructors were 48 and 38, the age of the lecturer was 43, the ages of assistant professors were 40, 41, 34, 34, 39 and the age of the associate professor was 42. The research assistant was 38 years old. One of the instructors was single and one of them was married with a child. 3 of the female academics were single, one of them was married, 6 of them were married with at least one child.

As to the male interviewees, at the time of the study they were working at two public universities, Hacettepe and Ankara Universities. 7 male academics were working at Hacettepe University in the faculties of engineering, education, arts and school of

foreign languages. Their titles included one instructor with PhD, one lecturer with PhD, 3 assistant professors and 2 associate professors. 3 male academics were working at Ankara University in the faculties of education and health sciences. One of them was a lecturer with PhD, one of them was an assistant professor, and one of them was an associate professor. The age of the instructor was 36, the ages of the lecturers were 33 and 40, the ages of assistant professors were 32, 40, 41, 38 and the ages of associate professors were 38, 39, and 60. 3 of male academics were single, 4 of them were married with a child and 3 of them were married. Table 3.2 presents the summary of key characteristics of the respondents.

Table 3.2

*Summary of Interviewee Profiles*

Name	Age	Experience in academia	Title	Family type	Faculty	University
Female 1	48	20 years	Instructor (Dr.)	Single	School of Foreign Languages	Hacettepe University
Female 2	38	13 years	Instructor (Dr.)	Married with a child	School of Foreign Languages	Hacettepe University
Female 3	40	8 years	Assistant professor	Single	Engineering faculty	Middle East Technical University
Female 4	41	6 years	Assistant professor	Single	Education faculty	Middle East Technical University
Female 5	34	8 years	Assistant professor	Married	Education faculty	Ufuk University
Female 6	34	5 years	Assistant professor	Married with a child	Engineering faculty	Hacettepe University
Female 7	38	8 years	Research assistant (Dr.)	Married	Faculty of media and communication	Hacı Bayram Veli University
Female 8	39	10 years	Assistant professor	Married with a child	Education faculty	Ufuk University
Female 9	42	15 years	Associate professor	Married with children	Engineering faculty	Hacettepe University
Female 10	43	22 years	Lecturer (Dr.)	Married with a child	Faculty of arts (Letters)	Hacettepe University
Male 1	36	9,5 years	Instructor (Dr.)	Married with a child	School of Foreign Languages	Hacettepe University
Male 2	40	15 years	Assistant professor	Married with a child	Education faculty	Hacettepe University
Male 3	32	11 years	Assistant professor	Single	Engineering faculty	Hacettepe University
Male 4	60	24 years	Associate professor	Married	Faculty of arts	Hacettepe University
Male 5	40	12 years	Lecturer (Dr.)	Single	Education faculty	Hacettepe University
Male 6	38	13 years	Associate professor	Single	Faculty of arts	Hacettepe University
Male 7	41	19 years	Assistant professor	Married with children	Engineering faculty	Hacettepe University
Male 8	38	10 years	Assistant professor	Married	Education faculty	Ankara University
Male 9	33	6 years	Lecturer (Dr.)	Married	Faculty of Health Sciences	Ankara University
Male 10	39	13 years	Associate professor	Married with children	Faculty of Health Sciences	Ankara University

### **3.4 Ethical Permission**

Before the initiation of the data collection process, the ethical permission from the Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee (Appendix A) was taken. To this end, a specific form regarding this ethical permission was filled in. The form asked some fundamental information regarding the thesis, the time period the data will be collected, the aims of the study, the way the data will be collected, the proposed sample and their selection criteria, the way the participants will be invited to the study, if there will be voice recordings, and the contributions of the study to the field and society. A voluntary participation form informing the participants about the participants of the study and two interview forms – one set of questions for male academics and the second set of questions for the female academics- were also attached to this application for ethical permission. In the evaluations for ethical permissions, each question in the interview forms was evaluated by professors from the field. After this evaluation, the ethical permission was sent as an e-mail on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018 to me as the researcher and to my thesis advisor. According to this ethical permission, the data collection process was permitted to start on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018 and finish on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2019. As to the ethical issues for the data collection process, the data collection instrument used in the study does not necessitate the participants to reveal their names, and in this way the confidentiality of the data was secured, and this information was shared with the participants of the study. The participants were also given the information that they had the right to leave the study any time they wished.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

After the interview data was transcribed, I read all interviews carefully, and using the blanks on the paper I wrote down the key words mentioned in the answers. As the second step, I listed all these keywords written on the hard copies of the interviews in an Excel sheet. Then, I grouped these key words under the themes that were related to. In this way, the key themes of the data were revealed. Later, I grouped the relevant quotes regarding the key themes that emerged in the study. This process was applied



twice for the data belonging to female participants and for the data belonging to male participants. With the purpose of determining the themes and relations in the data, the discussion of the findings was conducted in the light of the literature review provided previously. In order to convey the results of the study, the demonstrations are done through references to or quotations from the interviewees. The reason for this is that, as Patton (2015) mentions, direct quotations are fundamental to qualitative inquiry in that they represent the raw data by disclosing the interviewees' deep emotions, their conceptualizations and perceptions of the world, and related experiences.

### **3.6 Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

As mentioned previously in this study, this study aimed to explore the society by listening to the “native speakers” of female experiences in an academic world which is originally and primarily for men. Therefore, one strength of this study is to hear women's stories without imposing the concepts and terms of male world on them. Secondly, the gender dimension it has is another strength of the study. This gender dimension allows comparison of male and female experiences in academia. Hoffman (1986) claims that in bureaucratic structures power and privilege are gathered in the hands of managerial elite who are usually men in our case. Therefore, this stratification and assumptions of power and privilege give men and women different life experiences. Similarly, according to Hartsock (1983), differences in male and female material life will give them access to different pieces of knowledge which both will be partial and perverse. Accordingly, the vision available to the men is also significant and this study aims to reach this vision by adding a gender dimension to this study and asking for male experiences in academia. This will also allow the present study to reveal how men perceive and conceptualize the academic careers, and how they perceive and conceptualize the gendered bureaucratic organizations and the assumptions of power and privilege. Most importantly, the analysis of male perceptions and conceptions is important in order to understand how academic men contribute to the reproduction of gender inequalities in academia. Therefore, the most

significant strengths of this study stem from the gender dimension that shapes the inclusion of male and female respondents in the study.

In addition to these, this study has other strengths related to its methodology. Legard, Keegan and Ward (2003) claim that one good characteristic of interviews is to put together structure with flexibility. This is also one strength of this study in that while structure in the interviews allows the researcher to make comparisons and contrasts among the answers, flexibility allowed to capture more depth and details about the personal stories of the interviewees. Legard, Keegan and Ward also argue that good rapport between the interviewer and the interviewee is a key to a successful interview. Therefore, establishment of a positive rapport with the interviewee was one focus of the interviewer, and this situation allowed emergence of sincere personal stories while enabling sincere sharing of opinions and perspectives during the interviews. In this way, more in-depth data were obtained. Another strength of this study is integrating male academics, their stories and perspectives in the design of the study. Studies so far have mostly focused on female academics and their views about the gender issues at universities, but this study adds a gender dimension to the analysis and presents a more pluralist perspective.

As to the limitations of the study, the main limitation of the study is that the participants of the study are located in Ankara, they are working at best universities of the country. Especially, Middle East Technical University (601-800<sup>th</sup>), Hacettepe University (501-600<sup>th</sup>) and Ankara University (1001+) are among the best universities in Turkey according to The World University Rankings (2019). Therefore, this study has limitations regarding its representativeness of Turkey, excluding universities in its small cities and rural parts. In these small cities and rural parts, we expect patriarchal structures to be stronger and therefore we expect more adverse experiences on the part of the female academics in these cities and institutions. However, this study is also significant as it shows that gender inequality is a problem even at the best universities of the country which are located in the capital city. In addition, although qualitative interviewing is an effective method for data collection,

it is not free from its limitations. Gerson and Horowitz (2002) claim that the depth of interviews also depend on the interviewees' ability to remember past, understand the present and think about the future. Another limitation of the study may be its focus on specifically on gender in that this focus may mask other power relations that are taking place at universities. As academic titles are organized around seniority ranks, where one stands in this hierarchy is another issue related to power, for example. Ramazanoğlu and Holland (2002) maintain that when gender is the target, other forms of divisions related to power among people may be lost, silenced and marginalized. In addition to these general limitations regarding the method and design of the study, I would have been much better if I could have reached male academics from foundation universities in Ankara. Among the interviewees, there are two female academics working at a foundation university, but male academics are not represented in the sample in this aspect.

Despite these limitations, this study is still important on the grounds that it aims to explore and reveal female and male academics' experiences, perspectives and ideas in the current functioning of universities. The feminist theoretical framework in this regard helps to question and disclose gendered functioning of these institutions, understand how this functioning leads to gendered consequences for male and female academics, and make more structural suggestions to turn universities into better workplaces for different genders.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **GENDER INEQUALITY IN ACADEMIA**

*It is far harder to kill a phantom than a reality.*

In one of the interviews, this sentence was quoted from Virginia Woolf by one of the female academics. When taken into consideration within the framework of feminist standpoint theory, it is clear that what is a phantom for men can be a reality for women's lives in academia, and unless this phantom is made more visible for both the oppressed and the ruling class, it becomes absolutely more difficult to kill it. Therefore, one aim of this study was to make this phantom visible for everyone by listening to and revealing women's experiences and stories with the phantom which is usually more visible to them. To this end, in this study I asked the interviewees questions in order to understand individual, social, institutional and structural difficulties they face during their academic careers, their coping strategies with these difficulties, and their suggestions for the solution of these hardships. Through analyzing answers to these questions, my aim was to understand how these different levels of inequality are interconnected. The analysis of the interview data revealed four themes: Gender differences in experiences of success and productivity, gender inequality in hiring and promotion, work-life balance, and sexual harassment and gendered mobbing experiences.

#### **4.1 Gender differences in experiences of success and productivity**

The first theme that emerged in data analysis is gender differences in success and productivity in academia. The analysis of the interview data revealed some differences in how male and female academics experience, conceptualize and

perceive success. It was also found that women had to make some concessions in order to look successful and fit in the ideal worker stereotype. There were also some differences in how men and women talk about their own success in academia. The results revealed some challenges in academic career advancement and coping strategies. The following subsections present a discussion of the analysis of the interview data.

#### **4.1.1 Definitions and perceptions of success and productivity**

Male and female academics defined success and productivity using three dimensions. The first one was about teaching activities, the second was about research and publication, and the third dimension was service to the society. They underlined the importance of quality in all dimensions. Being good at teaching activities involved being a good teacher and transmitting knowledge effectively, the research and publication dimension involved being innovative, having the command of the field, contributions to the literature, and being a much-cited person in the field, and lastly, service to the society involved activities which are beneficial for the whole society and humankind. Although their definitions of success did not change much, when they were asked if there are any differences between being a successful female academic and being a successful male academic, their answers demonstrated a variety. As mentioned earlier, if what is a phantom for men can be a reality for women in academia, questioning the male definition of ideal worker and success is a must. Henley (2015) finds this definition insufficient in that it ignores gendered patterns of publication and citations as well as gendered aspects of contributions to the academic world by male and female academics. A critique of gender-blind definition of success is quite necessary when the findings of this study are also taken into an account. According to some participants, success was more easily attributed to men.

*There seems to be a standard in being a successful male and female academic, but this is just what it seems. With the same resume, a man looks more successful (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

*Imagine that you are two academics, one is female, the other is male. What you say is given less importance because the words come from a woman. For example, in the panel for higher education models, there was 5 male academics and no woman. You think “OK, Wait a minute. Isn’t there even one successful female academic studying higher education?”. We are not there, we are not visible, either we are not visible or we are not allowed to be visible. There is a question mark in my mind about who is more reliable and successful. It seems that men are listened more (Female 4, Assistant professor, Education).*

These two quotations given above claim that with the same resume, women look less successful and their words are given less importance. Previously it was mentioned that there is a gap between stereotypes of the ideal worker and stereotypes of how women should behave in the workplace (Reskin, 2010). In addition to this gap, women have to cope with negative stereotypes about working women which put them in a marginalized position in the workplace. These negative stereotypes marginalizing women included not being involved in their jobs, showing no commitment, and being less reliable among others (Cleveland, Stockdale, & Murphy, 2000). Also, in one study it was found that women’s negative characteristics, and men’s positive characteristics were seen as constant across different contexts and situations while men’s negative behaviors were context-specific (Rubini & Menegatti, 2014). Going back to the quotations taken from interviewees of the study, it is clear that this marginalized position remains as a reality even when women and men have the same resume. The reason for this is that there are these negative stereotypes affecting perception in the background. Furthermore, when men’s positive characteristics are seen as constant across situations this make them more reliable, and leads to the gendered experiences as mentioned by Female 4. This marginalization of women ends in neglect to what women say and think while empowering male reliability and credibility. The same situation was also mentioned by one of the male academics:

*I mean success seems to be attributed to men more. As I said women come the second in this structure after the men. In fact, jobs do not have a gender or there is not a difference between what a woman and a man can do. But the perception of the society treats even daughters as second-class, this has its echoes in the lives of adult female academics. They society may have this belief (Male 9, Dr. Lecturer, Health sciences).*

In a further discussion about who is more reliable and successful, one female academic gave an example of a female dentist academic who was always asking the technician how the process was going and obtaining approval during a dental operation. One of her friends said that he/she did not find female dentists as reliable as male ones, and she added that this is the general perception in the society. This example by one of the interviewees seem to be in line with Baker's (2010) finding which showed that women stated doubts on their academic capabilities and knowledge of academic practices when compared to men. The traditional definition of ideal worker allows men to define work as their own area, and gives men the privilege of not having to fit in a system which was not initially organized for them. Therefore, one reason why men were found to be more reliable and successful could be the reflections of this privilege to their attitudes about their own success as mentioned by one of the interviewees:

*Men can present everything as success, and the reason why we see them as success is their attitudes toward what they do. The importance they assign to everything they do signals success (Female 4, Assistant professor, Education).*

Another finding of the study was about the gendered separation of teaching and research. These are in line with Carli and her colleagues' (2016) findings which did not find a match between the stereotypes of successful scientists and women, but found a match between the stereotypes of successful scientists and men at a co-educational university. The interviewees in this study also mentioned that teaching was what is expected from female academics, and research is what is expected from male academics. Women were also reported to give more importance to teaching and their relationships with students.

*Teaching is usually left to women, and research is left to men. This was proved in reference letters in one study. When a female academic asked for a reference letter, she was described as a good teacher, and her good relationship with students was underlined. However, in reference letters for male academics, men were described as good researchers, and project-doers. As our moms advised us to become teachers, this is also valid in academia. When a successful female academic is thought, teaching is what comes to mind (Female 7, Dr. Research Assistant, Communication).*

*When women become successful in teaching, they like featuring this. When they have good relations with students, reach more students, this is important for them. Men feature things like “I did it first” and “I did it fastest” (Female 9, Associate professor, Engineering).*

*Being loved and appreciated by students is something important for women. I don't think that this is that important for men (Male 1, Language instructor).*

Similarly, Eccles (1987) also claimed that women highlighted teaching and advising aspects of the job while men highlighted the research and publishing aspects of the job. Accordingly, women were less likely to ask for promotion, salary increases and to assess the offers outside the university. This had its reflections also in our study.

*As a woman, I do not mind if my husband earns more than me. When I started this job, I did not come here with financial expectations. As I come here to really teach and learn, my concern for money is of the secondary importance (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

This participant also added her observation about male academics. In her opinion, projects that bring money are more important to be successful for male academics.

*For male academics, completing more projects and running projects that bring more money are usually the criteria for success. It does not fit my criteria for success. I like writing articles (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

In this study, marriage with another academic had three important impacts on the academic women's success. Firstly, women were reported to postpone their careers until the husband's career reaches a certain level. Secondly, although marriage delays women's careers, it was also found to be a sign of success for women in the eyes of the society. In addition, academic women's success was overshadowed by her husband's academic career.

*Women postpone their careers more. For married academic couples around me what I see is that firstly men's career is given importance until it comes to a certain level, then maybe women's career can advance. I don't know, but there is not just one factor here, we cannot link it to household responsibilities, maybe other things related to departments, opportunities, or the university. It can be related to concentration and wanting this career a lot (Female 1, Language instructor).*



*In societal level, it is important for a woman to have success in family in addition to her success in academia to look successful. It is important how they manage this two, and I feel that bigger successes are expected from men more. There is a perception that women have other roles (Male 8, Assistant professor, Education).*

*My husband became a part of my project and we published an article. But everyone thinks that it was my husband's project and I participated in it later. I don't know if this is because he is more successful than me or because of gender roles, but these are the things that can be questioned (Female 2, Language instructor).*

All in all, the analysis of the interviews showed that success was mostly attributed to men in the public eye. Going back to the female dentist example given by one of the interviewees, this had the effect of lowering self-confidence on the part of the female academics, and increasing it on the part of the male academics. Male attitudes toward everything they do was in fact signaling success, as one of the interviewees put forward. Also, when it comes to academic job itself, there were some gendered divisions between teaching, research and projects that bring money. While money was of the secondary importance for a female engineering academic, she says that running projects that bring money was a success criterion for male academics. When it comes to marriage, although it had some negative effects on women's academic careers, being married at the same time was a sign of success in public.

#### **4.1.2 Female concessions to fit in the ideal worker stereotype**

This part presents answers of only female interviewees because the question of whether they have to make concessions from their femininity or not in order to look more successful was asked to only female academics as the question investigates their experiences. As mentioned earlier, the ideal worker stereotypes are shaped around male stereotypes. Reskin (2010) claimed that when women want to get the positions which are traditionally held by men, they face problems due to the stereotypes in that stereotypes for women are not in harmony with the stereotypes of ideal male worker. The societal stereotypes regarding the expected behaviors of women are a violation of stereotypes regarding the characteristics of an ideal worker, and vice versa (Reskin,

2010). This was absolutely salient in the statements of interviewees. Female interviewees mainly mentioned that they sometimes had to abandon their characteristics and appearance which would make them look feminine to look more successful and productive. They make concessions from themselves in order to be taken seriously. Women are either expected to abandon their femininity and come to a harmony with male characteristics; or behave in a gender-neutral way; or expected to be pleasing to the eye. One of the participants claimed that all these three put pressures on women. The first two options were more commonly mentioned by the interviewees.

*Women try to abstain from mentioning their emotions, and they try to look harsh and more masculine in order to look more credible and reliable (Female 4, Assistant professor, Education).*

*It is not becoming mannish, but women sometimes have to use harsher, more offensive and more destructive statements. Sometimes they have to show male type behaviors which belong to men or which are attributed to men (Female 10, Dr. Lecturer, Arts).*

As can be seen in the quotations above, male-type behaviors were defined as abstaining from emotions, being harsher, more stubborn, offensive and destructive in this study. Women, on the other hand, were regarded as more amenable and open to communication and emotional. Obtaining the male-types of behaviors was believed to make the person more reliable and credible. Otherwise, women faced the challenge of not being taken seriously as mentioned by another interviewee.

*You cannot walk around in very feminine clothes. Your hemline is important for example, décolleté is important. If you want to be taken seriously, you need to pay attention to these (Female 2, Language instructor).*

Even when they do not abandon these characteristics and appearance, they had to think about abandoning or not, and make a justification for the place they stand as they feel the pressure. The quotations below show us that anything related to being female like a red nail polish, high-heels, or looking well-groomed (with make-up) can indeed end in being perceived as less successful and less credible although these have nothing to do with if women can calculate second order derivatives or not as mentioned by the interviewees.

*Of course, you have to make concessions from your femininity. My friends ask if I come to work with my red nail polish. I come to a superior position when my acts are in line with what the society expects from me, but if they will see me worthless just because I have red nail polish, this is their problem. Before I calculate a second order derivative of a function, if they will think that I cannot do it as I wear high-heels, this is their problem. This is what I think (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

*For example, I like being a well-groomed woman. I was questioning if others' perception of me would be just an appearance with an empty inside if I looked well-groomed before proving myself. I was questioning if I should look poorly groomed in order to make people believe that I was working hard and did not have time to be well-groomed. But, this is a very wrong perception. I am not a technician or worker in the field, I am an academic and I have space to prove myself with my academic work. Being well-groomed is a sign of respect for yourself and for your job. If people will perceive it in the other way, this is their perception and it should not have a binding force for me. This is the judgment that I have reached, and I am happy with that. Otherwise, it would be a very macho and sexist approach, I don't think we should let men pull us down that much (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

Therefore, it can be concluded that women had to make some concession both from their behaviors and appearance in order to fit the male academic world. What is expected from them as a woman and what is expected from them as ideal workers are not in harmony, and this cause problems for women. If they want to be taken seriously, they lose the privilege of being themselves. They had to either mask their gender and neutralize it or become more masculine depending on the context.

What should be underlined in this part is that as long as women are obliged to make concessions and fit into male stereotypes to look more reliable, credential and to be listened to, this obligation reproduces the existing stereotypes and inequalities and the gap between an ideal worker and a woman. However, breaking this cycle is possible through a social transformation in that women's characteristics are promoted as strength unlike the current situation. In the study it was claimed by one female academic that when women are open to communication, this is regarded as a weakness in the work environment. However, it was also claimed that it was a strength for women and for the work environment.

*Women should not make concessions from themselves. Society should teach their children that this is women's strength. Really, women are more amenable and men are more stubborn. Being amenable, however, is regarded as a weakness (Female 9, Associate professor, Engineering).*

Therefore, it is clear that what is a strength or what is a weakness is not solid facts, but determined by the perception through stereotypes. Therefore, to open a space for women in the workplace, the discourses that see female-type behaviors as a weakness should not be reproduced.

#### **4.1.3 Gender differences in self-promotion**

Gendered behavior expectations also shape the way men and women talk about their success in academic environments. Self-promotion in this part is conceptualized as talking about one's own success. There were some differences in the perceptions of male and female self-promotion in the answers of interviewees. These differences appeared in this study are in line with Moss-Racusin and Rudman (2010) who found that gender stereotypes expected from a woman are violated when women focus more on themselves and engage in self-promotion. This violation produces the fear of penalties that set a barrier in front of women to use their freedom to self-promote. This results in women's reduced ability to promote themselves even when it is necessary (Moss-Racusin and Rudman, 2010). In this study, the female answers displayed that women engage in self-promotion in a more emotional, modest, passive ways while men were described as more objective, cooler, more ambitious, and work-oriented in self-promotion.

*Men talk about success as something natural for them. Women talk about their success with a surprise like welcoming it as something unexpected (Female 1, Language instructor).*

*Women use more emotional words, and adjectives like "It's been loved a lot". However, men use more objective statements like mentioning how many times their article was cited (Female 7, Dr. Research assistant, Communication).*

*Men talk about their success more. They always try to open some space for themselves. Women use a more passive language, they are shier and stand aside. They exaggerate less. Men, on the other hand, start their sentences with "I" (Female 9, Associate professor, Engineering).*

*This is a default feature in men. I am against generalizations but this is true. It is more dangerous for women to talk about their success. People perceive you as a threat (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

As to male interviewees' answers, while some of them agreed with women and found women more modest, most of them claimed that there were not many differences in how men and women talk about their success in academia. Some participants mention that women are more ambitious while talking about their success:

*Both men and women talk about their success, but it is clear that women are more ambitious and this had a big background. Women have always been discriminated in society and they have had more difficulty in reaching success. You are a woman, you cannot do it. This makes women more ambitious (Male 10, Associate professor, Health sciences).*

*In a male dominated environment, women try to prove themselves. I am as good as you, I am here too, and I have studies too. But the other party is also very ambitious, and he wants to express himself. Therefore, on the part of the women, a discourse to prove themselves appears (Female 8, Assistant professor, Education).*

In addition, being married and managing an academic career at the same time were seen as something to be proud of in terms of female success.

*For example, a female academic may be proud that although she is a mother, she has completed her Ph.D. thesis. But no male academic says that although he is a father, he has completed her Ph.D. thesis (Male 10, Associate professor, Health sciences).*

It seems that women receive confusing messages about self-promotion. On the one side, gender stereotypes do not support women in their acts to talk about themselves and their success. However, academic environment is a competitive workplace. As one female participant put forward, academics use their own signature in every piece of work they produce, so their names are their brands in fact. According to the results of this study, the conflict between how women should behave and the competitive environment of their workplaces creates some challenges for academic women as they face more different reactions when compared to the reactions men receive when

they talk about their success. For example, one female participant gave an example from a speaker who visited their department. She said that he mentioned what he had done one by one and everyone appreciated him. If this man had been a woman, everyone would have said that she overpraised herself. This example clearly shows the difference in reactions to men's and women's self-promotion behavior.

Therefore, the ambition in women's self-promotion as mentioned by some participants can be interpreted in two different ways. One interpretation is that as some academics puts forward this ambition may be the result of the difficulties women face in their careers and as a result of need to open a space for themselves in this very competitive environment. The second interpretation could be about the conflict previously mentioned. As success is not something automatically assigned to women and modesty is the expected behavior, any self-promotion act done by women can be regarded as too much and too ambitious.

There is another point that needs to be highlighted about the differences between male and female answers to this discussion. A big majority of female academics claimed that there was a difference between how men and women talk about their success in academia and claimed that men do this in more aggressive ways. However, a majority of men said that there was not a difference between how men and women promote their success although a small group find women more ambitious, and another small group find women more modest and passive. A big majority of male academics are not aware of what a big majority of women experience. This shows that men find this structure natural and ordinary and are not aware of how women experience the same structure differently than them. This unawareness helps to reproduce gender inequalities in academia because it does not help to reveal gendered practices in self-promotion. Therefore, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, when gendered practices go unnoticed by men, they turn into a phantom for them and this phantom becomes visible only in the experiences of women.

To conclude the findings, this study has found some differences in how men and women in academia engage in self-promotion behaviors. While some participants claimed that women used a more passive and emotional language, other also claimed that at times women can be more ambitious. This was explained by women's need to claim their presence in a male world of academia, and by the challenges they have to face while they are advancing in their careers. In addition, family was sometimes used in female self-promotion. Having a child at the same time was something to be proud of for female success, but the same was not valid for male academic's success. This part has also revealed that more men than women think that there are not any differences between how men and women engage in self-promotion in academia. This finding is also quite important on the grounds that this situation turns gendered practices into a phantom in academia which is not visible to men, but experienced by women.

## **4.2 Gendered hiring and promotion processes in academia**

This study revealed some gendered practices that put women at a disadvantaged position regarding hiring and promotion processes in academia. Previously quoted, van den Brink, Benschop and Jansen (2010) claimed that gendered practices in academia including double standards, gender stereotypes and male networks which affect hiring and promotion in academic hiring and promotion processes are hidden by the ideology of meritocracy. This study also revealed similar double standards, gender stereotypes that affect these processes, and male networks were found to have an influence in the hiring and promotion in academia. Before mentioning these results in detail, working in female-dominated and male-dominated disciplines is shared from the perspectives of the interviewees.

### **4.2.1. Working in male and female dominated academic fields**

Most of the participants in this study worked either in female-dominated disciplines or male-dominated disciplines. Although the academia in Turkey seems to be more

egalitarian when the women's overall participation is considered, a deeper analysis of the numerical gender distribution in different academic fields in this study shows us that horizontal segregation continues to have impacts on where men and women work. As to the advantages and disadvantages of working in these academic fields, both have their advantages and disadvantages for the interviewees. For example, one female interviewee mentioned some difficulties regarding working in a male dominated department. Her department had only 2 female academics including her, and 18 male academics. Her main concern as a woman in a male-dominated department was about their right to speak and to be listened to.

*The disadvantages of working in a male-dominated discipline are that you do not have the right to speak, and your words always hang in the air. They aim to create the impression that they care for us, but it is not real. As to the advantages, there aren't any advantages (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

As is clear from the quotation above, the efforts to create the impression that women's words are taken into consideration does not seem sincere for the female academic. She says that their words always hang in the air, which means that they are uttered but not taken seriously. In the previous section of this chapter, it was mentioned that women are marginalized in the workplace through negative stereotypes which can be acted upon consciously and unconsciously, and these negative stereotypes reduce women's credibility and reliability. Together with this loss of credibility due to female gender, this marginalization reproduces the workplace as a men's space, in which women lose the right to speak and be listened to.

Working in a female-dominated discipline could be an advantage for women, on the other hand. Being able to communicate more easily and being understood was among the most commonly mentioned advantages.

*One advantage of working in a female-dominated discipline is that we can understand each other. Women can more comfortably talk about their problems with other female managers and stuff (Female 1, Language Instructor).*



*When the department head is female, it is more advantageous because they understand you. It is easier to communicate with them, they can more easily empathize with you, and they can be more emotional. Two years ago, my dog accidentally stepped on a nail, and I had to leave the school early. How can you tell someone who does not like animals this? Our department head a woman, she let me go and then said "let me know what happened later". At that time our dean was a man, and he said "So what!" (Female 5, Assistant professor, Education).*

Some men working in female-dominated departments also claimed that women are more organized, nurturing and loving when compared to men, and this brings some advantages to the departments that they work in.

*As to the advantages, women are more organized, more nurturing, and they claim the job. Men may not mind the job much, but the job can turn into women's whole life (Male 1, Language instructor).*

*Their approach can be milder and more moderate when compared to men. They can show more nurturing and loving behaviors (Male 9, Lecturer, Health Sciences).*

Despite the advantages mentioned here, some men and women in the study also mentioned several disadvantages of working in a female-dominated discipline. These disadvantages included incorporation of emotions into the work, the presence of hidden agendas, communication with women and the creation of an informal environment in the workplace.

*I have not seen an advantage. I worked in private sector before, and during my administrative duties I saw that women can personalize very simple things and they incorporate their emotions into their work. They are more emotional. When you say that this does not work, they are hurt. There is nothing to be hurt in this, they should do it again. This attitude also destroys friendships (Female 8, Assistant professor, Education).*

*We are talking about equality, but I do not know women have hidden agendas more. It depends on the personality, but men can be more direct and simpler at times. Women can have hidden projects and agendas more. We see the examples of this in disciplines like food engineering and chemistry. Unfortunately, women try to supplant each other. For this reason, maybe it is not good to have a lot of women (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

*Don't misunderstand me, but when women say "Good morning", this conversation grows longer and longer. Women think in more devious ways and communication becomes harder. The decisions at this school are made for example by two women's lobbies (Male 1, Language instructor).*

*For the disadvantages, there may be a more informal environment in a more conversational mood. An official meeting can be conducted in a tea, coffee and cake mood. This extends a one-hour meeting to three hours. Therefore, there are some problems in terms of time management, and this affects performance (Male 9, Lecturer, Health Sciences).*

In the quotations above, we can see that the interviewees shared some negative stereotypes and generalizations about women in the workplace. The danger with these kinds of negative stereotypes is that they can easily lead to confirmation bias. Passer and Smith (2008) define confirmation bias as human tendency to seek proof that confirms what they expect or believe rather than seeking proof that would disconfirm their expectations or beliefs. Passer and Smith add that disconfirmation in this case is more difficult in that people are not keen on changing their existing beliefs. Therefore, because of this tendency and the difficulty of disconfirmation of such negative expectations, gender stereotypes in the workplace can easily reproduce themselves through confirmation bias. The problem with this is definitely the reproduction of inaccurate negative stereotypes regarding women in the workplace and therefore, the reproduction of gendered workplace. The same danger with confirmation bias threat also existed in the quotation below by a male academic who was talking about the disadvantages of working in a female-dominated department, and mentioned his discomfort with female managers.

*I would not want our department to be female-dominated. To be honest, it should not be male dominated either, but I do not also want female managers. This is not because of gender discrimination. Female managers get involved in everything from your clothes to life style. You asked me as an academic. As an academic, they are quite normal, but when they are managers, the situation changes. So far, we have had two female managers, and three male managers. I have been working here for the last 15 years, and everyone complains about female managers. The high number of women is not important, but I feel uncomfortable when I have a female manager (Male 6, Associate professor, Arts).*

As a result, working in male-dominated environments and female-dominated environments had their own set of challenges for the academics interviewed. For example, while the problems of female academics in male dominated disciplines involved not having the right to speak and be listened to, men in female dominated

disciplines mentioned that the informal environment in meetings. When all these are considered, it becomes significant to conduct interviews with men in female-dominated disciplines, and women in male-dominated discipline. In this situation, the feminist standpoint theory expects that women in male-dominated disciplines and men in female-dominated disciplines have access to different pieces of knowledge or they may know better than the ones who are socially and politically privileged (Wylie, 2003). As to gender equality and breaking horizontal segregation, it becomes necessary to understand the reasons why men are not in female-dominated academic disciplines and why women are not in male-dominated academic disciplines. This investigation is important because although quantitative equality is not a guarantee for qualitative equality, it is a significant prerequisite (Peterson, 2011). The next part presents the findings regarding the hiring processes in academia to investigate one aspect of this question.

#### **4.2.2 Gender equality and positive discrimination in academic hiring**

The analysis of the interview data revealed that hiring processes in academia do not favor women, which makes their entrance to male-dominated fields more difficult, and feeds horizontal segregation. In this part, gendered practices in academia including double standards, gender stereotypes and male networks which affect hiring and promotion in academic hiring and promotion processes will be reported. One of the interviewees claimed that men are given the priority for hiring and promotions unless another person has a friend at court.

*Let's say that we will hire an assistant, or someone will become an associate professor, these positions are published in newspapers although we know that who will be promoted or hired. It is an obligation, and other people must also apply. Men's applications are examined firstly, they have a priority if the department head is not a woman. As favoritism (torpil) is common nowadays, women also have some advantages. The one who is favored gets the job (Male 4, Associate professor, Arts).*

This quotation is a demonstration of how gender inequality in academia is something that have become ordinary and something that is not questioned. Women suffer from these kinds of practices but their male colleagues can talk about them as if such

practices are normal and natural. Therefore, it can be claimed that through such discourses as given above, gender inequalities in academia are given a natural status. However, suffering from the adverse aspects of these practices, some women in the study claimed that there must be a search for quantitative gender equality especially in female-dominated and male-dominated departments.

*If the percentages are 5% to 95%, I think positive discrimination can be done because these percentages do not signal a natural distribution. They are unbalanced. If you have this type of a distribution, it is necessary to seek where the problem is (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

*Abroad, in the USA and Europe universities claim a support for the applications of minorities, and women. It can be a good idea to pay attention to gender distribution in the departments. Especially in the departments like pre-school education, there are only few male academics. This also can be done there to hire more male academics (Female 4, Assistant professor, Education).*

However, some male and female academics found this search for quantitative gender equality unnecessary and had some concerns regarding the quality of the academic who is being hired and regarding the internal peace of their departments. Another concern was about the message given by positive discrimination, or the efforts for the quantitative gender equality.

*It is not necessary to have equal number of men and women. It can decrease the quality. Our job has nothing to with our gender. If he writes 3 articles, I have to write 3 articles (Female 5, Assistant professor, Education).*

*This effort to equalize the numbers is very unnecessary. To protect the internal peace of the department, it will not work. I do not think that we are unconsciously prejudiced against women. We examine his/her academic qualities, but the most important thing is if he/she is compatible with us. This is more important than gender (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

*It should not be important if we hire men or women. I should care if he/she has a command of the field, and how good he/she is at her job. I do not like positive discrimination for women. It means that you do not deserve this job indeed. You should reach the source of the problem if there is injustice. I can understand some efforts, but I still do not like them (Female 2, Language instructor).*

Some academics underlined the importance of having different genders in terms of providing students with different role models and in terms of student needs. One male

interviewee who was working in the department of Psychological Guidance and Counseling said that students need different role models in their job; therefore, he believed that having a balanced distribution was beneficial. Underlining the student needs, another male participant said that he finds the efforts to equalize the numbers ridiculous.

*This is more about personality. It is ridiculous to equalize it. In academia, it is more about the personality. I do not mind the numbers. But if there are only men, and only women, it may be necessary to avoid this situation because the roles differentiate. For example, we also have female students, and they cannot come to me to ask if I have sanitary pads. The balance should not be forced, but it should come naturally (Male 10, Associate professor, Health Sciences).*

For gender equality, one male interviewee mentioned that his department used blind reviews in hiring:

*We try to be transparent in our examinations as much as possible. We close the names in examination papers. The candidates get their marks independent of their gender. We try to be transparent, objective and clear. In order not to be unjust, two female research assistants have been appointed. They could also be two men (Male 6, Associate professor, Arts).*

When all these comments are considered, there are three issues that need further discussion. The first one is about the double standards women face. As long as men continue to be given the priority in academic hiring, it will be impossible to talk about gender equality in academia. Secondly, the discussion of quality concerns for positive discrimination should also open the male standards of success for discussion. As long as success continues to be defined in terms of male standards, being blind to gender overall, or running a gender-blind process in hiring will not be fruitful. Although most of the interviewees claimed that the one who deserves the job should get it, this does not guarantee gender equality. As mentioned by van den Brink and Benschop (2011), gender blindness of meritocracy makes gendered hiring processes invisible and legitimizes them. van den Brink and Benschop suggest that women do not have as much time as men to conduct research, the conceptualization of excellence favors men, and men are encouraged and supported more to apply and be nominated for the positions more. A finding similar to this was also found in this study. The difference between male and female academics was that male academics were said to be given

the priority in hiring and promotion decisions. Also, even when meritocracy or gender-blind reviews are run, the discourse which says that the one who deserves the job should get it also favors male academics in that the success criteria are shaped based on male norms, by taking into consideration an ideal worker who is always available to work and free from domestic responsibilities. Without a focus on such underlying inequalities, it does not seem possible to create egalitarian universities. The third issue that needs to be discussed is the necessity to be careful when mentioning stereotypes. The interviewees in this study also mentioned some negative stereotypes about women including being emotional. However, some participants put this as advantage making the communication with women easier. Therefore, it is not a good idea to stick to the male stereotypes while defining a good leader. For gender equality in hiring and promotion processes, it is also necessary to reconceptualize previously defined male concepts such as leadership and promote them.

#### **4.2.3 Women's absence in top academic management positions**

The interviewees came from five different universities in the capital of Turkey, and all of them had men in the top management positions. Despite this visible absence of women, some male academics claimed that there was no gender discrimination and if women wanted to have roles in management, they could do so. The quotation given below underlines the importance of listening to women's stories as feminist standpoint theory requires in that gender discrimination seems to be a phantom for the male academic uttering these words.

*I see many female managers around us. I do not think that there is gender discrimination any more. I have never seen it (Male 2, Assistant professor, Education).*

However, gender discrimination is part of women's lived experiences as mentioned by both men and women in this study. The negative stereotypes about women's leadership skills and the positive stereotypes about men's leadership skills had their reflections in the study. Also, that women lack role models was underlined.

*Men are more inclined to manage and they are more active in management positions. Women can be managers, too. I worked with one male and two female managers. In my experience, the exhaustion is the same but I could never satisfy these female managers. They were the most difficult part for me. I do not know if they have different ambitions or not, they did not like what I did, were not respectful, they had emotional fluctuations. They dedicate themselves to work and they ruin themselves and people around them (Male 1, Language instructor).*

*There is an involuntary collective negative discrimination. In our subconsciousness, the figures of authority are all men. Women do not have enough role models. Family's attitudes toward daughters and sons are different (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

In line with these stereotypical views, some men argued that women are brought to middle-management position at university by men to give the impression that they are very democratic. They underlined that they do not find these efforts sincere in that they cannot see women in key decision-making positions.

*Management seems to be something granted to women. In our history we have only one female Prime Minister. We allow you to manage but you should idle around dean and department head positions. You cannot see women in key decision-making positions. This is ridiculous (Male 10, Associate professor, Health Sciences).*

*In cultural terms, the universities are male dominated. A management takes some women among them in order to show how democratic they are. In fact, the underlying message is that we manage this university (Male 4, Associate professor, Arts).*

One male academic criticized the quotas for women in management and he said that he found them meaningless and insulting as they seem to grant women something that in fact they do not deserve and another male academic claimed that universities and their managements should be gender-neutral.

*Top management positions are male-dominated unfortunately. They create the impression that they appoint women in order not to be criticized. I feel sorry for this. When a male rector is appointed, he appoints a male vice rector, and then a female vice rector. It is important to mention the qualities of these women instead of creating the impression that you appointed them just to have women too. This is valid in the whole country. Separate quotas mean that you are stupid, but we appointed you because of gender quota although you do not deserve it. This is an insult. It is important to show women deserve that position by highlighting their academic qualities (Male 10, Associate professor, Health Sciences)*

*It is not something specific to our country. The biggest mistake is to choose someone as they are female. Is it good to choose just because they are male? Gender should be ignored here except some situations. These special situations include Girl's Orphanage, a female principal is necessary there because she can understand the problems better. In academia, gender is not important. But if I have to take initiative, I would choose a female department head for Pre-school education department. They can get on well with children better. It is very natural (Male 2, Assistant professor, Education).*

This quotation given below is a good example of stereotypical views about women, connecting their nature to motherhood and also a good example of benevolent sexism. Although the interviewee seemingly says good things about women and their expected choices, he thinks he has the right to keep women away from certain occupational opportunities and decides what is important for women instead of women:

*It means women do not want to. It is not about the chances of winning. Administrative duties have a lot of difficulties. They are like an ordeal. They keep people away from their families. Women give more importance to family. This stems from their advantageous characteristics. If a man does not see his child for three days, his child can save himself/herself, but if a woman does not see her child for three days, the child cannot save himself/herself. Therefore, the role of mothers is very important in society and in the family. For example, if I had the authority, I would not put women in positions which require a lot of travelling and physical power. I do not have the right to keep this woman away from her family and children. Even if the woman wanted, I would think again. No success can be as important as happiness in the family. In other words, a man can be a professor at a young age, but if this person has an unhappy family life, is he still successful? Academically yes. But academic success is just a part of success in life. This man lost in life, but he is academically successful. Does this success have a meaning? (Male 2, Assistant professor, Education)*

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, what the quotation above tells us is a very traditional view of women and gender roles. According to this traditional view, what is expected from women is not having an interest in management positions, giving the priority to their family and children. He also finds these priorities advantageous, and this is in line with the dignified motherhood role in the society. For women, the most important source of happiness is supposed to be their happiness in the family as mentioned by this interviewee. Such a view definitely reinforces the heteronormative division of labor in the society by assigning the housekeeper role to women and



breadwinner role to men. As mentioned earlier, ideal worker is the one who does not have any domestic responsibilities. Women's housework and childcare responsibilities set limits to their time and energy which are necessary for professional careers (Baker, 2010). Therefore, keeping women away from these positions and giving them domestic responsibilities as suggested above are not solutions to gender inequality, but they are producers of gender inequality at work and in academia. Such traditional views of women held by men end in discriminatory practices that prevent women from participating in decision-making processes in which decisions about their workplace are made while legitimizing this discrimination.

Other reasons for women's absence in these positions included women's self-filtering by thinking that they will not be elected, lack of courage, escape from responsibilities, fragility. In addition to these, structural inequalities that killed women's willingness and male networks which do not allow women in were also highlighted.

*Probably as society, we are not ready. Women do not become candidates because probably they think they will not be elected (Female 4, Assistant professor, Education).*

*Women cannot find the courage. I heard someone saying she did not want to enter among that many men. It may be an escape from responsibilities, or they can show fragility more by saying that they cannot cope with male rudeness (Female 8, Assistant professor, Education).*

*Women's willingness to come to these positions is precluded in this structure. Under different conditions, the situation may change. This is an obligatory unwillingness (Female 10, Lecturer, Arts).*

*At universities, the management network is made up of men. It can be difficult for women to fit because everyone else will be male from the driver to other people. Men may know how to make other people work. It is because of these misconceptions I think. Being emotional. Physical endurance. Going home late. If you are a rector, you may stay at work until late night, you may work at the weekends etc. People think that if a woman goes home late, it matters. But if a man goes home late, it does not matter. There are some prejudices regarding women (Female 1, Language Instructor).*

*Men have set their own way in management and they want it to last. Accepting a woman among them, they may think that this will disturb their peace. They may also think that women are not authoritarian enough. I do not know (Female 5, Assistant professor, Education).*

All in all, when all these quotations given here are considered, the explanation that women's invisibility in top management positions is something that women choose becomes useless. As mentioned in the theoretical framework of this study, women's choices are not always as personal as they may seem and they are affected by other factors (Sandberg, 2013). Blaming women for their absence in the top management positions just masks the stereotypical views regarding female leadership, male networks that do not let them in, structural inequalities that kill their willingness, and the challenges of surviving in a male-dominated environment. Blaming women only works to legitimize the male dominance in top management positions. In addition, female quotas and the way they are used can be criticized as some interviewees do, but the real question here is whether we will be able to see women in these positions when we do not have these quotas. Quotas can also be a good way to leak into the male networks in which women are not normally allowed. Another interesting finding of this study is that when the top management is male-dominated, it is easier to regard it as gender-neutral. This is probably as a result of a match between an ideal worker and a man in people's minds. Therefore, before accepting male-domination as gender-neutrality it is necessary to investigate the reasons for women's absence. Lastly, the ideal worker, leadership and management should be redefined in order to eliminate their exclusionist impacts on women. Universities which give importance to gender equality have to promote these new definitions.

#### **4.3 Work-life balance in academia**

For the purposes of this study, the definition of work was done as an individual's activities which were conducted to earn money (Cleveland, Stockdale & Murphy, 2000). Work-life balance, on the other hand, was defined as workplace practices which acknowledge the necessity of creating a balance between family (life) and work in the lives of the employees while work-life conflict was used to refer to the

cases where this balance is not achieved (Yadav, 2014). The analysis of the interview data revealed that academic women experience work-life conflict more seriously when compared to their male colleagues. The next part presents a discussion of the findings regarding gender issues in work-life balance/conflict in academia.

#### **4.3.1 Gender issues in work-life balance**

The analysis of the interview data revealed that problematizing of heteronormative division of labor is necessary in order to understand gendered work-life balance/conflict experiences. A work-day is conceptualized as adjacent number of predetermined hours, and the ideal worker did not have any responsibilities other than work, and was always available to work (Acker, 2011). According to Acker, this was as a result of the heteronormative division of labor which placed men as breadwinners and women as homemakers. Although it has been a long time since the entrance of women into the workforce, this study proves that this heteronormative division of labor continues to shape work-life balance experiences of men and women in academia. Trying to hold on to the work activities which are designed for an ideal worker without any domestic or carework responsibilities, this study demonstrated that women experience work-life conflict more. Women receive less partner support, they spend more time for house and children when compared to their partners, and these findings are also in line with O’Laughlin and Bischoff (2005). Female respondents claimed that they have more responsibilities when compared to their husbands regarding home, childcare and other care work activities. Domestic responsibilities also created some challenges in terms of promotion and academic leadership.

*I saw my responsibilities to my family are more than my husband’s. Apart from my immediate family, I have the responsibilities of my mother, father and sister. If one of them falls sick, I take care of them. My husband’s mother was ill, I took care of her too. Meanwhile my husband was in Cyprus. I could not say that I wanted to go to a conference. I think men are luckier (Female 8, Married with a child, Assistant professor, Education).*

*In terms of productivity, marriage has negative impacts. In marriage, women have more responsibilities, ironing, cooking and children. It is a more difficult life (Female 3, Single, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

*If there are children their whole responsibility is given to women. In this case, men can continue to work as deans, but women cannot even think of getting a promotion because she is given other responsibilities. She needs to go home and cook. Even when she thinks promotion, she faces some problems (Female 7, Married, Dr. Research Assistant, Communication).*

In addition, when women experience work-life conflict their careers are easily open for discussion. This was one area male and female interview data differentiated in this study. Some female participants mentioned the importance of permission of their husbands for their career related decisions, but the permission of wives was not a matter in male interviews. One striking example comes from an assistant professor who mentions her responsibility to pick up her daughter from school. Her words are good instances of lack of partner support, male-designed working hours, and her work being trivialized as something easily dispensable in the eyes of the husband in addition to the challenges of working at a foundation university. It is important to underline this last factor, working at a foundation university because there working hours are stricter when compared to public universities. This quotation means that these strict and long work hours which are designed for a male academic who does not have any childcare responsibilities like picking up children from school causes extra difficulties for women who work at these universities.

*For example, when we were arranging the time to meet you, I said that I had to leave at 4 o'clock because I had to run to pick up my daughter from school. When I have a meeting, I call my mother, father, or sister. I can never call my husband because he cannot leave his job. In fact, I should not leave either. But, why cannot he leave? He asks how he can leave the work early, then I say "OK, I can leave". For example, when there is a change in our management, my heart starts to ache: "What if they didn't allow me to leave work early to pick the child up?" Working hours at foundation universities are different. My husband can easily say that if they don't allow you to leave early, you can quit your job. All these are very difficult things (Female 8, Married with a child, Assistant professor, Education).*

In addition, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, some female participants gave examples about the importance of husband's permission if they are married, or

father's permission if they are single for the career-related activities of academic women. However, for male academics, this type of permissions was not mentioned.

*It is not about marital status, but family life and communication with the husband have some impact on academic careers. It depends on the family structure you have and your husband. If the husband does not allow a female academic to go conferences or other places, this can have an impact. I can count things similar to this (Female 6, Married with a child, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

*Men have more opportunities to be successful. For example, I do not have this problem, but a lot of academic friends of mine cannot do many things just because their husbands do not permit (Female 8, Married with a child, Assistant professor, Education).*

*Men are freer in conference participation for example. When you look you will say that this is an academic, but her father does not allow her to go somewhere alone. For example, our research assistants. One of them went to Serbia for a conference with her father. I asked what she was doing. She said her father did not let her go alone (Female 5, Married, Assistant professor, Education).*

Even when women reported partner support, they underlined that it was for a limited time. One participant said that when she was writing her Ph.D. thesis, her husband helped her by conducting some domestic tasks like cooking. However, she also highlighted that this help was limited to one-month time period. Besides lacking partner support to advance in their careers and to ensure work-life balance, the experiences of academic women also revealed that their husbands did not want them to advance in their careers.

*When I started my Ph.D., my ex-husband cried while everyone else was congratulating me. He said he had to start his Ph.D. studies because of me. In fact, he was a very successful economist with a bright career. However, as he thought there would be a difference in our education levels if he had stayed with his Master's Degree. Therefore, he became upset. I would not have expected this because he was someone well-educated, and received his Master's Degree abroad (Female 7, Married, Dr. Research assistant, Communication).*

*For Turkish men, it is something bad to be called as someone's husband. If I am called as his wife, he feels proud. I can realize this. When he is asked my occupation, he whispers "An academic" and he skips this part quickly. If he could say that I was a research assistant, he would be happier. It is a very difficult situation. I saw a lot of friends whose marriages ended because of*

*this. Although my husband has supported me in my career, now I can see that he wanted me to take a backseat. My husband has a Master's Degree, when I completed my Ph.D., he said that he needed to do Ph.D. too because I was more educated, and he thought we were not equal any more. When he was more educated, it was not a problem, but when I became more, it became a problem (Female 8, Married with a child, Assistant professor, Education).*

When all these were considered together with the heteronormative division of labor, most women in the study mentioned that being single was more advantageous. The advantages related to work-life balance included being more productive, freedom from the doubled work day, having time to socialize, being able to come to upper management positions, being more active in their jobs, and having more time to work.

*In the general sense, single women are more productive. You can see them in the upper management positions. They can become the heads of some centers. They can be department heads, run projects and can be more active. For married academics, these opportunities decrease incredibly (Female 2, Married with a child, Language instructor).*

*If you are single, your all time is yours. If you are married, you have a doubled work day. There are some women who can balance this, who receive partner support, but their number is really low. Social roles, if you are married, have a partner, single or in a relationship, they all have an impact on your career (Female 4, Single, Assistant professor, Education).*

*If I were single now, I could satisfy all the success criteria that I have set for myself. If I had had my current mindset in the past, I would not have got married. Being an academic is the best decision I have made so far, but I wish I had made this decision before getting married, and my whole life could be this (Female 8, Married with a child, Assistant professor, Education).*

Despite these advantages of being single in the lives of female academics, being single also brought some disadvantages for them. Therefore, this study has shown that marginalization of women continues in academia also when they are single. Some women in this study claimed that being single caused them to be perceived as more dangerous and as a threat to men's success. One of them said that when women are single and ambitious, how they dare to be that ambitious is questioned by men since they see those women as a threat. Another female academic mentioned that when a woman is married, she is more normal and appropriate for expected norms in the eyes of the society. When she is not married, she is not found to be acceptable. If a woman is going to be appointed for a position, if she is married or not is important,

and if she is married, she is more advantageous. This aspect of being single is also important for this study because women are put in a socially unacceptable position if they are single women in academia. This means that women have to make a choice between the double day of marriage or marginalization due to being single while deciding on getting married or not, and both options are negative situations.

In addition, this study also displayed that even when women have servants, or their home-related duties continue unlike men. This finding is in line with Delphy and Leonard (1994) who claimed that although husband's help has an impact on women's careers, women still lack something that men have. It is the right to time off. In their studies this was also valid even when women had domestic workers, and servants in that these helpers needed to be hired, disciplined, and supported (Delphy and Leonard, 1994). Being responsible for the coordination tasks related to home was not something expected from men, and this study revealed the same findings.

*Success is easier for men because they do not take much responsibilities in the family. Women are also responsible for the running of the domestic work. Male academics can more easily focus on their jobs. Imagine that there is a servant, this servant will be hired, supervised, everything will be arranged for her, children will be picked up from school, they will be helped in their homework, the fridge is empty and so on. Men do not do these (Female 9, Single with a child, Associate professor, Engineering).*

Although being married was reported to be as a disadvantage for women academics, it was thought to be an advantage for male academics. The analysis of the interview data revealed that academic men receive more partner support. Their wives prepare their work environment either by running some executive tasks like preparing the dinner or keeping the children busy while their husbands are working. The important thing here that needs to be underlined is that this was not mentioned only by male academics but also female academics.

*You do not have the chance to say that you will not fulfil your responsibilities and you will focus on your research. Being married affects male academics positively. There is always someone to prepare the work environment for them. But female academics both have to do this and work at the same time, they have to work three times, four times more (Female 10, Married with a child, Dr. Lecturer, Arts).*

*It relieves you when your wife shares the life with you. For example, when I want to work, my wife says she will take care of children so that I can go to my room and work (Male 10, Married with children, Associate professor, Health Sciences).*

*My family has had a good contribution to my life. When I was single, I did not know what I ate and drank and sometimes I did not realize that I did not eat anything while working. I did not have a balanced diet, but now while I am working, my wife brings my tea. She brings fruits and my meals are prepared by her. The meals are ready when you go home, you eat and then continue to work (Male 1, Married with a child, Language instructor).*

Despite these benefits of marriage in their life, male interviewees also criticized their working conditions, and claimed that academic job of our day, the academically acceptable worker profile turned this job into a single man's job.

*Being married and having an organized life have a positive impact on academic careers. But on the other hand, the conditions that academia wants, the quantity focus success criteria for example, turn this job into a single man's job. I think that being married is not a barrier to your productivity. But when you look at the general conjuncture, I have some difficulties (Male 10, Married with children, Associate professor, Health Sciences).*

Therefore, some male participants also mentioned some benefits of being single and at least not having young children. These participants had young children, therefore as they experience the difficulties of having young children. One participant gave an example from his colleagues with whom he worked on the same Project. He said that they could work better than him because they did not have young children. He underlined that being married is a disadvantage and lowers the individual's productivity and performance. Similarly, another participant claimed that being single at younger ages could be an advantage for a male academic, but at later ages marriage brings some advantages.

*At younger ages it is more advantageous to be single. I mean until around the age of 30, it is more advantages for men and women to be single. At younger ages, at certain career stages, your work hours can be more flexible. But at later ages, it is more advantageous to be married and have children (Male 2, Married with a child, Assistant professor, Education).*

Another point where male and female attitudes toward marriage differentiated was that some male academics claimed that marriage and home-related responsibilities



could not a barrier to academic success if a person really wanted to succeed. The difference of these academics from their colleagues who thought that marriage and having young children have some adverse impacts on their careers was that they did not have children. Therefore, not having children and childcare responsibilities may have affected this attitude. Unlike their male colleagues, all women in the study saw marriage as an obstacle to their performance and productivity.

*This is more related to the person. There are some people who are married but they have not lost their motivation and they are more successful than our single colleagues. I believe that personal motivation is more important. (Male 8, Married, Assistant professor, Education)*

*I do not think that being married has an impact on your career. Maybe we can say that this is only valid for the young, for them to be able to concentrate better on their work, other than that if you have productivity inside you, you will be productive (Male 9, Married, Lecturer, Health Sciences).*

All in all, this study revealed that women receive less partner support when compared to men and they spend more time doing housework, coordinating housework and more time on care-work. When they experience a conflict in their domestic and work-related tasks due to working hours arranged according to the needs of a male worker, their careers can be opened for discussion, they can be trivialized and presented as something dispensable. Also, some female participants mentioned the importance of permission from the husbands or fathers to participate in some occupational activities. The wives' permission was not a concern for male academics. In addition to lack of partner support, some participants claimed that their husbands felt discomfort when they were advancing in their careers. While being single was an advantage for female academics, male academics' answers to this question can be grouped into three categories. The first group mentioned some challenges regarding marriage and having children especially young children. The second group claimed that being married was advantageous because family and marriage made their lives more organized, and they mentioned partner support. The third group of male academics who were married but did not have children claimed that marriage did not matter and success was more about individual efforts. Therefore, it can be claimed that the factors like having children, and having young children have affected how men

perceive the challenges of marriage for their careers. However, for women having children or not did not create the same effect on their opinions. They all claimed the difficulties of reconciling work and life. All these gender-based differences tell us that women in academia experience work-life conflict more seriously when compared to their male colleagues.

#### **4.4 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment**

Sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing are other important issues that help to perpetuate existing power relations in academia. For the purposes of this study, sexual harassment is defined as any deliberate and persistent acts which include sex-related, unfriendly, abusive and humiliating behaviors that are not wanted by the recipient (Fitzgerald, 1993). According to this definition, Fitzgerald suggests that these behaviors do not have to be physically violent although there is not always an easy escape from these acts. As to the mobbing, it is defined as systematic unfriendly acts toward one individual who is put and kept in a helpless position due to mobbing acts (Leymann, 1996). For the purposes of this study, gender-based mobbing was used to refer to both the victim's and the perpetrator's gender, and the power relations between them. Departing from these definitions, this study revealed that women face sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing more in academia.

##### **4.4.1 Gender issues in mobbing and sexual harassment**

Firstly, for experiences of gender-based mobbing, the analysis of the interview data revealed that mobbing was very common in academia and women experienced mobbing more when compared to their male colleagues. One female interviewee who was an assistant professor in a male dominated discipline mentioned that she was exposed to idea theft, and she would not have been exposed to this if she were a man.

*This male-dominated mindset is a threat to women. For example, I mentioned the idea-theft that I was exposed to. To seek my legal rights now, I am afraid that they can become obsessed with me and prevent me from obtaining my associate professor title. There is something here, you are right but you cannot claim your rights. Therefore, men use this male dominated system in the way that they want (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

What she refers as the male dominated system here is the male bureaucracy as mentioned in Hoffman (1986). This quotation makes it clear that male-domination both in the decision-making and control mechanisms makes it more difficult for women to raise their voices when encounter sexual assault or gender-based mobbing. She is afraid that her right to associate professor title will be hindered by these mechanisms. The same female academic also claimed that working in a male-dominated discipline, they (women) do not have the right to speak. The male academics in her department were said to ask for women's opinion, but in practice female opinions were ignored. Therefore, ignoring women's right to participate in decision making through ignoring their opinions was one way of mobbing that female academics were exposed to in this study. Similarly, another form of mobbing was trivializing what female academics had done. Another woman academic engineer who was an assistant professor gave an example of a male professor who questioned her work in her discipline. Her strategy to deal with this male professor was being humble and modest and claiming that she had a long way to go. Although this female academic did not give this as an example of gender-based mobbing, in this experience it is clear that her work is being trivialized through questioning and she does the same thing to her work by being humble instead of obtaining a more self-confident attitude. As to acceptance of women and their work, it seems that fitting into female stereotypes of being humble and modest, women increase their chances of being accepted without her work being questioned or trivialized by other parties.

In addition, gender-based mobbing was also found in the supervisor-subordinate position. One female participant who was an assistant professor claimed that mobbing is very common in academia and she encountered mobbing when she was working in an administrative position. She had some conflicts with her supervisor. Her supervisor swore, she made a fist and did not say anything. She still thinks how she could accept these things. For one year and a half, she said that she experienced mobbing.

Some male and female interviewees claimed that although mobbing was very common in academia, gender of the victim did not matter. They said that they had not experienced mobbing because of their gender. They also mentioned that women can also get involved in mobbing behavior, and they stated that gender is not the only determiner of mobbing in academia.

*We were exposed to mobbing by one of our female instructors. But, gender was not important for her. I do not think that she did these things just because we were women (Female 2, Language instructor).*

Although both male and female participants said that gender did not matter in the experiences of mobbing, when the findings of this study are considered, more women told experiences of mobbing by their male colleagues including an idea theft, and supervisor male academic-subordinate female academic in management work. The pattern in these experiences point a gender-based mobbing, in which we can consider both the gender of the perpetrator and the gender of the victim in line with the gender stratification existing in society. Also, the academic titles of the victims of mobbing in these experiences tell us that female assistant professors who are in the initial stages of their academic careers may be more vulnerable to gender-based mobbing since the women who shared these experiences were assistant professors. As one female assistant professor who was the victim of an idea theft mentioned, she was afraid to seek for her rights since she was afraid that she could have problems with male bureaucracy to get his associate professor title. Therefore, from this sentence it can be concluded that being an assistant professor makes her more vulnerable. Both gender stratification and being in the lower positions of the academic hierarchy seem to work together in this example. These findings are in line with Hoffman (1986) who set the connections between gender stratification and hierarchal distribution of power and authority. As a consequence, being female and occupying a position in the lower parts of the academic hierarchy affect the distribution of power and authority, and put women at a more disadvantageous position when gender-based mobbing is considered.

As to sexual harassment, previous research on sexual harassment in academia demonstrated that women face a more systematically produced sexual harassment in

the workplace when compared to men due to the socially constructed definitions of sexuality, gender stratification and hierarchical distribution of power and authority (Hoffman, 1986). Hoffman adds that these are as a result of bureaucratic forms of decision-making and control mechanisms. Accordingly, these bureaucratic forms limit female access to resources, strength, and authority (Hoffman, 1986). The results of this study can also be interpreted within this perspective. The analysis of the interview data showed that men do not experience sexual harassment in the workplace, however, both male and female participants of the study told stories regarding women's sexual harassment both in academia and in their previous workplaces.

To begin with, one of the female interviewees who was an assistant professor working in a male-dominated discipline stated that she faced sexual harassment every day. She mentioned that although they were not open and straightforward acts of sexual harassment, but she felt uncomfortable because of glances thrown at her. She added that even the university administration does this. She said that she cannot claim her rights because when she does, she is labelled as quarrelsome. Her utterances are good instances of how bureaucracy, power and sexual harassment are intertwined. University administration, in her case, refers to decision-making and control mechanisms as mentioned by Hoffman (1986). When they are male dominated bureaucratic forms, and when they are the executives of sexual harassment, this situation limits women's opportunities to access strength and authority denying even their rights to claim their own rights.

There was also male academic who mentioned the frequency of sexual harassment to women especially in male-dominated disciplines like Medicine. He said that sexual harassment is normalized in these disciplines because women are thought to accept sexual harassment if are present there in men's world. He concluded that as the number of men increases in a department and it becomes male-dominated, the incidents of sexual harassment to women increase. When there is a more balanced distribution, he said, these incidents decrease. While these interviewee's utterances

are significant to show the relations among power and sexual harassment, they also demonstrate the importance of creating more both quantitatively and qualitatively egalitarian universities.

The relations between the power relations and sexual harassment also showed themselves in the relationships between male professors and female students or female research assistants. One female interviewee said that she has seen many examples of professor-assistant marriages in academia. She added that when men receive their title, they divorce their wives, make some promises to help the young colleague to help her advance in her career, get married to research assistants. This usually happens because of promises: The promise of an easy and quick progress in her career. She found these things naughty for both sides and stated that it is something naughty that a woman sees this as a means of success. Some male participants also mentioned the same power relations in academia.

*Women face more challenges. In the simplest term, an undergraduate student can be sexually harassed by a male professor. A male professor may also tell his female graduate student that he would hire her, makes her his assistant and may sexually harass her (Male 9, Dr. Lecturer, Health sciences).*

Hoffman's (1986) explanation for distribution of power and authority depending on gender stratification and bureaucratic hierarchy is also visible here. In these examples, female students and research assistants clearly suffer from being in the lowest part of this hierarchy and gender stratification. What was interesting for these power relations was that they turned upside down in female instructor and male student relationship. One female instructor mentioned that she was harassed verbally by a group of her students while she was working in academia. Therefore, this can show us that gender and power relations may turn upside and down when women reach the superior positions and gender relations continue to perpetuate. Title or position is not as effective as gender in assigning power to the individuals in this case. Although this is true, another aspect of the situation is that instructors also occupy the lowest positions in academic hierarchy, this may be one reason why their position cannot be as powerful as gender stratification. Therefore, both being a female and

being in an instructor position to which academic hierarchy does not assign power make women vulnerable to sexual harassment of even their male students.

Despite these disadvantages and challenges, the participants mostly believed academia offered them a work environment which is relatively safe from sexual harassment when compared to other sectors. One female participant for example mentioned that working in academia was the only option for women in Communication sector because of sexual harassment in the sector. She said that men can easily start working in the field, but women have the only option of academia because media is an evil sector. She added that when a woman enters media sector, she faces sexual harassment, and even rape. She gave examples from her experience in the field, and said that it is impossible to imagine how those respectful men you see on TV can turn into horrible beings. Therefore, women prefer to stay in academia. Similar comments also came from women in education and engineering sectors. While they mentioned that they did not face sexual harassment in academia, they had experiences of sexual harassment in their previous workplaces.

*I have not worked only in academia, I also worked in the field in companies. When a colleague of yours does something, it is not like sexual harassment, but when your superior does something, women are in a weaker position. When she says "No", she has to quit that Project or the company. Men can insist because they feel more powerful. When he hears "No", he shows that he does not want you there. Women do not want to stay there either (Female 9, Associate professor, Engineering).*

*I have never experienced sexual harassment in academia. However, in all my previous workplaces, there was sexual harassment. All of them were multinational companies (Female 8, Assistant professor, Education).*

*I worked in one of the schools of Ministry of National Education before I started working in academia. There were some duties and all my duties were in the school principal's corridor. Frequently, he came out and invited me to drink tea with him (Female 2, Language instructor).*

All in all, the analysis of the interview data revealed that women face more sexual harassment and mobbing in academia when compared to their male colleagues. Despite this finding, it was also clear that academia offers women a safer workplace than other sectors like media or other workplaces like multinational companies. Some

women shared their experiences regarding gender-based mobbing, but most participants acknowledged that although mobbing was very common in academia, the gender of the victim did not usually matter.

#### **4.5 Challenges and coping strategies**

In this part of the analysis, gender-based challenges and coping strategies of male and female academics are discussed in the light of the analysis of interview data and in the light of the existing literature. The discussion of gender-based challenges and coping strategies is important in that they show the interviewees' agency. In its discussions, this study has claimed that one's personal choices are not always as personal as they seem, and social and structural forces have the power to have an impact on these personal choices (Sandberg, 2013). However, through this discussion, this study also claims that individuals' own choices, in this case their coping strategies, also have the power to transform the society and structures or at least to create desired outcomes. In The World Bank's World Development Report (2012), agency is defined as a person's capability to make effective choices and to turn these choices into desired outcomes for themselves. In the same report, it is argued that women are at a disadvantage in making effective choices and this argument has its connections to Sandberg's (2013) argument which highlights the role of social forces on women's personal decisions. So far, this study has also shown the gendered aspects of individuals' decisions. However, this part, as mentioned earlier, underlines the interviewees' agency in creating desired outcomes for their careers through their own decisions and strategies despite the negative impacts of social and structural forces. Therefore, it is important to understand what kind of challenges men and women face in academia, how they use their agency to cope with these challenges and what the gendered aspects of these coping strategies are. With all these questions in mind, this section handles specific challenges in each theme and the coping strategies with these challenges.



#### 4.5.1 Ambitious success and productivity criteria

As mentioned earlier, the first theme was gender differences in the experiences of success and productivity. Before the challenges I asked the participants what criteria that their success was measured upon. Both male and female participants mentioned the criteria that were asked from them by the Council of Higher Education. These criteria mainly included publications, conference presentations, citations. Both groups of academics mentioned the hardships they face because of these criteria. Both groups mentioned that they do not measure quality but quantity.

*I think in a general sense the criteria for success focus more on quantity rather than quality. I especially think that the official criteria to become an associate professor have some missing points. The number of citations can be thought as a relatively effective means to measure the quality of the publication. However, there is limit to the score that you can get from citations. In this sense, I believe that the criteria set by my own university are better. For example, you receive a different score depending on where you publish your work. On the other hand, measuring success in all departments with the same criteria is not a good idea (Male 7, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

The challenges academics face while they are trying to fulfil success criteria can be grouped in four groups. The first group of challenges is individual challenges. Among these individual challenges were personality traits, having the undergraduate degree in a different field, liking sleep, social life, not being able to focus on a single field, mental barriers, and not minding having a title for women academics. For the male academics, on the other hand, these challenges involved concentration problems, procrastination, perfectionism, being too meticulous, the fear of rejection, self-discipline and social life. The second group of challenges were social challenges. These social challenges were about family life and familial responsibilities for both male and female academics. The third group of challenges were about the institution they work at. These challenges involved teaching hours, difficulty in accessing resources, financial challenges related to the budgets of the universities they work at, the structure of the university (being a foundation university, public university, research university, teaching university), bureaucracy, having administrative duties

and not receiving enough support from their own university for both male and female participants. All these different challenges brought some difficulties for academics.

As to the coping strategies with these challenges, the mentioned strategies showed that both male and female academics used their agency to reach the outcomes that they desire. Male academics said that they extend the deadlines they give themselves, ignore the problem, turn the problems into something more manageable, be happy with what they have, go with the flow, get some hobbies, borrow resources, use some techniques about procrastination, make some self-sacrifices, use the environmental support and collaborate, save the day and keep calm when they face these challenges. Female academics, on the other hand, focused on self-sacrifices, collaboration, acceptance, receiving help from their families, escaping administrative duties, arranging the physical environment, continuing working at home, developing motivational discourses, patience and working hard. These strategies helped both male and female academics to survive in academia and become more successful and productive.

However, a deeper analysis of the interview data showed that there were some gendered aspects of how these agencies are used. Previously, it was mentioned in this study that the design of academia as a workplace is based on male norms. Therefore, fitting into these male norms with a female life style meant more self-sacrifices on the part of the female academics. Female life style meant the responsibility of domestic and care work which were ignored in the definition of academic ideal worker. Therefore, self-sacrifices were something that is more commonly mentioned by female academics. In the quotation given below, the female lecturer explains this female life style in more detail, and mentions her coping strategies with gendered challenges. Through self-sacrifices she aims to reach the desired outcome for herself although she does not seem happy with the self-sacrifices that she has to make.

*Women make more sacrifices to become successful. She needs to think her family life, child, and take everything into account. As a strategy, I try to work after my son sleeps if I can manage to stay awake. I try to use my time at work more effectively. My husband sometimes helps, but it is not always possible. After some time, it turns out that “I do not do anything for myself”. (Female 10, Dr. Lecturer, Arts)*

Apart from self-sacrifices, one challenge that was different in male and female experiences of conducting research was about limited female mobility. In the interview data, the difficulties women faced regarding their security while collecting data from different parts of Ankara were also underlined and their coping strategy is going these places with their male colleagues. One male interviewee said that their department do not send women to these areas to collect data. Therefore, it can be inferred that women do not have freedom to move in all parts of the city to collect data, but they use some coping strategies to overcome this challenge.

*We do not distribute the roles regarding our genders in the department. But only in some cases, for example if we will collect data from Çiğir, we think that one of our male friends should go there (Male 10, Associate professor, Health sciences).*

*I have to go to Sincan for social service courses. I ask Mehmet, who is my colleague here, if he has a free day to come with me to Sincan. I don't know what will happen to me there. When they see a blond lady in the car, there is nothing to do. These are the places even navigation cannot find. I have been sandwiched in traffic many times (Male 5, Assistant professor, Education).*

In conclusion, success was defined in objective terms by male and female academics under the effect of official criteria that they need to fulfil to advance in their careers. However, nearly all of them mentioned some problems regarding these criteria and highlighted its focus on quantity not quality. The challenges they face to meet this success criteria included some personal, social and institutional levels. When their coping strategies were analyzed, it was clear that self-sacrifices were more common among women as a coping strategy when compared to other strategies. Previously, it was mentioned that surviving in academia for women means fitting in a work environment which was not designed for them. To be able to survive and become successful in this environment, they have to make more self-sacrifices. These self-sacrifices were sometimes as a result of being have to take more responsibilities than

they could like thinking the family, children and work at the same time, and they were sometimes as a result of being have to lower their ambitions. What should be underlined here is that being have to lower their ambitions is also a self-sacrifice. One female academic mentioned that while aiming to become a good mother and wife, women lower their ambitions. Therefore, it is clear that although both men and women in this study use some strategies to reach the outcomes they desire for their careers, their agencies had gendered aspects which were visible in the differences in the coping strategies they use.

#### **4.5.2 Gendered hiring and promotion processes**

As to the second theme, it was gendered hiring and promotion processes. The challenges mentioned here were women's self-filtering, lack of courage and escape from responsibilities, fragility on the individual level, facing negative female leadership stereotypes on the social level, and double standards of selection and dominance of male networks on the institutional and structural level. However, as Sandberg (2013) says women's own decisions are shaped by social forces, and one female academic claimed that women's willingness to lead was killed by social and institutional forces. These factors killing women's willingness cause women to think that they will not be elected or appointed, so by losing their courage they engage in self-filtering as the findings of this study suggest. Therefore, here the individual, social and institutional factors create each other in a vicious cycle. The individual self-filtering acts keep women away from management, negative female leadership stereotypes are fed by absence of women and dominance of men in the top management positions and dominant male networks eventually discourage women. This vicious cycle ended in women's absence in top academic management positions and women developed some strategies regarding their invisibility in these positions. As it is women who are absent in academic management positions, they were asked their coping strategies with this invisibility and what they do to become more visible. To become more visible, they used their agency and developed some coping strategies to enter the social and institutional structures that ignore them.

Firstly, getting involved in lobbying was one of these strategies. One female participant claimed that women need to be more insidious for visibility. They have to get involved in lobbying in a secret manner. For example, if a woman becomes a candidate for rectorate, her job is very difficult. She added that women may do it by receiving support from a powerful man. Getting a support from a powerful man also reveals the relations dimension. The answers provided by other female participants also underlined this dimension.

*Relations dimension appears here. They can use some relations. For example, there may be some colleagues that they worked together when they are assistants, they can use such relations. Apart from that, expressing oneself correctly, and meaningfully can be some strategies (Female 10, Lecturer, Arts).*

*Being closer to the ones in the top management can be a strategy like taking part in their projects or duties. In projects, symposiums, or organization they may try to come to the forefront. They try to express themselves in meetings to make themselves more visible (Female 1, Language Instructor).*

Other common strategies used by women to become more visible at university was using middle management positions and working hard if they get a job in the upper management position. Proving themselves was an issue for women.

*As far as I see, they work hard. At least when I look at rectorate team at the moment, I can see that they work hard. In this way, they try to prove themselves (Female 4, Assistant professor, Education).*

*In order to be visible, they can be department heads. They cannot be a dean or a rector, but when they become department heads, they can join the senate meetings. This is the most commonly preferred strategy. Even this is enough in fact (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

For the second theme, it can be concluded that women use relations, get involved in lobbying, work harder and use middle management positions to make themselves more visible at university. All these strategies show that women use their agency to challenge the existing structures that ignore them and in fact they aim to become part of these structures.

#### **4.5.3 Work-life conflict**

The challenges regarding work-life balance were mainly the tension between the heteronormative division of labor at home (social factors) and the requirements of the work (institutional factors). The tension between these factors also had some individual consequences. For example, heteronormative division of labor required women to take more responsibilities at home and the institutions which were organized based on male norms required women to be available to work as much as these norms require. While these norms do not consider family, women have to integrate family work into this routine. This ends in more self-sacrifices. The analysis of interviews showed that women utilized self-sacrifices more when compared to male academics. When the gendered patterns in work-life balance presented in the previous section is considered, this situation becomes more understandable. One female participant of the study claimed that she tries to work after her son sleeps if she can manage to stay awake. She added that at the beginning of each term, she decides to do sport but then seeing the workload she abandons this idea. She said that she tries to manage the situation, but the things she cannot do accumulates and turns into “I do not do anything for myself”. Quite similar sentences were also uttered by another female participant who claimed that women continue to make more self-sacrifices, which brings unhappiness to them.

As a strategy to cope with work-life conflict, both men and women in the study used some coping strategies. They received outside help, but the sources of this help were different for men and women academics. Men received help from their wives, but women received help from other women in their families. The partner support existed but was more limited for women. While one male participant claimed that his wife takes care of children when he needs to work. Another male participant said that his wife prepares dinner for him and so he does not lose much time and can continue working when he goes home. However, women, as mentioned earlier, ask help from other women in their families. One female participant said that she left her daughter to her mother when she needed to work on Saturday. Another female participant of

the study claimed that her friends invite their mothers or mothers-in-law to help them when they need to work harder and longer.

*Firstly, I accepted that this is the structure. I said to myself you have to adapt, otherwise you will lose. Still my daughter is stealing too much time from me. It affects my productivity. I did not use to do this but last Saturday for example I left my daughter with my mother. I came to school and worked the whole day. I need to create time (Female 8, Assistant professor, Education).*

As a different strategy than men, women also used working hard as a strategy to prove that their marriage and children do not have a negative impact on their careers. One female participant of the study said that men do not have to prove that their children or marriage will not have an adverse impact on their career because the default perspective is that someone else will take care of his family and children, probably his wife. But this is not the case for women. They have to work hard to show that their careers are not adversely under the impact of their family and children. She has to prove that she is available to work whenever needed.

Women also utilized fight as a coping strategy. As work was seen as male space, men did not need to fight for what they want to get. However, the situation was different for female academics. One female academic claimed that she uses arguments as a strategy because she has to insist on what she wants, if she wants to get it. She added that there are no reconciliation strategies for this. The need for a fight to get what women want stems from their efforts to fit in a system which was not originally organized considering their life experiences. As mentioned earlier, the ideal academic worker stereotype is in line with male norms of success, which makes it more natural for men to reach success. To reach the same success women have to fight and insist on what they want. As we have seen in this study, women's careers can easily be opened for negotiation if there is a work-life conflict. As one female academic mentioned, according to her husband, she can easily quit her job if the university does not allow to pick up her daughter from school at 4 p.m.; therefore, it is clear that women have to fight for their careers to protect it from the adverse impacts of work-life conflict.

Time management was one of the common strategies that is used by both male and female academics. One of the male interviewees said that he puts the things in order depending on their priority. He read books on personal development and time management, and creates deadlines. He added that he has prepared a one-year personal strategic plan. Another female interviewee claimed that she needed to manage time well, and she added that when she spends the evening chatting with her husband, she wakes up at 4.30 in the morning to compensate. Therefore, it can be concluded time was a concern for both male and female academics in the study, and they have developed some time management strategies.

Other strategies utilized by women regarding work-life conflict included imposing empathy to her husband, by using some techniques from their own department which was psychological counseling, postponing having a baby, managing the division of labor, procrastination and using the academic network of her husband. Other strategies that were utilized by men, on the other hand, included solution-oriented thinking, positive thinking, valuing what they have, buying services, sleeping less, and procrastination.

When all these strategies are analyzed in more detail, it is clear that both men and women use their agency to cope with work-life conflict. However, as women are at a more disadvantageous position due to the domestic and care-work responsibilities that are assigned to them, they also exploit some strategies different than men. They ask for help from other women in their families, work harder to prove themselves, fight for the outcomes that they desire to achieve. The differences in male and female life experiences regarding work-life conflict and women's more disadvantageous position cause women to develop different strategies than men to reach the career outcomes that they want and to be able to survive in a workplace which is designed based on the male norms.



#### 4.5.4 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment

As to the last theme, in accordance with Hoffman (1986), gender stratification on the social level, and male bureaucratic forms on the institutional level shaped women's individual experiences of gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment. As mentioned in the previous part, some women mentioned sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing, none of male interviewees mentioned that they faced sexual harassment or gender-based mobbing. Therefore, this part is about women's coping strategies with these. In academia, women have to use some coping strategies to protect themselves from harassment.

Women's coping strategies included reducing the communication with the harasser as much as possible, wearing more conservatively, acting more conservatively. One participant claimed that if women behaves in an extroverted way, this can be understood as an invitation by men, and therefore women turn in on themselves. One of the most common strategies she mentioned was wearing a ring although they are not married.

*I sometimes have to go to Ministries or state agencies. I bought a solitaire engagement ring for myself. Do you know why? Thinking that I am married, they cannot make advances at me (Female 3, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

Another part of turning in on themselves as mentioned by another participant was becoming more to-the-point in their jobs. She said that women's behaviors and characters become sharper and firmer in order to avoid these negative situations. One participant claimed that women start to only pay attention to the things that can bring them success, for example writing articles.

Another commonly used strategy was being invisible to the harasser. Another female participant gave an example from one of her colleagues and said that she was appointed to an administrative position by another administrative man. She mentioned some unnecessary acts of touching while talking and she added that her friend was appointed as an administrative because the male administrative wanted

to see her more. The interviewee said that her friend quitted her position because of sexual harassment and she did her best not to visible to the harasser.

Another similar strategy was ignoring the harasser and harassment. One female participant stated that women can live it inside them, continue to work as if nothing happened. When she shared the harassment with another colleague, he suggested her to endure for her career. This was also visible in the experience of female academic who mentioned idea-theft in the previous section. She decided to keep quiet because she was afraid that they could harm her career. Therefore, it can be concluded that women sometimes feel have to endure the harassment or mobbing for their careers. This was also mentioned by another participant. She said that although women in academia are more conscious about their rights, they have some worries when it comes to taking the harassment to the court. She said that this also harms the women's names, and it is something difficult to prove. Therefore, women may not prefer to take this risk.

One last strategy used by female academics was showing humble and modest behaviors. One female participant said that she used this strategy as a preventive act to all sexist actions toward her. She thinks that she prevents the other party from showing any behavior of harassment or mobbing because she talks mildly and utters sentences like "Yes, I do not know. I am trying to learn".

*There was a male professor, with high ego, he questioned my studies in my discipline. But I do not mind. I do not care what others think. I said "Is it easy to do this job? I still have a long way to go." Then he softened, she said (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering).*

What is clear from this quotation is that modesty and humility was expected from women, and fitting in these stereotypes increases the chances that women will be accepted without being questioned. Women may fear the penalties when their behaviors are in conflict with what is expected. For example, this interviewee believes that she will be appreciated thanks to her modesty, and she thinks she would face different attitudes if she were in a "I did, I worked" attitude. What is interesting is that when she was asked if she had ever experienced sexual harassment or mobbing,

her answer was that she encountered them abroad, and added that women's work was trivialized. Although she says she did not encounter this trivializing behavior here in academia in Turkey, she in fact does it to her work to avoid other's negative and sexist attitudes including sexual harassment and mobbing.

Therefore, it is clear that gender inequality comes with challenges at different levels which are individual, social, institutional and structural. In this part, these different levels of challenges and coping strategies were handled under the four themes that emerged in this study. This part highlighted some gender-based differences in the challenges and coping strategies with these challenges during academic careers. These coping strategies and agency of male and female academics are affected by women's disadvantageous position at work although both men and women exploited some coping strategies to increase their success and productivity or to be able to cope with work-life conflict. This study claimed that social and structural forces have impacts on women's careers and individual decisions regarding their careers. However, in this part, it was underlined that women's individual choices also had the power to help them survive in academia whose ideal worker is shaped based on male norms and help them reach the career outcomes that they want to achieve, and exist in structures that normally ignore them. It is clear that this agency in this case has some transformative power allowing women to enter the structures that exclude them. Therefore, it is significant to understand how women cope with their disadvantageous position in academia.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GENDER EQUALITY IN ACADEMIA**

This study investigated multiple levels of gender inequality in academia which are individual, social, institutional and structural levels. By highlighting the connections among these different levels of inequality, the findings of this study call for a systematic approach with multiple levels to combat gender equality in higher education institutions. In addition, this study also underlined that gender inequality is not a women's problem and aimed to show the failures of solutions which see it as women's problem. It was clear in the findings of the study that childcare, for example, is not a women's responsibility and problem alone. Seeing it in this way as a women's problem masks the need for social and structural changes, while exempting educational policy-makers and leaders from their responsibilities to create egalitarian workplaces. As a consequence, this study underlines the failures of this perspective and calls for more systematic approaches to gender equality.

Looking at the gender distribution in the numbers of research assistants and professors, this study assumed that the way female academics experience the academic career journey and academic career advancement was different from the way male academics experience this career journey. This assumption was verified by the findings of this study. Therefore, if there is a career advancement problem and a dramatic decline in the number of female academics as one goes up in the academic hierarchy, the proposed policies should take these facts into consideration. Therefore, the first thing that needs to be done is collecting data on what areas of academic life causes difficulties and challenges for young female researchers and for female academics who are in their mid-careers. Both qualitative and quantitative methods

should be used for these purposes and the evidence coming from this need analysis should be the base for actions that will be planned. With the involvement of all levels of the institution, a gender equality plan should be prepared, promoted, and revised with feedback when necessary. In this planning process, it is important not to produce women-only solutions as mentioned before as they create the discourses that see gender inequality as a women's problem alone. As one male academic in the study claimed we need the transformation of academia. Solutions that see gender inequality as women's problem do not provide this transformation, in contrast, they deepen the inequalities by reinforcing the heteronormative division of labor as in the childcare example given in the first paragraph of this chapter. Keeping these in mind, in the first part of this section, this study presents a discussion of academics' institutional and structural expectations to make their working conditions better and in the second part, it makes some policy recommendations regarding the four themes that emerged in the data analysis.

### **5.1 Academics' institutional and structural expectations**

The analysis of the interview data revealed that both male and female academics mentioned some concerns regarding success and productivity criteria used in academia, and they criticized these criteria for turning the academia into a single man's job, and for stressing quantity over quality. Therefore, they claimed that some changes in these evaluation criteria would facilitate their job. For example, one male academic claimed that going abroad for 6 months before one becomes an associate professor is a very harsh criterion. He said that he needed to think about this family, rent, and other expenditures before he went, and said that therefore he could not go. He added that he found this kind of criteria arbitrary and for the joy of the senators occupying a seat in the university senate. Likewise, most academics in this study mentioned a requirement for changes in academic success and productivity evaluation criteria de-emphasizing the importance of quantity, but increasing the importance of quality. Therefore, these suggestions tell us that ideal worker conceptualization as a person who does not have family or similar responsibilities

create problems not only for women but also for men in academia. As a consequence, the first expectation from the institution was about the success criteria that academics were supposed to fulfil. Both male and female academics highlighted the importance of the need for the transformation of academia mentioning the adverse impacts of academic work on their time with their families.

Similarly, while these criteria were found hard to fulfil due to their quantity-based challenging requirements, academics also claimed that their institutions did not facilitate their jobs by preparing the grounds for fulfilment of these criteria. Financial academic incentives and increases in their salaries were the most common examples given by the interviewees in this study. Financial academic incentives and research budgets were underlined because interviewees regarded them as a requirement for their academic success. Having only a limited budget for their research was a concern for them as an obstacle to the quality. Similarly, interviewees also underlined the importance of an increase in their salaries. Financial situation and difficulties were mentioned as a factor pulling their attention away from their work. One female academic claimed that when their financial situation is good, they can buy services for housework and childcare. In this way, she added that she could concentrate better on her job. These financial expectations are important on the grounds that our findings revealed that women suffer more from the work-life conflict. Buying services for housework and children can be one way how women cope with this challenge. Therefore, financial expectations from their institutions were underlined by the interviewees as a facilitator to increase their success and production.

Another suggestion was about the work conditions and especially the female academics working at foundation universities mentioned that working hours make their lives very difficult, and harm their work-life balance, as mentioned in the quotation given below. Similarly, the number of teaching hours were mentioned as a problem for the academics working at public universities. Some of them mentioned the confusion resulting from being a research university. One of them claimed that they are named as a research university but they are expected to teach many hours.

He said that the institution should decide if we are a teaching university or research university. With this argument, he underlined the work-life conflict he experiences.

*The institution can regulate work hours. There is a real need for this. In my contract, I am expected to teach 45 hours a week. I will be teaching at school for 45 hours. Normally we are also supposed to come to school on Saturdays too, but we do not come. When will I prepare for my classes? When will I be with my family? When will I write articles? (Female 5, Assistant professor, Education)*

Therefore, the work hours at foundation universities, especially the teaching hours both in foundation and public universities bring a challenge to academics in that they had difficulties allocating their time between their work and their families. Some structural confusions like being a research university but being have to teach long hours were also expected to be solved by the institution.

As to hiring and promotion criteria, having gender equality as a principle and including it in the values of the universities was another suggestion for the universities. The gender equality center of the university was mentioned and the importance of the meetings and seminars this unit will have was highlighted. It was suggested that universities can take responsibility for gender equality and conduct informative meetings with students and academic staff. One female academic said that male academic staff may not notice that they sometimes occupy the space that belongs to women, therefore such things can be shown and shared. Conducting this kind of cultural activities were suggested not only women but also by men in the study. Interviewees claimed that these activities should not be limited to conferences and seminars, but there should also be consciousness raising activities to empower women. Assigning a representative to each department, contacting departments one by one, and making the efforts visible were also suggested to transform the institution. The importance of these centers was also mentioned by another interviewee.

*There must be centers and units at universities which work for gender equality. When they face a gender discriminatory act, women should be able to go to these centers and share the problem. Universities should take appropriate acts in these cases (Male 9, Dr. Lecturer, Health sciences).*

Both male and female academics also expressed their expectations from their institutions regarding childcare. They agreed that there must be a kindergarten at university, and if financial conditions do not allow parents to send their kids to kindergarten, they can bring them to the kindergarten here at university. Also, for older children organization of study groups, art or sport activities by their school was suggested. Female academics whose university had a primary school and middle school in it were happy to have this opportunity but still they mentioned some limitations regarding this help.

*If there were some facilities and study groups for children after their school, and if women can bring their children to school in the morning and pick them up at the end of work day, this would facilitate my job. These can include some art and sport activities. After I pick them up from school, I take them to chess, to sports because the school does not provide such activities. If school provided such activities, my life would be easier. In addition to these, the numbers of kindergartens and pre-school institutions are not enough (Female 9, Associate professor, Engineering).*

Therefore, it can be concluded that having a kindergarten, and school for children in the university campus was important both male and female academics. In addition, another female interviewee mentioned an expectation regarding childcare in conference organizations. She mentioned that she has to pay more for the child if she wants to attend a conference. Her suggestion was both financial facilities regarding travel and accommodation expenses and childcare option while she is in the conference. She argued that this would facilitate women's job.

As to sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing, both male and female said that sexual harassment consciousness raising activities should be conducted at universities. One female participant said that women should be given this consciousness because they should know that when they remain silent if they face a sexual harassment incident, they contribute to legitimization and normalization of the incident. Women should be encouraged to raise their voices against sexual harassment, and when they do this, they should know that they do something good. In addition to the consciousness raising activities, women said that severe sanctions



are needed to prevent both. One female academic suggested that women's words about the harassment should be given importance. She added:

*People still look for other proofs for sexual harassment. When someone is harassed at work, other men support the harasser. Women's words and arguments are trivialized and lost in the process. In this way, this male network situates women as a liar. This is very discouraging for women. If sanctions were imposed by considering women's words, this will decrease these incidents (Female 9, Associate professor, Engineering).*

As can be seen the female interviewee said that the male network covers the sexual harassment incident and does not allow women to seek their rights. A similar argument was also put forward by a male academic who claimed that although there are legal sanctions they are not used in practice. He underlined that in sexual harassment, the incident should not be covered, and legal processes should be enabled. If the legal sanctions were used, the number of incidents would decrease. Therefore, academics expected their institutions not to cover sexual harassment incidents, but enable necessary sanctions and legal processes when necessary.

Some academics, on the other hand, produced some solutions that see these problems as women's problem and those solutions should be cautiously used. For example, different from male academics, female academics also expected their universities to adjust their expectations from them. One female academic claimed that women's responsibilities should be considered by the institution and some facilitator solutions can be produced, and expectations from women can be adjusted. However, these kinds of solutions like adjusting expectations from them can have two negative impacts on women's careers. The first one is that this adjustment may mean lowering expectations from women. For example, another female academic said:

*An administrative duty should not be given to an assistant professor and a female academic. I do not want these duties because they become a burden as an addition to the work at home and work at school. I believe that these duties should be done by male associate professors and professors unless women want to do them voluntarily. I do not prefer them, and I do not want them to be given to me. Our institution can do positive discrimination here, this facilitates our job (Female 6, Assistant professor, Engineering)*

Although she has a point in mentioning the work-life conflict she experiences, giving administrative duties to only men is simply not a solution. The reason for this is that giving administrative duties to men, home-related responsibilities to women reproduces the heteronormative division of labor, which was mainly responsible for the work-life conflict the female academic has been experiencing. She also uses the concept positive discrimination to express her idea about this issue. The second adverse impact is that women-oriented solutions can isolate the existing institutional and structural problems as women's problem only. However, they are not simply women's problems, there are social and institutional factors in the background. If we name these problems as women's problems, we lose this perspective and recreate the inequality by failing to produce multilevel real solutions.

A similar type of solution was produced by one of the male academics. Another male participant suggested a longer maternity leave for women by criticizing the welfare state implementations.

*Social state cannot fulfil its responsibilities. Financial conditions are important for this, and they have negative impacts on our lives. For example, you have a maternity leave but what will you with the child after 4 months? A baby needs his/her mother until the age of 1. Therefore, maternity leave should be for a year. When women are at a disadvantaged position, this also affects fathers in a negative way (Male 2, Assistant professor, Education).*

Thinking that giving women longer maternity leaves is not enough to solve the inequality problem. Indeed, this can have some negative impacts in terms of gender equality. Firstly, keeping women away from work for longer period of time is a concern for their career advancement. Secondly, this reinforces the belief that childcare is women's job, and reproduces heteronormative division of labor. In these examples, the solutions that see the problems as women's problems have some drawbacks.

As to women's absence in top administrative positions, the expectation of some academics from the institution was creating a more egalitarian workplace. Women were expected to be given more space in upper and top administrative positions.

Women were also expected to be included in male networks in these positions. One female academic mentioned that this will bring women's perspective into the work, some innovations and facilities for women in administratives and academic environments. Bringing quotas for women in the administrative positions were also suggested by one male academic.

It was suggested in this study that universities and faculties meet regularly with their academic staff to talk about the difficulties that their academic staff face, and also to talk about what kind of solutions they expect from their institutions. In this way, universities can prepare better work conditions for their academics. However, some male and female academic also mentioned that these inequalities are not limited to universities. They mentioned that these inequalities and problems are directly related to the whole society. The female academic claimed that solving the problems here on its own does not solve many problems because when leave the university at the end of the work day, we have to join the society outside. They can solve the problems here, but they cannot call my husband and say "(Her name) needs to attend a conference". Their emphasis was on a social transformation. Another female academic mentioning the importance of social transformation suggested media literacy education starting at a very young age. According to her, media literacy helps children to have gender awareness before they enter the labor force. She gave the social construction of gender roles in advertisements as an example and claimed that trying to give this awareness to adults is more difficult than giving it to children.

All in all, interviewees in this study had some institutional and structural expectations to facilitate their work and family lives. Their expectations from their institutions and from the structure in which they work was discussed in this part. Before concluding this part, two important points need to be underlined. Firstly, what was mainly highlighted in this part should be the caution that solutions and expectations that see gender equality as a women's problems do not serve to solve inequality problems as they carry the danger to deepen the inequalities by legitimizing the institutional and structural acts and putting the burden on the shoulders of the individual woman. In

addition to these, as mentioned by some academics in the previous paragraph, the transformation of academia needs to be supported by the transformation of society as these inequalities also have a social dimension. Therefore, any systematic approach to gender inequality in academia has to consider these facts.

## **5.2 Policy recommendations**

Keeping academics' institutional and structural expectations in mind, this study allows to make some policy recommendations for gender equality in academia. Each theme that emerged in this study is discussed through policy recommendations that can make the academia a better workplace.

### **5.2.1 Redefining ideal worker and success criteria**

One way to transform the academia is to redefine the ideal academic worker. This ideal academic worker should not be someone who has no domestic or caregiving responsibilities and who can work from nine to five every day. This definition should change to include anyone who has domestic and caregiving responsibilities. Baker (2010) claimed that the long-established academic gender gap is reflection of institutional expectations which value ambition, long working hours, and high publications and being productive in all stages of academic career. As the interviewees in this study mentioned academia in Turkey have the same expectations as mentioned in Baker's study. Both male and female academics criticized the quantity-oriented success criteria imposed on them. However, as Baker argued women's domestic and caregiving tasks were not compatible with these expectations and caused them to diminish their ambitions, work part-time and take some time off during their career journeys which all feed the academic gender gap by affecting women's careers adversely. Therefore, for the transformation of academia there is a need for redefining who is an ideal academic worker and what success criteria are expected from him/her. Redefining this ideal worker and his/her success criteria mean better work conditions for both men and women.

This study also verified the gap between the stereotypes of an ideal worker and stereotypes of women, and demonstrated that women had to face negative stereotypes at work which marginalized them. Whether this stereotyping is done consciously, or unconsciously, it is something that need to be fought against because it has adverse impacts on women's careers as shown by the findings of this study. Therefore, higher education institutions should organize consciousness-raising activities for all the members of their institution which include academic staff, administrative staff and students. These consciousness-raising activities should aim to create an awareness regarding negative stereotypes about women and women managers in the workplace, the confirmation bias and discrimination bias. As one female academic in the study mentioned male academics may not be aware that they sometimes invade women's individual space, therefore it could be a good idea to raise this awareness through such consciousness raising activities. These activities will be beneficial in preventing marginalization of women in academia. In addition, promotion of female-type behaviors like being amenable and open to communication is possible through these consciousness raising activities. Otherwise, male type as they are defined in this study behaviors will continue to be seen as a strength while female type behaviors will continue to be seen as a weakness. In addition, as academic environment is very competitive, engaging in self-promotion act is necessary. These consciousness-raising activities should also focus on this aspect of academic environment. This study found different patterns of self-promotion for men and for women. The female answers showed that women engaged in self-promotion in a more emotional, modest and passive ways while men engaged in the same behavior was seen as more objective, cooler, more ambitious and work-oriented. These findings were in line with gender stereotypes and Moss-Racusin and Rudman (2010) mentioned that gendered behavior expectations from a woman are violated when women focus more on themselves and engage in self-promotion. Therefore, women can lose their ability to promote themselves even when it is necessary. This study also revealed different reactions to men talking about their success and women talking about their success. While men's self-promotion was seen as something more natural, women's self-promotion was seen as an exaggeration. Therefore, in this competitive environment,

women should also be able to use self-promotion when necessary and consciousness-raising activities can act to encourage them to do them, and provide them with the means which will help them while using self-promotion.

In addition to these, there must also be efforts to increase the visibility of female academics. For example, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi in Romania initiated Women Researchers Day to increase female academics' visibility and recognition by promoting their professional profiles and awarding distinguished female researchers (European Institute for Gender Equality, 2016). Therefore, universities can also organize such days and give such awards to increase and support the visibility of female academics.

All in all, to transform the academia to make it more egalitarian in terms of an expected ideal worker and success criteria expected from him/her, these steps should be taken:

- Consciousness raising activities need to be planned and conducted to combat negative stereotypes about women together with confirmation bias and discrimination bias, to prevent marginalization of women in academia, to help female academics to engage in self-promotion behavior more easily when necessary.
- The activities that will promote women's visibility in science should be organized. These activities can include events like Women Researchers' Day as exemplified by European Institute for Gender Equality (2016). Similarly, organizing events to bring students and successful female academics together especially in male-dominated departments and to present them as role models for female students serves to increase women's visibility in academia.

### **5.2.2 Gender equality in academic hiring and promotion**

This study revealed a female disadvantage in academic hiring and promotion processes. For gender equality in academic hiring and promotion consciousness raising activities, temporary positive action, female quotas can be used, and some changes in the hiring and review committees can be made.

Firstly, consciousness-raising activities can also be beneficial in reducing the discriminatory acts and biases in hiring and promotion processes. The literature presented in this study revealed that there may be some stereotype bias or linguistic bias in hiring and promotion processes (Cleveland, Stockdale, & Murphy, 2000; Rubini, & Menegatti, 2014). Thus, it is necessary to conduct consciousness-raising activities with the academic recruiters and managers. In this way, gender bias that lead to discriminatory acts in academic hiring and promotion can be prevented or reduced.

In addition, as one of the female academics in the study claim, if the gender percentages in a department is 95% to 5%, some positive action can be taken to create a more gender balanced work environment. Again, as mentioned by another male participant of the study, this is also important for providing students with different role models. Therefore, in the cases where the distribution does not seem natural, temporary positive action can be beneficial. Besides positive action, female quotas are another way of promoting gender equality especially in management positions. Although these two solutions were criticized by some interviewees in this study, they are good ways to leak into the male networks in male dominated disciplines and top academic management positions.

Furthermore, in a report by European Institute for Gender Equality (2016), female representation in all stages of hiring was presented by the example of University of Copenhagen in Denmark. At this university, before a vacant position is filled, an application from both sexes was waited for. Also, both in hiring and review

committees, there was at least one person of each sex. When the findings of this study are considered, these measures can also be used in our context. As a result, higher education institutions can use such rules to regulate gender equality in academic hiring and promotion.

Also, universities can develop a mentorship program, in which women who are in more senior positions in academia can guide their young colleagues. This mentorship should be different from the professor-research assistant relationship. It should be related more to career mentorship. This can be a measure for preventing the dramatic decline of women in the upper stages of academic hierarchy.

For gender equality in academic management positions, as mentioned in the report by European Institute for Gender Equality (2016), in 2014 Ghent University in Belgium requested 40/60% gender balanced of representation in the elections of its highest decision-making body. In this way, for the first time at this university gender balance was achieved. In addition, faculties were supposed to have at least one male and one female candidate for the elections. When this balance could not be achieved in the results of the election, the person who has the least vote in the over-represented group gave his/her seat to the member of the underrepresented group who has the highest number of votes. This university was a good example for gender equality in academic management. As one male participant of this study stated, academic managers should be elected, and the election system should not allow the dominance of one group as in the example of Ghent University.

Together with these policies recommended, there is a need for a change in the definition of leadership and the characteristics of a good leader. This study showed that while male-type behaviors (as defined in this study) are seen as strength, female-type behaviors are seen as a weakness. This is one reason why women have to make some concessions to look more credible and reliable, and also one reason why women are not in top management positions. Most interviewees in the study argued that the representative of a powerful leader in people's minds is a male character. Gender



equality in top management positions is possible through breaking this bias. Therefore, universities need to redefine leadership, and promote it through awareness-raising activities in their institutions.

All in all, to accomplish gender equality in academic hiring, promotion and management, these steps should be taken:

- Consciousness raising activities should be conducted to prevent gender and discriminatory bias in academic hiring and promotion.
- Temporary positive action should be taken and female quotas can be brought especially in male-dominated academic, research and management positions.
- The hiring and review committees should be gender-mixed and gender-sensitive.
- Ideally, vacant positions should not be filled in unless an application from each sex is received. However, this may not always be possible. In these cases where this ideal is not possible, when a male candidate is hired for a vacant position, for the next vacant position a female academic should be sought.
- A mentorship program should be developed where senior women mentor young female academics and researchers. However, it is essential that gender equality is important for these senior women, which means senior women should have gender-sensitivity and should be able to encourage young female academics and researchers in their careers.
- It is easily understood from the absence of female academics in the top management positions that the academic election and appointment systems in Turkey does not favor female academics. Therefore, research should be conducted and encouraged to understand the structural factors excluding women from this system such as strong and close male networks and double standards of hiring and promotion and etc., and the research findings should be used to in policy making to remove the structural barriers.

### **5.2.3 Work-life balance in academia**

This study found work-life conflict examples both in the lives of female academics and also in the lives of male academics, however, it was also clear that women suffered more from this conflict due to the roles that are assigned to them such as domestic responsibilities and caregiving responsibilities. While mentioning their expectations from their institutions, some academics mentioned that maternity leave must be longer. However, this perspective was criticized in this study in that producing solutions like longer maternity leaves do not solve the inequalities because they reinforce the belief that childcare or other domestic responsibilities are women's duties. In this way, heteronormative division of labour becomes sharper and women's place as home and men's place as workplace are differentiated. Therefore, academic institutions should firstly abandon the belief that childcare and domestic work are women's responsibility and problem since work-life balance comes with the transformation of academia as discussed in the first section of this policy chapter. This requires individual, social and institutional transformations at the same time.

Firstly, as the interviewees expected from their institutions, institutions should provide child-care facilities for the academic staff. Some academics also mentioned that for after-school art and sport activities for children could be beneficial for them. For these facilities, financial concerns were also mentioned by the interviewees in the study, and this study suggests that academic staff should be able to benefit from such facilities in their own institution without financial concerns. This is necessary for the reconciliation of work and life responsibilities on the part of the academics.

As to the maternity leave, this study suggests that childcare facilities are not only women's problem. Therefore, parental leave policies rather than maternity leave policies are promoted in this study. Some good examples were shared by European Institute for Gender Equality (2016), and these good examples are discussed in the light of the findings of this study. The first example comes from University of Southern Denmark, and it is about a teaching-free period after a parental leave. The

work-life balance supporting policies of this university included two important measures. The first one is that they provide their academics with regular academic updates when they are using a parental leave, and secondly, they offer a teaching free period for the academics who have been away for parental leave for six months or more. These two specific measures are said to promote work-life balance with specific consequences on young female researchers. Therefore, when considered the concerns of the academics in this study, applying these two measures would also help them. Secondly, Hanken School of Economics in Finland also make use of some work-life reconciliation policies for the academics who work there. They aim to remove the negative consequences of parental leave on the careers of academics. To this end, they automatically extend the contracts of teaching and research staff who work on temporary basis if they were on a maternity (three months), paternity (two weeks) or parental leave (six months). One male assistant professor in this study also mentioned that their contracts have to be renewed every two years. In addition, losing research time -which means not being able to conduct research in maternity leave-, and being able to return to work as soon as possible was also a concern for the interviewees in this study. Therefore, learning from the example of Hanken School of Economics in Finland, such policies can make parental leave attractive not only for women but also for men.

In addition to these, institutions should be willing to make necessary work arrangements for both male and female academics for different needs of a life course. These different needs can also include illnesses or illness-related care-work, which can require both long-term or short-term arrangements on the part of the work. The transformation of work culture is also necessary to accommodate these needs and this new work culture is directly related to transformation of definition of ideal academic worker.

All in all, this study revealed that women suffer more from work-life conflict and they received less partner in reconciliation of work and life. Therefore, institutional policies should make parental leave more attractive for men and women. As policy

recommendations to help academics reconcile work and life, this study suggests that the institutions and educational policy-makers should

- provide their female and male academics with childcare opportunities.
- implement policies to attract men to take parental leave. Consciousness-raising activities should also be conducted with managers and commissions that will approve these leaves and they should be informed about the importance of parental leave.
- implement return-to-work policies like no teaching load or reduced teaching load and automatic renewal of temporary contracts. Another suggestion related to return-to-work policies could be assigning distance education classes to these academics.

#### **5.2.4 Gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment**

This study found that women face gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment more when compared to their male colleagues in academia. Therefore, the interviewees suggested that their universities should found a preventive unit, and such cases should also be taken there. Also, they said that there must be severe sanction for the perpetrators of gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment. Furthermore, they expected their institutions to develop educational awareness raising activities to prevent these acts in academia. There was also both male and female academics who claimed that the existing sanctions were not implemented in these cases, and this harms women. One female academic mentioned that male network covers the sexual harassment incident and does not allow women to seek their rights.

Based on these expectations, this study suggests preventive units at universities. The universities should have gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment preventive units and policies. These units should organize awareness-raising activities, and participation to these activities should be for all academics, administrative staff and students. When a person in the school campus faces harassment, he/she should be able to go to these units and share the situation. When a harassment or mobbing case

is shared, sanctions should be used on the perpetrator. European Institute for Gender Equality (2016) shares an example regarding this. Paris Institute of Political Sciences prepared a very detailed protocol regarding gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment. This protocol was everyone in the campus including students, academic and administrative staff. Its purpose was to create a respectful working environment for everyone in the campus, a safe environment to report any harassment incidents and a guarantee for the privacy of the information that was shared. The institution established a monitoring unit, there were 11 people who were actively working for this unit, being in direct contact with people in the campus and gender equality officers. This staff received trainings on yearly basis, and they were also in charge of preparing and disseminating informative booklets on sexual harassment and a devoted hotline. This is a good example in that all universities need such protocols and units to prevent and combat these harassment incidents.

To conclude, the higher education institutions need to be strict in their standing against any form of gender-mobbing and sexual harassment incidents. To prevent and combat these incidents, universities should

- clarify the point that any form of gender-based mobbing or sexual harassment is not tolerated in the school campus.
- sign protocols and establish units to combat sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing and to take preventive measures about them.
- inform all the habitants of their campuses which include academics and administrative staff and students about what gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment is. All these people should also be informed about the campus-specific types of harassment and mobbing, including sexual harassment of female students by a professor who threatens them with grades, stalking and flirt violence and etc.
- inform all the habitants of their campuses about the importance and necessity of reporting these incidents.
- use legal sanctions for the perpetrators of these acts.

### **5.2.5 Other policy recommendations**

If universities want to promote gender equality in their institutions, one strategy should be gender mainstreaming. United Nations (2002) define gender mainstreaming as efforts to integrate gender equality into the mainstream of activities, instead of dealing with them as “add-on” s. This is important in that dealing with gender equality as add-ons to existing policies and structures marginalizes the efforts for gender equality. Therefore, gender equality perspective should be in all activities of the institution as an integrated and indispensable part rather than a part which is added later.

Keeping gender mainstreaming in mind, research and teaching about gender issues should be encouraged in all disciplines. For example, University of Santiago de Compostela in Spain initiated research content and teaching awards for research projects and teaching practices that integrate the gender dimension. The aim of these awards is to increase the visibility of research and teaching activities that promote gender equality (European Institute for Gender Equality, 2016). Similarly, in the same report by European Institute for Gender Equality, another example about this issue was from Linköping University. Linköping University in Sweden started gender lectureships in 2005 with the purpose of helping faculties to mainstream gender equality. These gender lectureships aimed to integrate gender dimension in all study programs and courses and aimed to cultivate pedagogical approaches to gender sensitive teaching and gender equality in academia.

Gender mainstreaming in research and teaching is also significant in several ways. Universities can also use these research findings for evidence-based policy making in their institution. Universities also have responsibilities for the society they exist in, and gender mainstreaming in teaching can transform the society by changing the mindsets of the students. As mentioned earlier, without social transformations these institutional transformations become very difficult. Therefore, if possible institutional policies should also trigger wider changes in the society and these changes should support gender equality policies. To this end, conducting gender

research serves to understand the gender inequalities in society better and while presenting an analytical picture of these equalities, these findings can be used as evidence for policy-making to transform the society. Similarly, training students as gender-sensitive individuals means training the professionals of the future as gender-sensitive people. This sensitivity will definitely be a life-long awareness, which will play an important role in the transformation of the whole society. Policy-makers should act with this awareness that academia has the power to affect and transform whole society through the individuals it educates.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **CONCLUSION**

This study aimed to investigate gender-based challenges and coping strategies in academic career investment. The data received from the Council of Higher Education website show that women in academia in Turkey become less visible higher positions of academic hierarchy. Looking at the data regarding gender distribution of male and female academics in research assistant and in professor positions in Turkey, this study started with the assumption that the way male academics and female academics experience this academic career journey must be different so that it becomes possible to explain the sharp decline in the number of female professors when compared to the number of female research assistants. Related to this, the present study argued that universities are gendered organizations, and work conditions in these workplaces are still organized around a traditional ideal worker who does not have any domestic and caregiving responsibilities (Williams, 1989; Lynch, 2007; Acker, 2011). Taking these major assumptions and arguments into consideration, this study used feminist standpoint theory, which set the framework in the investigation of male and female experiences in the academic environment as a workplace. To this end, the study was designed as a qualitative inquiry which helped to understand the challenges male and female academics face in their academic career advancement in a more detailed and comprehensive way. Therefore, the present study sought to examine the individual, social, institutional and structural challenges male and female academics face while revealing their coping strategies with these challenges. With this aim in mind, the research questions of the study were as follows:



- What are the personal, social, institutional and structural gender-based challenges academics face in their career progression at universities in Turkey and how are these challenges related?
- What are the coping strategies of academics with these gender-based challenges to increase their success and productivity?
- What can be some policy recommendations to decrease gender-based challenges experienced by academics through their academic careers at universities in Turkey?

The analysis of the interview data with male and female academics revealed four main themes regarding gender-based career challenges. These included gendered definitions of success and productivity, gendered hiring and promotion processes, gender issues in work-life balance/conflict, and sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing experiences. The first theme which was gender differences in experiences of success of productivity, and the findings revealed that some differences in how male and female academics experience, conceptualize and perceive success. Success was mostly attributed to men in the public eye, and this had some consequences in terms of the self-confidence male and female academics have. In addition, the women were perceived to be less credible and reliable and this perception was explained through negative stereotypes that women face. These negative stereotypes lower women's academic credibility and reliability while strengthening male credibility and reliability. Therefore, women sometimes had to make some concessions from their own characteristics and obtain more male-type behaviors to be affected less by these negative stereotypes. In addition, self-promotion was another issue discussed under this theme, and there were some differences in how men and women engage in self-promotion. These self-promotion behaviors were in line with gender stereotypes in that women were reported to be more modest, emotional and passive in self-promotion while men were perceived to be more objective, ambitious, work-oriented and cooler according to the female interviewees. While some of the male interviewees claimed that women were more modest, some of them reported no differences between male and female self-promotion and some of them found women

more ambitions. This situation was explained by the possible arguments in this study. The first one was that women have to open some space for themselves in the men's world, and that's why they can behave in more ambitious ways. Secondly, in line with gender stereotypes when modesty is the expected behavior from women, any self-promotion act can be regarded as too much and too ambitious. In addition to these, quantity-focused productivity expectation was criticized both male and female academics and they both had some coping strategies with the challenges they face in academia. As a coping strategy, self-sacrifices were more commonly mentioned by female academics. Women have to make self-sacrifices because there is no natural connection between their gender and ideal worker stereotypes, therefore they have to work harder to earn their status.

The second theme that emerged was gendered hiring and promotion processes. This study found that double standards, the impact of gender stereotypes, and male networks have an influence on academic hiring and promotion processes. Firstly, the study revealed a specific set of challenges for both working in a female dominated discipline and working in a male dominated discipline for male and female academics. This study underlined the importance of quantitative equality in these disciplines to break the horizontal segregation, and supported a more balanced distribution. Therefore, an investigation of hiring and promotion processes was a must. The finding regarding this must showed double standards in academic hiring. One participant openly said that men are given the priority in hiring and promotion unless another person has a friend at court. As to quotas and positive discrimination discussion, some participants mentioned some concerns regarding the quality and workplace peace. However, the definition of quality itself was criticized in this study together with the gender-blindness of meritocracy. This study also found that gender stereotypes regarding women were perceived as negative although they could turn into positive aspects in academic leadership. The example was being emotional, although it was marked as a negative characteristic by some participants, for some participants it was something positive which facilitated communication with female colleagues and leaders. Therefore, this study suggested reconceptualization and re-

questioning of leadership qualities to embody female characteristics that would be good for the work environment. For example, in this study, while in the general sense, being open to communication was reported to be a sign of weakness, the female interviewees mentioned that it is one of the good qualities for healthy workplace communication and it should be promoted in society. Therefore, the new definition of leadership should not be under the influence of stereotypical views of men and women. Women's coping strategies with their invisibility in top academic management positions involved lobbying, getting support of a powerful man, using middle management positions and working harder.

The third theme that emerged in this study was work-life balance in academia. Findings revealed that problematizing the heteronormative division of labor was necessary because female respondents claimed that they have more responsibilities when compared to their husbands regarding home, childcare and other care work activities. Women still needed to get the permission of their husbands, or fathers in order to attend the career-related activities. Being married was a disadvantage for women due to housework and childcare, but for male academics it could be something advantageous at times in that their partners prepared the work environment for them. Being married and having children did not change female attitudes toward marriage, but having children seemed to change male attitudes toward the effects of marriage on academic careers. Male academics who were married but did not have children claimed that academic success depends on the personal ambitions, and marriage does not affect success. However, other male academics who had children especially young children also mentioned the impacts of negative impacts of marriage on academic careers although these challenges were not as strong as the challenges mentioned by female academics. Although female academics were of the same opinion about the adverse effects of marriage and children on their academic careers, being single also brought some challenges for them. They were marginalized and they were not found socially acceptable as they were not married. Furthermore, working at a foundation university which had long and strict work hours which were designed for a male academic who did not have any domestic or care-work activities

like picking up children from school also created extra difficulties for female academics who had these responsibilities. Their children's school hours and their work hours were not the same, and this was an extra difficulty for them which needed an extra arrangement. Both male and female academics had some coping strategies regarding work-life conflict. They both used some time-management techniques. Women reported self-sacrifices more. Women have to make self-sacrifices because they have to reconcile success expectations which are shaped by male norms and their female lifestyles. Both men and women received outside help, the sources of this help were different for them. Men received help from their wives, but women received help from other women in their families. Women's different strategies than men included working harder and fighting for what they wanted. The fight originated from the conflict between the female lifestyle and male norms of success. This conflict makes it more difficult for women to reconcile the demands of work and the demands of life, and they have to fight for what they want. Women's other strategies, as the female participants mentioned, involved imposing empathy to their husband, postponing having a baby, managing the division of labor, procrastination and using the academic network of their husbands. Men's strategies, in their own words, on the other hand involved solution-oriented thinking, positive thinking, valuing what they have, buying services, sleeping less and procrastination.

The last theme that emerged in this study was gender based mobbing and sexual harassment in academia. The findings demonstrate that mobbing is very common in academia, and some female interviewees mentioned gender-based mobbing such as trivializing their work or ignoring their voices. There were also participants who claimed that mobbing was not based on gender, although it was very common. However, going back to the definition of gender-based mobbing used in this study which considers both the gender of the perpetrator and the gender of the victim, as female interviewees reported more of being victim to these cases, it can be argued that there are reflections of gender stratification in this perpetrator-victim relationship, but the interviewees may not have this perception in their minds. Also, the academic titles of the victims who shared their mobbing experiences were

assistant professors who are in one of the lowest positions of academic hierarchy. At this point it seems that the disadvantages related to gender stratification and academic hierarchy work together to create mobbing experiences for women, and the perpetrators of mobbing in the shared stories were men. As to sexual harassment, the analysis of the interview data showed that men do not experience sexual harassment in academia, but both male and female participants of the study told some stories about sexual harassment to women both in academia and in their previous workplaces. Working in male dominated disciplines made women more vulnerable in terms of sexual harassment. The reason for this was that as the analysis of the interview data revealed men thought these disciplines as their own area, and women were not welcomed. Women were marginalized through sexual harassment. Furthermore, gender and power relations revealed themselves in male professor, female research assistant/student relationship. However, these power relations turned upside down in male student, female instructor relationship in that one female instructor mentioned she was harassed verbally by some of her students while she was working in academia. Title and position were not found to be as effective as gender as a determinant of power. Although this is true, the academic title of this woman was an instructor. As instructors are in the lowest position of academic hierarchy, it is also possible to argue that being in the lowest position of this hierarchy and the disadvantageous position in gender stratification work together to produce this kind of sexual harassment experiences for academic women. The same is also valid for the female research assistants and male professor. Many academics in this study gave these examples as instances of sexual harassment in academia. Despite these challenges mentioned, the analysis of the interview data also showed that academia offered a relatively safer work environment for women when compared to other sectors like media in which sexual harassment were more common and savage. This was one reason why women preferred to stay in academia.

All these discussions showed us that women occupy a disadvantaged position in academia, but women still used their agency to challenge existing structures that ignore their presence. By presenting a discussion of gender differences coping

strategies of academics with the career-related difficulties in academia, this study highlighted that women's agency through coping strategies they develop helps them survive in gendered universities which favor a male ideal worker. However, these coping strategies are not always easy to handle as this study has shown. Women had to make more self-sacrifices to be able to look successful and productive even when they have the same resume with their male colleagues, or they have to work harder in order to show that their family life does not interfere in their careers. A good career is not something naturally assigned to them and is not something that is naturally expected from them, therefore they have to fight for what for what they want. Similarly, for their invisibility in academic management positions, they involve in lobbying, getting support of a powerful man, or they use middle management positions like being the department head. To reduce the harmful effects of gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment on their careers, they reduce the communication with the harasser as much as possible or try to ignore the situation. Although gender-based coping strategies of women such as making more self-sacrifices, fighting, or avoiding the harassers are not positive experiences for women, without these examples of agency women's survival in academia would be much more difficult.

As mentioned earlier, all these themes and coping strategies show women's disadvantaged position in academia. Another important finding of this study is that it shows how male academics normalize and reproduce gender inequality in academia. For example, in the discussion of gender patterns in self-promotion it was claimed by most male academics that there were not any gender differences in how male and female academics talk about their success. However, most female academics claimed that men are more aggressive in self-promotion. Therefore, in this example it seems that male academics normalized their privileges and are not aware of how female academics experience self-promotion. Similarly, double standards in academic hiring and promotion was normalized by one male academic who openly claimed that male applications are examined first. Another male academic claimed that if he had had the authority, he would not have chosen female academics to occupy academic

management positions on the grounds that family and children are more important for women. Another male academic claimed that he did not prefer working with female academic managers since they are difficult to get on with. These explanations also show how the minds of male academics are shaped by gender stereotypes and how male academics shape the academia in return.

A deeper analysis of these themes that emerged in this study demonstrate that these gender-based challenges are at the intersection of individual, social, institutional and structural level challenges that have created gender inequalities in academia. Looking at the interview data, individual level gender-based challenges can be exemplified as self-doubts on their academic capabilities, attitudes toward their own success, likeliness to ask for projects that bring money, personal concessions to fit in the ideal worker stereotype, ways of self-promotion, self-filtering, lack of courage, and willingness to take part in academic management. On the social level, there were the impacts of gender stereotypes, heteronormative division of labor, differences in what society assigns as success to women and men, family type, and partner support in career advancement. The institutional and structural level challenges included the general design of the workplace for a worker who does not have any caregiving or domestic responsibilities, success criteria which was set according to this ideal worker, which both signal absence of family-friendly policies and female-friendly policies. In addition, male networks in academic management, gender-blindness of meritocracy, and absence of sanctions that would protect women from sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing were also found to affect women's careers.

Regarding these different levels of gender inequalities, what was underlined in this study was the interactions among them. For example, the links between women's self-confidence, and gender stereotypes about success, the work-life conflict they experience, and the male design of the institutions reveal themselves in this study. As success is not something that is easily and initially attributed to women, this creates a "work harder" situation for women. In this process, they may lose the work-life balance and this creates another "I am not enough" situation and feeling. In a male-

designed work environment, women always try to fit in a structure that was not initially organized for them, and naturally this will have some consequences for women's self-confidence, which seems quite individual at first, superficial sight. Therefore, individualization of social, institutional and structural levels of inequality comes with a price: A legitimized inequality.

This legitimized inequality was also mentioned in the discussion regarding women's absence in top academic management positions in the previous chapter. It was claimed that blaming women for their absence in academic management positions individualizes the problems regarding gender stereotypes about female leadership, male networks that do not let them in, structural and social inequalities that kill their willingness, and the difficulties regarding survival in a male-dominated environment. Blaming women can only serve to legitimize the domination of top management positions by men. The same is valid for blaming women for sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing. Therefore, gender inequality in academia has to be approached as a multi-level problem.

This multi-level approach and understanding of the interactions among different levels of inequality are necessary in that they help not to waste time on producing individual level solutions to problems which have in fact social and structural backgrounds. One example of this approach was given in Savigny (2014). When one claims that childbearing is a women's problem, this person trivializes the role of social and structural precautions and solutions to this problem. However, childbearing is in fact also related to social organization of unequal division of labor and the institutional and structural organization of paternity and maternity leaves. However, this is not a problem that can be solved only on the individual level. If this interaction is ignored, solutions tend to be more superficial and ineffective.

Keeping these findings in mind, this study also has made some policy recommendations for gender equality in academia based on the four themes that emerged in the analysis. The first group of recommended policies were about



redefining ideal worker and success criteria. This group of recommendations underlined the fact there is a need for transformation of academia as mentioned by one male academic in the study. Therefore, there is a need to redefine ideal academic worker to include people with domestic and caregiving responsibilities. The ideal worker stereotypes also were not in harmony with women's stereotypes and women at work usually encountered negative stereotypes, which was also found in this study. Therefore, consciousness raising activities were suggested to create an awareness about these stereotypes and their negative impacts on women's careers. Similarly, to increase women's visibility, organization of events that promote female researchers was suggested.

As to the gender equality in academic hiring and promotion, consciousness-raising activities, temporary positive action, female quotas, mentorship programs and some changes in the hiring and promotion processes were suggested. The consciousness-raising activities help in this context the people in the hiring position to become aware of their prejudices that can affect the hiring or promotion process. This study also supports positive action and female quotes in male dominated disciplines and top academic management positions. They are important to present different role models to students and young academics, and they are a good way to leak into the male networks in these areas. In addition, development of mentorship programs was suggested in that senior female academics who believe in gender equality guide their young colleagues. Also, hiring and review committees should be gender mixed and the academic leaders should be elected not appointed. This election system should be developed in a way that does not allow dominance of neither sex. Lastly, this study suggested the need for reconceptualization of leadership to promote the characteristics that are assigned to women.

For reconciliation of work and life in the lives of academics, this study has also made some policy recommendations. Accordingly, firstly, universities should abandon the belief that work-life conflict and related issues are women's problem. Secondly, the institutions should provide academics with childcare facilities. Thirdly, the

institutions should develop policies that will make parental leave attractive also for male academics and implement return-to-work policies that will facilitate the return of academics to academia after taking parental leave.

Lastly, to combat gender-based mobbing and sexual harassment, universities should openly claim that any of these acts will not be tolerated. Universities should also establish units and sign protocols to combat these acts and should take some preventive measures too. These preventive measures include informing all the members of the campus about what is sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing, and informing them about the importance of reporting these incidents. The universities should also use legal sanctions for the perpetrators of these acts.

Overall, this study suggests gender-mainstreaming at universities. To this end, the integration of gender dimension into research and teaching in all study programs at universities were suggested. In this way, through the individuals educated at these universities and programs, universities can accomplish a mission to transform the society. This means that gender-mainstreaming is important for both organizational change and social change. As often mentioned in different chapters of this study, gender equality in academia requires action at different levels of equality simultaneously. Therefore, the institutional changes that will have effects on the whole society should be made, and these changes should be supported by the changes in the society. Academia should not forget the transformative power of education.

## REFERENCES

- Abadan-Unat, N. (1991). The impact of legal and educational reforms on Turkish women. In N. R. Keddie, & B. Baron (Eds.), *Women in Middle Eastern history: Shifting boundaries in sex and gender* (pp. 177-194). USA: Yale University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1bhkp33.14>
- Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society*, 20(4), 441-464. doi: 10.1177/0891243206289499
- Acker, J. (2011). Theorizing gender, race, and class in organizations. In E. L. Jeanes, D. Nights, & P. Yancey (Eds.), *Handbook of gender, work and organization* (pp.65-80). Martin. UK: Wiley.
- Alkan, M. Ö. (1990). Tanzimat'tan sonra "kadın"ın hukuksal statüsü ve devletin evlilik sürecine müdahalesi üzerine. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 50, 85-95.
- Altınoluk, D. (2017). Cinsiyetlendirilmiş kurum olarak akademi: Erkek akademisyenlerin "öteki" üzerinden erkeklik inşaları. *Masculinities A Journal of Identity and Culture*, 8, 37-58. Retrieved from [http://masculinitiesjournal.org/tr-tr/makele/cinsiyetlendirilmis-kurum-olarak-akademi--erkek-akademisyenlerin---"öteki"-uzerinden-erkeklik-insalari/217/pdf](http://masculinitiesjournal.org/tr-tr/makele/cinsiyetlendirilmis-kurum-olarak-akademi--erkek-akademisyenlerin---)
- Baker, M. (2010). Career confidence and gendered expectations of academic promotion. *Journal of Sociology*, 46(3), 317-334. doi: 10.1177/1440783310371402
- Bakioğlu, A., & Ülker, N. (2018). Career barriers faced by Turkish women academics: Support for what? *Yükseköğretim Dergisi*, 8(3), 313-321. doi:10.2399/yod.18.017
- Başarır, F., & Sarı, M. (2015). Kadın akademisyenlerin "kadın akademisyen olma"ya ilişkin algılarının metaforlar yoluyla incelenmesi. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 5(1), 41-51. doi: 10.5961/jhes.2015.108

- Beddoes, K., & Pawley, A. L. (2014). 'Different people have different priorities': Work-family balance, gender, and the discourse of choice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(9), 1573-1585.
- Berktaş, F. (2001). Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Feminizm. In T. Bora, & M. Gültekinil (Eds.), *Modern Türkiye'de siyasi düşünce, Cilt I: Cumhuriyet'e devreden düşünce mirası* (pp. 348-361). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bosak, J., & Sczesny, S. (2011). Gender bias in leader selection? Evidence from a hiring simulation study. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 65(3-4), 234-242. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-0012-7
- Bradley, H. (1994). Gendered jobs and social inequality. In *The Polity Reader in Gender Studies* (pp. 150-159). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Carli, L. L., Alawa, L., Lee, Y., Zhao, B., & Kim, E. (2016). Stereotypes about gender and science: Women  $\neq$  scientists. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(2), 244-260. doi: 10.1177/0361684315622645
- Carvalho, T., & Santiago, R. (2010). New challenges for women seeking an academic career: the hiring process in Portuguese higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(3), 239-249. doi: 10.1080/13600801003743331
- Cleveland, J. N., Stockdale, M., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). *Women and Men in Organizations: Sex and Gender Issues at Work*. UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crabb, S., & Ekberg, S. (2014). Retaining female postgraduates in academia: the role of gender and prospective parenthood. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(6), 1099-1112. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2014.911251
- Cruz, A., & Klinger, S. (2011). Gender-based violence in the world of work: Overview and selected annotated bibliography. Geneva: International Labor Office

Çağlayan, K. (2015). Türkiye’de kadın akademisyenlik. *Türkiye Tohumcular Birliği Dergisi*, 16, 22-23. Retrieved from <https://www.turktob.org.tr/dergi/makaleler/dergi16/22-23.pdf>

Çakır, S. (2013). *Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Çögenli, M. Z., Asunakutlu, T., & Türegün, Z. N. (2017). Gender and mobbing: The case of Turkey. *Journal of Business Research Turk*, 9(3), 109-121. Retrieved from [https://isarder.org/2017/vol.9\\_issue.3\\_article08\\_full\\_text.pdf](https://isarder.org/2017/vol.9_issue.3_article08_full_text.pdf)

Çögenli, M. Z., & Barlı, O. (2013). The exposure of psychological violence (mobbing) in universities and an application to the academicians. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1174-1178. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.010

Çögenli, M. Z., & Döner, E. (2015). Türkiye’de akademisyenler üzerine gerçekleştirilen mobbing konulu lisansüstü çalışmaların incelenmesi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(3), 27-46.

Delphy, C. & Leonard, D. (1994). The Variety of Work Done by Wives. In *The Polity Reader in Gender Studies* (pp.159-166). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dedeoğlu, S. (2012). Equality, protection or discrimination: Gender equality policies in Turkey. *Social Politics*, 19(2), 269-290.

Demir, S. (2018). Women in academia: The situation of women in academia and its interference with their domestic life. *Marmara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(1), 187-210. doi: 10.14782/marusbd.412643

Demirdirek, A. (1998). In the pursuit of the Ottoman women’s movement. In Z. F. Arat (Ed.), *Deconstructing Images of “The Turkish Women”* (pp.65-80). New York: St. Martin’s Press.

Eccles, J. S. (1987). Gender roles and women’s achievement-related decisions. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*, 11, 135-172. doi:10.1111/J.1471-6402.1987.Tb00781.X

- Eden, D. (2016). Women's participation in academic conferences in Israel. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 38(4), 406-421. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2016.1181887
- Ergöl, Ş., Koç, G., Eroğlu, K., & Taşkın, L. (2012). Encountered difficulties of female research assistants at domestic and business life in Turkey. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 2(1), 43-49. doi: 10.5961/jhes.2012.032
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2016). *Gender equality in academia and research*. Retrieved on May 7, 2019 from <https://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/mh0716096enn.pdf>
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1993). Sexual harassment: Violence against women in the workplace. *American Psychologist*, 48(10), 1070-1076. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.48.10.1070
- Gerson, K. & Horowitz, R. (2002). Observation and interviewing: Options and choices in qualitative research. In T. May (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in action*, 199-224. UK: Sage publications.
- Gönenç, İ. M., Akgün, Ş., Özvarış, Ş. B., & Tunç, T. E. (2013). An analysis of the relationship between academic career and sex at Hacettepe University. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 38(170), 166-178. Retrieved from [http://www.huksam.hacettepe.edu.tr/Turkce/SayfaDosya/Gender\\_Academic.pdf](http://www.huksam.hacettepe.edu.tr/Turkce/SayfaDosya/Gender_Academic.pdf)
- Grummell, B., Devine, D., & Lynch, K. (2009). The care-less manager: gender, care and new managerialism in higher education. *Gender and Education*, 21(2), 191-208. doi: 10.1080/09540250802392273
- Hartsock, N. (1983). The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*, 157-180. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hekman, S. (1997). Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited. *Signs*, 22(2), 341-365. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3175275>

- Henley, M. M. (2015). Women's success in academic science: Challenges to breaking through the ivory ceiling. *Sociology Compass*, 9, 668– 680. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12291.
- Hoffmann, F. (1986). Sexual harassment in academia: Feminist theory and institutional practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(2), 105-122. doi: 10.17763/haer.56.2.y11m78k58t4052x2
- Howe-Walsh, L., & Turnbull, S. (2014). Barriers to women leaders in academia: tales from science and technology. *Studies in Higher Education*, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2014.929102
- Jagsi, R., Griffith, K. A., Jones, R., Perumalswami, C. R., Ubel, P., & Stewart, A. (2016). Sexual harassment and discrimination experiences of academic medical faculty. *JAMA*. 315(19), 2120–2121. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.2188
- Jones, C. S., & Urban, M. C. (2013). Promise and pitfalls of a gender-blind faculty search. *BioScience*, 63(8), 611-612. doi: 10.1525/bio.2013.63.8.3
- Kahneman, D., & Riis, J. (2005). Living, and thinking about it: two perspectives on life. In F.A. Huppert, N. Baylis, & B. Keverne (Eds.), *The science of well-being* (pp. 285-304). UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from [https://scholar.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/kahneman/files/living\\_dk\\_jr\\_2005.pdf](https://scholar.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/kahneman/files/living_dk_jr_2005.pdf)
- Karakuş, H. (2016). Leaky pipeline: An analysis on female academics in Turkey. *International Journal of Social Science*, 53, 533-556. doi: 10.9761/JASSS3635
- Kurnaz, Ş. (1991). *Cumhuriyet öncesinde Türk kadını (1839-1923)* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Ankara: Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- Legard, R., Keegan, J. & Ward, K. (2003). In depth interviews. In J. Ritchie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*, 138-169. UK: Sage publications.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165-184. doi: 10.1080/13594329608414853

- Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-Liberalism and marketisation: The implications for higher education. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5(1), 1–17. doi: 10.2304/eerj.2006.5.1.1
- Lynch, K. (2007). Love labour as a distinct and non-commodifiable form of care labour. *The Sociological Review*, 55(3), 550–570. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2007.00714.x
- Mayer, A. L., & 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
- McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review*, 77(4), 625–647. doi: 10.1177/0003122412451728
- Monroe, K., & Chiu, W. (2010). Gender equality in the academy: The pipeline problem. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 43(2), 303–308. doi:10.1017/S104909651000017X
- Morley, L. (2013). The rules of the game: Women and the leaderist turn in higher education. *Gender and Education*, 25(1), 116–131, doi: 10.1080/09540253.2012.740888
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). Disruptions in women's self-promotion: The backlash avoidance model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34(2), 186–202. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01561.x
- O'Connor, J. (1993). Gender, class and citizenship in the comparative analysis of welfare state regimes: Theoretical and methodological issues. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 44 (3), 501–518.
- O'Laughlin, E. M., & Bischoff, L. G. (2005). Balancing parenthood and academia: Work/family stress as influenced by gender and tenure status. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(1), 79–106. doi: 10.1177/0192513X04265942
- Özkanlı, Ö. (2007). The situation of academic women in Turkey. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 32(144), 59–70.



- Passer, M. W., & Smith, R. E. (2008). *Psychology: The science of mind and behaviour*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). USA: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). USA: Sage Publications.
- Peterson, H. (2011). The gender mix policy – addressing gender inequality in higher education management. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33(6), 619-628. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2011.621188
- Polkowska, D. (2014). Why the scientific pipeline is still leaking? Women scientists and their work–life balance in Poland. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 24 (1), 24-43.
- Poyraz, B. (2013). Akademi kadınların cenneti mi?: Ankara Üniversitesi örneği. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4(2), doi: 10.1501/sbeder\_00000000057
- Pringle, R. (1992). Defining work. In L. McDowell, & R. Pringle (Eds.), *Defining women: Social institutions and gender divisions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ramazanoğlu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist methodology: Challenges and choices*. UK: Sage Publications.
- Rao, A., Stuart, R. & Kelleher, D. (1999). *Gender at work: Organizational change for equality*. USA: Kumarian Press.
- Reskin, B. (2010). Unconscious raising. In J. Goodman (Ed.), *Global Perspectives on Gender & Work*, 385-391. UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Elam, G. (2003). Designing and selecting samples. In J. Ritchie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*, 77-108. UK: Sage publications.

- Roebuck, D. B., Smith, D. N., & Haddaoui, T. E. (2013). Cross-generational perspectives on work-life balance and its impact on women's opportunities for leadership in the workplace. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 33, 52-62.
- Rubini, M., & Menegatti, M. (2014). Hindering women's careers in academia: Gender linguistic bias in personnel selection. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 33(6), 632-650. doi: 10.1177/0261927X14542436
- Salin, D. (2003). The significance of gender in the prevalence, forms and perceptions of workplace bullying. *Nordiske Organisasjonsstudier*, 5(3), 30-50.
- Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work and the will to lead*. USA: Alfred A. Knoff.
- Savigny, H. (2014). Women, know your limits: cultural sexism in academia. *Gender and Education*, 26(7), 794-809. doi: 10.1080/09540253.2014.970977
- Sert, Ö. & Akkoyunlu Wigley, A. (2012). Mobbing, üniversiteler ve toplumsal cinsiyet. Retrieved from <http://www.radikal.com.tr/radikal2/mobbing-universiteler-ve-toplumsal-cinsiyet-1097527/>
- Sert, Ö. & Akkoyunlu Wigley, A. (2015). Breaking the silence on mobbing. *Education Science Society Journal*, 13(51), 8-32.
- Sheltzer, J. M., & Smith, J. C. (2014). Elite male faculty in the life sciences employ fewer women. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(28), 10107-10112. doi:10.1073/pnas.1403334111
- Smith, D. E. (1972). Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological Inquiry*, 44(1), 7-13. Retrieved from <http://home.ku.edu.tr/~mbaker/CSHS503/Smith.pdf>
- Softa, H. K., Bükeçik, E., Çolak, A., & Göçer, D. (2016). Akademisyenlerin mobbing durumlarının incelenmesi. *Ege Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32(1), 34-47. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/download/issue-file/8772>

The Council of Higher Education (2019). *Summary table for numbers of academics*. [Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi]. Retrieved from <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr>

The Council of Higher Education (2019). *University-based numbers of academics*. [Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi]. Retrieved from <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr>

The World Bank (2012). *World development report 2012: Gender equality and development*. Retrieved on June 1, 2019 from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/492221468136792185/pdf/646650WDR0201200Box364543B00PUBLIC0.pdf>

The World Bank (2019). *Tertiary education, academic staff (%female) 1971-2015 Turkey*. Retrieved on March 21, 2019 from: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.TER.TCHR.FE.ZS?locations=TR&view=chart>

The World University Rankings (2019). *Turkey*. Retrieved on June 9, 2019 from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings>

Toprak, Z. (1991). The family, feminism, and the state during the Young Turk Period, 1908-1918. In *Première rencontre internationale sur l'Empire Ottoman et la Turquie modern*, (pp.441-452). Istanbul-Paris: Éditions ISIS.

United Nations (2002). *Gender mainstreaming: An overview*. Retrieved on May 6, 2019 from <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/e65237.pdf>

van den Brink, M., Benschop, Y., & Jansen, W. (2010). Transparency in academic recruitment: A problematic tool for gender equality? *Organization Studies*, 31(11), 1459–1483. doi: 10.1177/0170840610380812

van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2011). Gender practices in the construction of academic excellence: Sheep with five legs. *Organization*, 19(4), 507- 524. doi: 10.1177/1350508411414293

- White, J. (2003). State feminism, modernization, and the Turkish Republican woman. *NWSA Journal*, 15(3), 145-159. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4317014>
- Williams, J. C. (1989). Deconstructing Gender. *Michigan Law Review*, 87(797), 797-845. Retrieved from [https://repository.uchastings.edu/faculty\\_scholarship/836/](https://repository.uchastings.edu/faculty_scholarship/836/)
- Woodward, D. (2007). Work-life balancing strategies used by women managers in British “modern” universities". *Equal Opportunities International*, 26(1), 6-17. doi: 10.1108/02610150710726507
- Wylie, A. (2003). Why standpoint matters. In R. Figueroa, & S. Harding (Eds.), *Science and other cultures: Issues in philosophies of science and technology*, (pp.26-48). New York: Routledge.
- Yadav, N. (2014). Comparison of the work life balance of women employees in educational field (degree colleges permanent employees) and IT industries. *SIES Journal of Management*, 10 (1), 36-43.
- Zihnioğlu, Y. (2013). *Kadınsız İnkılap*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- 206 üniversitede sadece 18 kadın rektör. (2019, March). Birgün. Retrieved from <https://www.birgun.net/haber-detay/206-universitede-sadece-18-kadin-rektor.html>

## APPENDICES

### A. APPROVAL LETTER FROM METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARASTIRMA MERKEZİ  
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DÜMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800

SAYI: 28620816 / 2018

T: +90 312 210 22 91

F: +90 312 210 79 59

ueam@metu.edu.tr

www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

05 NİSAN 2018

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Doç.Dr. Fatma Umut BEŞPINAR

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Ece YILMAZ'ın "*Kadın ve Erkek Akademisyenlerin Kariyerlerinde İlerleyen Karşılaştıkları Kişisel, Toplumsal ve Yapısal Zorluklar ve Çözüm Önerileri*" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay 2018-SOS-058 protokol numarası ile 05.04.2018 - 30.06.2019 tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

  
Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

  
Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

  
Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

  
Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

  
Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

  
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

## B. CONSENT FORM FOR DATA COLLECTION

Bu çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü öğretim üyesi Doç. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar gözetiminde, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Ece Yılmaz tarafından yürütülmektedir. Bu form sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın amacı kadın ve erkek akademisyenlerin kariyerlerinde ilerlerken karşılaştıkları zorluklara sebep veren kişisel, toplumsal ve yapısal faktörlerin neler olduğu, bu faktörlerin birbirleri ile nasıl bir etkileşim gösterdiği ve kadın ve erkek akademisyenlerin bu zorluklarla ne gibi stratejiler kullanarak başa çıktıkları sorularının araştırılmasıdır.

Bu araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz, sizinle bir mülakat gerçekleştirilecek ve bu mülakatta izniniz olması durumunda ses kaydı alınacaktır. Size öncelikle akademik unvanınız, yaşıınız, bölümünüz, medeni durumunuz olmak üzere demografik sorular yöneltilecek ve sonrasında akademisyenlerin akademik kariyerlerinde ilerken karşılaştıkları kişisel, toplumsal, yapısal zorlukları, bunlar arasındaki ilişkileri ve bunlarla başa çıkmada kullanılan stratejileri ve olası çözüm önerilerini anlamaya yönelik hazırlanan kadın akademisyenler için 39, erkek akademisyenler içinse 32 soruyu cevaplamanız beklenecektir. Görüşmelerin yaklaşık 60 dakika sürmesi planlanmaktadır.

Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır. Cevaplarınız ve kimlik bilgileriniz tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, cevaplarınız sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir. Katılımcılardan elde edilecek bilgiler toplu halde değerlendirilecek ve bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Sağladığımız veriler gönüllü katılım formlarında toplanan kimlik bilgileri ile eşleştirilmeyecektir.

Mülakat genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular içermemektedir. Ancak katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp araştırmadan ayrılabilirsiniz. Çalışmaya katılım süreciniz başlamadan da bütün sorularınız araştırmacı tarafından cevaplanacaktır.

Mülakat sonunda bu çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız cevaplanacaktır. Araştırmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü yüksek lisans öğrencisi Ece Yılmaz (e-posta: [yilmaz.ece@metu.edu.tr](mailto:yilmaz.ece@metu.edu.tr)) ya da Sosyoloji Bölümü öğretim üyelerinden Doç. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar (e-posta: [bespinar@metu.edu.tr](mailto:bespinar@metu.edu.tr)) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum.

Katılımcı Ad/Soyad:

Tarih:

İmza:

## C. INSTRUMENTS

### Interview Questions for Male Academics

Demografik Bilgiler:

Bölümünüz:

Yaşınız:

Akademik unvanınız:

Medeni durumunuz:

Mülakat soruları:

1. Sizce akademide başarılı olmak ne demek?
2. Sizin alanınızda başarılı olmak ne demek?
3. Akademisyenler kendi başarılarından bahsederler mi? Bu yaygın bir durum mudur?
4. Daha çok kimler başarılarından bahseder?
5. Kendi başarılarından bahsetmede cinsiyetler arası bir farklılık gözlemlediniz mi?
6. Kimler hangi durumları başarı olarak görürler? Bunu hangi şekillerde aktarırlar?
7. YÖK tarafından ve kurum içinde tanımlanmış başarı kriterlerini ele alırsak, sizin konumuzdaki bir akademisyenin başarısı hangi kriterle ölçülüyor?
8. Bu kriterleri karşılamada kendinizde gördüğünüz güçlü yanlar neler?
9. Bu başarı kriterlerini sağlamanızı zorlaştırdığını düşündüğünüz özellikleriniz var mı?
10. Başarılı bir erkek akademisyen olmak ile başarılı bir kadın akademisyen olmak arasında fark var mı?
11. Bir akademisyen olarak sizce üretkenlik nedir?
12. Üretken olabilmek nasıl önkoşullar gerektiriyor? Ne tür faktörler üretkenliği etkiliyor?
13. Bölüm içindeki görev dağılımı (idari görevler, ders programları) üretkenliğinizi etkiler mi?
14. Sizin için üretkenliği en çok zorlaştıran etmen nedir? Bununla nasıl başa çıkıyorsunuz?
15. Alanınızla ilgili konferanslara katılım sıklığınız nedir?
16. Yurt içi ve yurt dışı konferanslarda katılım sıklığınız ne şekilde değişiyor?
17. Size faydalı olacağını düşündüğünüz yurtdışı bir göreve gitme konusunda sizi olumsuz bir cevaba yönlendirecek etkenler nelerdir?
18. Konferanslarda bilimsel ve akademik etkinliklerde katılımcı ve konuşmacı sayılarına baktığınız zaman kadın-erkek sayılarının dağılımı nasıldır?

19. Bu farklı dağılımın sebepleri neler olabilir?
20. Yurt içi ve yurt dışı akademik etkinliklere katılımda hareketliliği artırmak için kullanılan stratejiler nelerdir?
21. Bölüm içinde kadın erkek akademisyen dağılımı nasıl?
22. Kadın/Erkek egemen bölümlerde çalışmanın avantajları, dezavantajları nelerdir?
23. İşe alımda cinsiyet eşitliği gözetilen bir faktör olmalı mıdır?
24. Üniversite içindeki yönetim kademelerindeki kadın-erkek akademisyen sayıları nasıl?
25. Cinsiyet eşitliğinin gözetildiğini düşünüyor musunuz?
26. Kadınların bu görevlerde daha az bulunmasının sebepleri neler?
27. Mesai saatleri dışında bölümünüzdeki akademisyenlerle iletişiminiz nasıldır? Mesai dışındaki aktivitelerde iş konuşulduğu olur mu?
28. Medeni durumun akademisyenin başarısı, üretkenliği üzerine etkileri var mıdır?
29. Medeni durumun yarattığı dezavantajlar ile akademisyenlerin başa çıkma stratejileri nelerdir?
30. İşyerinde cinsiyet kaynaklı taciz, mobbing yaşadınız mı?
31. Tespit ettiğiniz bu sorunlara karşı yapısal ne tür önlemler alınabilir? Örneğin kurumumuzun bu sorunlara karşı alabileceğini düşündüğünüz önlemler nelerdir?
32. Peki bu sorunlara karşı aile neler yapabilir? Akademisyenlerin hayatını kolaylaştırmak için ailede nasıl bir dönüşüme ihtiyaç var?



## Interview Questions for Female Academics

Demografik Bilgiler:

Bölümünüz:

Yaşınız:

Akademik unvanınız:

Medeni durumunuz:

Mülakat soruları:

1. Sizce akademide başarılı olmak ne demek?
2. Sizin alanınızda başarılı olmak ne demek?
3. Akademisyenler kendi başarılarından bahsederler mi? Bu yaygın bir durum mudur?
4. Daha çok kimler başarılarından bahseder?
5. Kendi başarılarından bahsetmede cinsiyetler arası bir farklılık gözlemlediniz mi?
6. Kimler hangi durumları başarı olarak görürler? Bunu hangi şekillerde aktarırlar?
7. YÖK tarafından ve kurum içinde tanımlanmış başarı kriterlerini ele alırsak, sizin konumuzdaki bir akademisyenin başarısı hangi kriterle ölçülüyor?
8. Bu kriterleri karşılamada kendinizde gördüğünüz güçlü yanlar neler?
9. Bu başarı kriterlerini sağlamanızı zorlaştırdığını düşündüğünüz özellikleriniz var mı?
10. Başarılı bir erkek akademisyen olmak ile başarılı bir kadın akademisyen olmak arasında fark var mı?
11. Kadın olmak başarılı akademisyen imajını zorlaştıran bir faktör müdür?
12. Başarılı bir imaj için kadınların bazen kadınlıklarından, kadın görüntülerinden taviz vermek zorunda kalması söz konusu mudur?
13. Bir akademisyen olarak sizce üretkenlik nedir?
14. Üretken olabilmek nasıl önkoşullar gerektiriyor? Ne tür faktörler üretkenliği etkiliyor?
15. Bölüm içindeki görev dağılımı (idari görevler, ders programları) üretkenliğinizi etkiler mi?
16. Sizin için üretkenliği en çok zorlaştıran etmen nedir? Bununla nasıl başa çıkıyorsunuz?
17. Alanınızla ilgili konferanslara katılım sıklığınız nedir?
18. Yurt içi ve yurt dışı konferanslarda katılım sıklığınız ne şekilde değişiyor?
19. Size faydalı olacağını düşündüğünüz yurtdışı bir göreve gitme konusunda sizi olumsuz bir cevaba yönlendirecek etkenler nelerdir?
20. Konferanslarda bilimsel ve akademik etkinliklerde katılımcı ve konuşmacı sayılarına baktığınız zaman kadın-erkek sayılarının dağılımı nasıldır?
21. Bu farklı dağılımın sebepleri neler olabilir?
22. Yurt içi ve yurt dışı akademik etkinliklere katılımı hareketliliği artırmak için kullanılan stratejiler nelerdir?
23. Bölüm içinde kadın erkek akademisyen dağılımı nasıl?

24. Kadın/Erkek egemen bölümlerde çalışmanın avantajları, dezavantajları nelerdir?
25. İşe alımda cinsiyet eşitliği gözetilen bir faktör olmalı mıdır?
26. Üniversite içindeki yönetim kademelerindeki kadın-erkek akademisyen sayıları nasıl?
27. Cinsiyet eşitliğinin gözetildiğini düşünüyor musunuz?
28. Atama ve yükseltme süreçlerinde kadın olmanın dezavantajları var mıdır?
29. Kadınların bu görevlerde daha az bulunmasının sebepleri neler?
30. Yönetici kadrolarında az olan kadın akademisyenlerin üniversite içinde kendilerini görünür kılmak için kullandıkları stratejiler var mıdır? Nelerdir?
31. Literatürde “old boys network” denen bir iletişim ağı var işyerindeki erkekler arasında. Bu ağlar da gayriresmi işyeri iletişim ağlarının kurulması, bu ağ sayesinde işyerinde birbirlerini destekleme, koruma, kişisel ilişkileri üzerinden işler ile ilgili kararlar alma gibi süreçleri içine alan bir iletişim ağlarını oluşturuyor. Örneğin bir fakültede çalışan erkek akademisyenlerin mesai dışında halı saha maçı yapması, çıkışta birbirlerine yarınki toplantıda şu kararları alırız değil mi diye ayaküstü, kişisel konuşmaları sonucu ertesi gün fakülte kurulunda o kararın orada bulunan erkekler tarafından “oldu bitti”ye getirilmesi gibi. Böyle bir erkek iletişim ağını gözlemlediğiniz oldu mu?
32. Kadın akademisyenlerin bu tür iletişim ağlarından olumsuz etkilenmemek adına kullandıkları stratejiler var mı?
33. Üniversitede kadın akademisyenlerin katıldıkları resmi ya da gayriresmi dayanışma ağları mevcut mudur? Faydalı ve yeterli?
34. Medeni durumun akademideki kadının başarısı, üretkenliği üzerine etkileri var mıdır?
35. Medeni durumun yarattığı dezavantajlar ile kadınların başa çıkma stratejileri nelerdir?
36. İşyerinde cinsiyet kaynaklı taciz, mobbing yaşadınız mı?
37. Kadınların akademideki mobbing ve taciz ile başa çıkmada kullandıkları stratejiler nelerdir?
38. Tespit ettiğiniz bu sorunlara karşı yapısal ne tür önlemler alınabilir? Örneğin kurumumuzun bu sorunlara karşı alabileceğini düşündüğünüz önlemler nelerdir?
39. Peki bu sorunlara karşı aile neler yapabilir? Kadın akademisyenlerin hayatını kolaylaştırmak için ailede nasıl bir dönüşüme ihtiyaç var?

## **D. TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET**

### **Trkiye’de Akademide Cinsiyete Baęlı Zorluklar ve Baęa ıkma Stratejileri**

Trkiye’de kadın ve erkek akademisyen sayılarını anlamak iin Yksekęretim Kurumu verileri incelendięinde kadın akademisyen sayısı toplamda olduka fazla olmasına raęmen, daęılımın akademik kadroların alt basamaklarında yoęunlaştıęı grlmektedir. rneęin, araştırma grevlisi kadrosunda kadın ve erkek akademisyen sayıları neredeyse birbirine eştiken, yardımcı doent kadrosundan itibaren kadın akademisyen sayısı erkek akademisyen sayısının gerisinde kalmaya bařlamakta ve profesr kadrosunda kadın erkek sayısı erkek akademisyen sayısının yarısından bile dřk bir rakama ulařmaktadır. Akademik kadroların st basamaklarına doęru ıkıldıka kadın akademisyen sayısında yařanan bu keskin dřř akademide cinsiyete baęlı zorluklar olduęunu ve akademik kariyer ilerlemesini kadın ve erkek akademisyenlerin aynı řekilde deneyimlemedięini dřndrmektedir. Bu nedenle bu alıřma akademik kariyerde cinsiyete baęlı olarak yařanan bireysel, toplumsal, kurumsal ve yapısal zorluklar ve akademisyenlerin bu zorluklarla baęa ıkma stratejilerini incelemeyi amalamıřtır.

alıřmanın teorik erevesini feminist bakıř aısı teorisi řekillendirmiřtir. Feminist bakıř aısı teorisi, bilgi kavramı konusunda bir paradigma deęiřiklięi yaratmıř ve bu da feminist teori ile epistemolojisine farklı bir yaklařım anlamına gelmiřtir (Hekman, 1997). Bu yeni yaklařım sosyolojide kadın deneyimlerini yansıtmada ve ortaya ıkarmada mevcut erkek egemen bakıř aısının sınırlılıklarının fark edilmesi ile birlikte olmuř ve Smith (1970) alternatif sosyolojinin kadın deneyimlerinin de anlařılmasını kolaylařtıracak bir kapasite yaratması gerektięini vurgulamıřtır. Smith’e gre kadınlar kendi deneyimlerinin “doęal konuřucuları”dır ve kavramsal

olarak kadın dünyasının ne anlama geldiğini herkesten önce bilebilirler. Buna göre feminist bakış açısı bilginin evrensel ve bütüncül olduğunu reddeder ve bilginin konumsal, bağlamsal ve kısmi olduğunu söyler (Hekman, 1977). Benzer şekilde Hartsock (1983) de maddi hayatın bireylerin toplumsal ilişkileri nasıl algıladığı konusunda bir sınırlılık oluşturduğunu söylemektedir. Buna göre bireylerin etraflarındaki dünyayı nasıl algıladığı hiyerarşik olarak inşa edilmiş güç ilişkileri içerisindeki toplumsal konumları tarafından şekillendirilmektedir. Buna göre cinsiyete bağlı olarak toplumsal konumlanma, kadın ve erkeklerin deneyimleri ile ilgili bilginin farklı parçalarına erişim sağlayabilmelerine neden olmaktadır (Wylie, 2003). Bu çalışma için de toplumda kadın ya da erkek olarak bulunmanın sağladığı farklı yaşam deneyimlerine bağlı olarak farklı bilgilere erişebilme durumu önem taşımaktadır.

Bir önceki paragrafta belirtildiği gibi feminist bakış açısına göre çoklu gerçekliklerin ve bakış açılarının varlığı, ideal çalışan kavramının sorgulanmasını da gerekli kılmaktadır. Williams (1989) ücretli işin, cinsiyetçi yapısını hiçbir ev içi görevi olmayan ideal çalışan kavramını sorgulayarak eleştirmiştir. Benzer şekilde Acker (2011) de her zaman çalışmak için erişilebilir olan, ev içi ve bakım sorumlulukları olmayan bu ideal çalışan kavramını ve bununla birlikte evi kadınların ekmek kazanma işini de erkeklerin alanı olarak konumlandıran heteronormatif iş bölümünü eleştirmiştir. Çünkü bu heteronormatif iş bölümü ev içi ve bakım sorumluluklarını kadına yükleyerek, erkeğin her zaman iş için ulaşılabilir ideal çalışanlar olmasını desteklemekte ve çalışma kavramının erkek egemen bir şekilde düzenlenmesine yol açmaktadır. Ancak bu erkek egemen bakış açısına göre organize edilmiş çalışma hayatı kadınların hayat deneyim ve sorumlulukları ile uyumlu değildir (Bradley, 1994).

Çalışma hayatının erkek egemen normlara göre düzenlenmesinin sonuçları akademide de görülmektedir. Kadınların akademiye yüksek oranlı katılımı, Williams (1989) tarafından da belirtildiği gibi bakım işlerinin bireyler tarafından gerçekleştirilmesi gibi konular ideal çalışanın nasıl tanımlandığını değiştirmemiştir.

Grummell, Devine ve Lynch (2009) da bakım sorumluluğundan bağımsız olarak dizayn edilmiş akademik yönetim işlerini eleştirmiş ve bu tür işlerin bu tür sorumluluklardan muaf olan çalışanların lehine olduğunu ve bunların da çoğunlukla erkek çalışanlar olduğunu belirtmiştir.

İdeal çalışan kavramının akademideki yansımaları akademik işe alım ve yükseltme süreçlerinde de görülmektedir. Bunların görünür olmasını meritokrasinin maskeleyiği görüşü van den Brink, Benschop ve Jansen (2010) tarafından dile getirilmiştir. Buna göre başarı kriterlerinin erkek çalışan idealine göre belirlenmiş olması işe alım ve yükseltme süreçlerinin altında yatan cinsiyetçi yapıyı göstermektedir. Ev ve bakım sorumlulukları yüklenen kadın akademisyenlerin araştırma yapabilmek için daha az zamanının olması ve doğrusal olmayan kariyer çizgileri yapılan mülakatlarda göz ardı edilmekte, başarı erkeğe alçakgönüllülük kadına atfedilmekte, erkekler yeni pozisyonlara başvurmaları için daha çok desteklenmekte, tavsiye edilmekte, aday gösterilmekte olmaları van den Brink ve Benschop (2011) tarafından da vurgulanmış ve meritokrasinin bunları maskeleyesi ve meşrulaştırması eleştirilmiştir.

Benzer bir durum iş ve yaşam dengesi konusunda da gözlemlenmektedir. Buna göre kadınlar ev işlerine ve çocuk bakımına partnerlerinden daha fazla zaman ayırmak zorunda kalmakta, erkek akademisyenlere göre daha az partner desteği ve kurumsal destek görmektedir (O’Laughlin & Bischoff, 2005). Bu durumda iş ve yaşam dengesinin kaybolması ise kadınların işe yönelik hırslarını olumsuz etkilemektedir. Baker (2010) bu konu üzerinde durmuş ve uzun süredir süre gelen akademideki cinsiyet eşitsizliğinin, ev ve iş sorumluluklarının nasıl algılandığının ve uzun çalışma saatlerine, yüksek sayıda yayına, akademik kariyerin her aşamasında üretkenliğe önem veren kurumsal beklentilerin yansımaları olduğunu altını çizmiştir. Ev ve yaşam dengesini kurmakta zorlanan kadın akademisyenler hırslarını azaltmakta, yarı zamanlı çalışmakta, işe ara vermekte, diğer akrabaların da bakım sorumluluklarını üstlenmekte, partnerlerinin işleri sebebiyle taşınmakta ve aileleri ile yeterince zaman geçiremedikleri için suçluluk duygusunu dile getirmektedirler (Baker, 2010).

Bu ideal alıřanın erkek normlarına gre kavramsallařtırılmıř olması aynı zamanda kadınları iřyerinde tekileřtirmekte ve cinsiyet temelli mobbing ve cinsel taciz yoluyla da bu teki konumlarını srekli kılmaktadır. Bunu Hoffman'ın (1986) yksekğretim kurumlarının g ve otoritenin ynetimdeki elitlerde toplandıėı brokratik kurumlar olduėu syleminden yorumlayabilmekteyiz. Hoffman'a gre kadınlar kendilerini dezavantajlı konuma yerleřtiren g, imtiyazlar ve bu erkek egemen yapılara karřı ıkmalıdır. alıřmalar da bu dezavantajlı konumla uyumlu olarak kadınların hem cinsiyet temelli mobbinge hem de cinsel tacize daha fazla maruz kaldıklarını bulmuřtur (Howe-Walsh & Turnbull, 2014; Jagsi vd., 2016).

Tm bunlar Trkiye'de akademide de kendini gstermektedir. Trkiye'de kadınların 1914'te niversiteye kabul edilmesine uzanan tarihsel sre incelendiėinde kadınların akademiye girmeleri ve o dnemin ideolojileri arasındaki iliřkileri ortaya ıkmaktadır. Gen cumhuriyet de evlilik ve ocuk bakımını kadınların ulusal grevleri olarak grd. Buna gre ideal Trk kadını řehirli, yeniliki ve aynı zamanda da evine adanmıř bir kadındı. Bu idealizasyon ise kadının kamusal alandaki zgrlėne nem atfedilirken zel hayatları ile ilgilenilmemesine neden oldu (White, 2003). Dedeoėlu'nun (2012) sylediėi gibi, gnmze kadar da Trkiye'de refah devletinin kadınların toplum iindeki temel rollerini anne ve eř olmak grevleri zerinden tanımlaması devam etti ve bunun da kadınların iř gcne katılımlarında ve toplumdaki yapısal cinsiyet eřitsizliklerinin retilmesinde ve devamlılıėında etkileri bulunmaktadır. eřitli arařtırmalarla da anne ve eř olarak kadınların temel grevlerinin tanımlanmasının ve buna baėlı heteronormatif iř blmnn Trkiye'de akademideki kadının yařadıėı zorluklar arasında iliřkiler olduėunu ortaya ıkar mıřtır. Bu alıřmalardan biri Gnen vd. (2013) tarafından yapılmıř ve ev ii sorumluluklar nedeniyle kadınların iř-hayat dengesi konusunda daha ok problemler yařadıklarını, kariyerlerinde daha yavař ilerleyebildiklerini ve daha ok alıřmak zorunda kaldıklarını bulmuřtur. Bakioėlu ve Gnen (2018) ise kadınların aile ve kariyer arasında seim yapmak zorunda kaldıklarını, kendilerinden daha ok dnler vermek durumunda kaldıklarını bulmuřtur.

Türkiye’de akademi içindeki cinsiyet eşitsizlikleri ve ataerkil değerlerin üretiminden yüksek eğitilmiş erkek akademisyenler de muaf olmadıkları ise Altınoluk (2011) tarafından ortaya konmuştur. Bu çalışmada erkek akademisyenlerin de farkında olarak ya da olmayarak cinsiyet eşitsizliklerini konuşmalarında ürettikleri bulunmuştur. Bu eşitsizlikler bir önceki paragrafta bahsedildiği gibi iş-hayat dengesi zorlukları yaşatırken aynı zamanda cinsiyet temelli mobbing konularında da kendilerini göstermektedir. Çögenli ve Barlı (2013) da yaptıkları çalışmada kadın akademisyenlerin erkek akademisyenlere göre daha fazla mobbinge maruz kaldığını bulmuştur.

Bu teorik çerçeveyi göz önünde bulundurarak bu çalışma akademisyenlerin kariyerlerinde ilerlerken karşılaştıkları cinsiyet temelli farklılıkları ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamış ve üç araştırma sorusu üzerine odaklanmıştır:

- 1) Türkiye’de akademisyenlerin kariyerlerinde ilerlerken karşılaştıkları cinsiyet temelli bireysel, toplumsal, kurumsal ve yapısal zorluklar nelerdir ve bu zorluklar birbirleriyle nasıl ilişkilidir?
- 2) Akademisyenlerin başarı ve üretkenliklerini artırmak için cinsiyet temelli zorluklar ile başa çıkma stratejileri nelerdir?
- 3) Akademisyenlerin kariyerlerinde yaşadıkları cinsiyet temelli zorlukları aşmak için politika önerileri neler olabilir?

Bu soruların cevaplarını bulmak amacıyla nitel araştırma metodu kullanılmış ve veriler yarı yapılandırılmış mülakatlar aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Veri toplama süreci Nisan 2018 ile Şubat 2019 arasında sürmüş ve katılımcılara kişisel kontaklar aracılığıyla ulaşılmış ve mülakatlar için akademisyenlerin çalıştıkları üniversiteler ziyaret edilmiştir. Görüşmeler Ankara’da üniversitelerde çalışmakta olan 10 erkek 10 kadın akademisyenle yapılmıştır. Çalışma akademisyenlerin kariyerlerinde ilerlerken karşılaştıkları zorlukları tespit etmeyi amaçladığı için akademik hiyerarşinin alt ve ara kadrolarındaki doktoralı öğretim görevlileri, doktoralı araştırma görevlileri, doktor öğretim üyeleri ve doçentler çalışmaya dahil edilmiş, en üst basamağa ulaşmış profesörler çalışmaya dahil edilmemiştir. Veriler analiz edilirken ise tüm mülakatlar dikkatlice okunarak ilk aşamada verilen cevaplardaki anahtar kelimeler ve onlardan

bahseden katılımcılardan oluşan bir liste oluşturulmuştur. İkinci aşamada ise bu anahtar kelimelerin kümelendikleri üst başlıklar yani ana temalar oluşturulmuş ve anahtar kelimeler ana temaların altına taşınmıştır. Üçüncü aşamada ise temalara uygun olarak katılımcılardan alınan alıntılar, oluşturulan tabloda temaların altına yerleştirilmiştir. Çalışmanın en temel güçlü yanlarından biri, cinsiyet boyutuyla akademideki cinsiyet eşitsizliğinin erkek akademisyenler tarafından da nasıl deneyimlenip nasıl yeniden üretildiğini göstermiş olmasıdır. Çalışmanın en önemli sınırlılığı ise mülakatların Ankara'da akademisyenler ile yapılmış olması nedeniyle taşradaki ve daha küçük şehirlerdeki akademisyenlerin deneyimlerini tam olarak yansıtmada sınırlı kalmasıdır. Ataerkil yapının daha güçlü olmasını beklediğimiz taşra ve küçük şehirlerde yapılacak bu tür çalışmalar daha büyük çaplı cinsiyet eşitsizlikleri ortaya koyabilir.

Mülakatlarla toplanan verilerin analizi sonrasında ise çalışma dört ana tema ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bunlardan birincisi başarı ve üretkenliğin kavramsallaştırılmasında, deneyimlenmesinde ve algılanmasındaki cinsiyet farklılıklarıdır. Bulgulara göre toplumun gözünde başarı erkeklere atfedilmekte ve bu da kadın ve erkek akademisyenlerin sahip oldukları özgüven açısından farklılıklar yaratmaktadır. Cleveland, Stockdale, ve Murphy (2000) tarafından bahsedilen çalışan kadınların devamlı karşılaştıkları negatif stereotiplerden akademisyen kadınlar da muaf değildirler ve bunlar onları akademik kariyerlerinde daha az güvenilir bir konuma koymaktadır. Bu durumsa kadınları dezavantajlı konuma koyarken erkek akademisyenleri de daha güvenilir ve ideal çalışan kavramına daha çok uyan bir konuma getirmektedir. Bu nedenle bu negatif etiketlerden daha az etkilenmek ve daha güvenilir, daha başarılı bir konum elde etmek için kadınlar bazen kadınlıklarından ödün vermek ve kendilerine ait özelliklerden vazgeçmek ve erkeğe ait olduğu düşünülen özellikleri edinmek zorunda kalmaktadırlar. Benzer şekilde kendi başarılarından bahsetme davranışında da kadın ve erkek akademisyen arasında farklılıklar olduğu bulunmuştur. Buna göre kadınların kendi başarılarından bahsederlerken daha alçakgönüllü, pasif ve duygusal oldukları, erkeklerin ise daha objektif, hırslı ve iş odaklı oldukları kadın akademisyen tarafından belirtilmiş, erkek



akademisyenler ise çoğunlukla kadın ve erkek akademisyenler arasında bir fark olmadığını belirtse de bazıları kadın akademisyenlerin daha pasif kaldığını bazıları ise kadın akademisyenlerin daha hırslı olabildiklerini dile getirmişlerdir. İlk olarak erkek akademisyenlerin çoğunluğunun kadın akademisyenlerin belirttiğinden farklı olarak akademide kendi başarılarından bahsetmede cinsiyetler arası bir farklılığın olmadığını belirtmeleri, kendilerinin daha rahat ve doğal bir süreç olarak başarılarından bahsedebildikleri bu ortamı normalleştirdikleri ve kadın akademisyenlerin deneyimledikleri dezavantajlı durumdan haberdar olmadıklarını söyleyebiliriz. İkinci olarak kadınların daha hırslı görünmeleri bu çalışmada iki şekilde açıklanmıştır. Erkeklerin dünyasında kendilerine yer açabilmek adına kadınlar daha hırslı davranışlarda bulunabilirler ya da cinsiyet stereotiplerinin etkisinde daha alçakgönüllü davranması beklenen kadınların gerçekleştirdikleri herhangi bir kendi başarılarından bahsetme davranışı beklenen ile uyuşmadığı için çok fazla olarak algılanıyor olabilir. Sonuç olarak başarı kadın ve erkek akademisyenler tarafından deneyimlenirken toplumsal beklentilerin ve cinsiyet stereotiplerinin etkisinde kalmakta ve kadın ve erkek akademisyenler için farklı yaşam deneyimleri olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Çalışmanın bulduğu ikinci tema ise akademik işe alım ve yükseltme süreçlerindeki cinsiyet eşitsizlikleridir. Bu çalışma bu süreçlerde cinsiyete bağlı çifte standartların varlığının, cinsiyet stereotiplerinin, ve erkek ağlarının etkileri olduğunu bulmuştur. Bir erkek katılımcı açıkça akademik işe alım ve yükseltmelerde eğer torpili bulunan başka bir aday yoksa erkek adaylara öncelik verildiğini belirtmiştir. Kadın kotası ve pozitif ayrımcılık gibi konularda ise bazı akademisyenler bölümleri cinsiyet dağılımının normal olmadığını ve bu kotaların gerekli olduğunu belirtirlerken bazıları da işyerinin huzuru ve alınacak kişinin işe uygun kalifikasyonlara sahip olması açısından endişelerini dile getirmişlerdir. Ancak bu çalışmada, çalışanın kalitesi, kalifikasyonları ve meritokrasi kavramları zaten bir erkek çalışana ve onun hayat deneyimine göre dizayn edilmiş kriterlerle belirlenecek olması açısından eleştirilmiştir. Buna göre meritokrasinin cinsiyet eşitsizliklerini görmezden gelmesi, bu eşitsizliklere meşruluk kazandırmaktadır. Çalışma aynı zamanda cinsiyet

eşitsizliklerinin cinsiyet stereotiplerinden de etkilendiğini bulmuştur. Bir erkek akademisyen, kadınlar için ailelerinin ve çocuklarının daha önemli olduğunu söylemiş ve kendisine yetki verildiği takdirde kadınları ailelerinden koparmamak adına onları daha zorlayıcı görevlere getirmek istemeyeceğini belirtmiştir. Bu erkek akademisyenlerin de cinsiyet stereotipleri ile uyumlu olarak akademi içindeki cinsiyet eşitsizliklerini nasıl yeniden ürettiklerini göstermektedir. Benzer şekilde bir başka erkek akademisyen de kadın yönetici stereotiplerini yeniden üreterek kadın yöneticiler ile çalışmak istemediğini belirtmiştir. Ancak burada dikkat edilmesi gereken insanların dış dünyayı yorumlarken kendi düşünce ve inanışlarına uygun kanıt arama eğilimi olan doğrulama sapmasının bu tür stereotiplerin yeniden üretimine neden olarak bir tehdit oluşturma ihtimalidir. Bu son iki örnek de erkek akademisyenlerin akademi içindeki eşitsizlikleri nasıl yeniden ürettiklerini örneklendirmektedir. Bu çalışma aynı zamanda da kadınlara ait olduğu düşünülen duygusal, iletişime açık olma gibi özelliklerin, liderlik pozisyonlarında istenmemesine rağmen aslında liderliğe olumlu bir katkı yapabileceğini de bulmuştur. Bazı katılımcılar kadın iş arkadaşları ve yöneticileriyle bu özellikleri nedeniyle daha rahat iletişim kurabildiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bu nedenle de bu çalışma liderlik özelliklerinin ve kavramının tekrar sorgulanarak kadınlara atfedilen ve liderliğe olumlu yönler katabilecek özellikleri de barındıracak şekilde tekrar kurgulanmasının gerekliliğini de göstermiştir. Özellikle üst yönetimde var olan erkek ağlarının da kadınların yükselme ve yönetici pozisyonlarına gelme süreçlerinde kadınlar için bir zorluk oluşturduğu da bu çalışmada ortaya konmuş başka bir bulgudur. Kadın akademisyen kendi yönetici konumuna gelme isteklerinin yapısal sebep ve süreçlerle öldürüldüğünden, erkek akademisyenlerin kendi huzurlarını kaçırmamak adına kadın akademisyenleri aralarına almak istememesinden ve bu pozisyonlara geldikleri takdirde etraflarındaki herkesin erkek olmasının yarattığı ötekileştirici etkiden bahsetmişlerdir.

Çalışmanın ortaya çıkardığı üçüncü tema ise akademide iş-hayat dengesidir. Bulgular heteronormatif iş bölümünün sorunsallaştırılması gerekliliğini ortaya koymuştur. Kadın akademisyenler eşleri ile kıyaslandığında ev, çocuk bakımı ve diğer bakım

işleri konusunda daha fazla sorumluluk aldıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Kadın akademisyenlerin kariyerle ilgili kararlarında eşlerinin ya da babalarının iznine tabi olması da bir başka bulgu olmuştur. Erkek akademisyenler mülakatlarında bu tarz bir eş ya da baba izninden bahsetmemişlerdir. Evlilik kadın akademisyenler açısından ev ve çocuk sorumlulukları nedeniyle dezavantaja dönüşürken, erkek akademisyenlerin bu sorumlulukları evlilik yoluyla eşleri tarafı tarafından karşılanır hale geldiği için erkek akademisyenler daha çok evliliğin avantajlarından bahsetmektedirler. Çocuk sahibi olup olmama durumu ise erkek akademisyenlerin evliliğin kariyerlerine olan etkilerini anlatımını değiştirmiştir. Evli ve çocuğu özellikle küçük çocuğu olan erkek akademisyenler negatif etkiler kadınların deneyimlediği kadar güçlü olmasa da evliliğin akademik kariyerleri üzerindeki negatif etkilerinden bahsetmişlerdir. Ancak evli olan ve çocuğu olmayan akademisyenler evliliğin kariyerleri üzerinde hiçbir etkisi olmadığını ve başarının kişinin kendi azmine bağlı olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Evlilik kadın akademisyenler için kariyerleri açısından bir dezavantaj olurken bekarlık da sorunsuz değildir. Kadın akademisyenler bekar olduklarında erkek akademisyenlerin başarısı için daha büyük tehdit olarak algılandıklarını, başarıya nasıl cüret edebildiklerinin sorgulandığını dile getirmişlerdir. Evli olduklarında ise daha normlara ve toplumsal kabule uygun hale geldiklerini dile getirmişlerdir. Bu nedenle kadın akademisyenler evli olduklarında iş hayat uyumsuzluğunun olumsuz etkilerini daha çok deneyimlerken, evli olmadıklarında ise normlara uygun olarak algılanmamakta ve öteki konumuna konulmaktadır. Ev ve çocukların okuldan alınması gibi çocuk bakım sorumluluğu olmayan erkek akademisyen ideale göre dizayn edilmiş uzun ve katı mesai saatlerine sahip vakıf üniversitelerinde çalışmanın da kadın akademisyenlerin iş ve hayat dengesi açısından ekstra zorluklar getirdiği de çalışmanın bulguları arasındadır.

Çalışmanın ortaya koyduğu son tema ise cinsiyet temelli mobbing ve cinsel tacizdir. Veri analizi, mobbingin akademide çok yaygın olduğunu ve kadın akademisyenlerin yaptıkları işin önemsizleştirilmesi ya da söz haklarının olmaması gibi mobbing davranışları ile daha çok karşılaştıklarını göstermiştir. Mobbing deneyimlerini paylaşan kadın akademisyenlerin unvanlarına bakıldığında da kariyerlerinin ilk

basamaklarından birinde olan doktor ğretim yelerinin, hem akademik hiyerarşinin en alt basamaklarından birinde olmaları hem de cinsiyet stratifikasyonundan doğan dezavantajlarından dolayı mobbinge daha çok maruz kaldıkları düşünölebilir. Katılımcıların çoğı maruz kaldıkları mobbingin cinsiyetlerine bağılı olarak gerçekleşmediğini söyleseler de kadın akademisyenlerin buna daha çok maruz kalmaları mobbingin uygulayıcısı ile kurbanının cinsiyet stratifikasyonu ile uyumlu bir şekilde eşleşmesi mobbingin cinsiyet temelli olduğunu düşöndürmektedir. Cinsel taciz deneyimlerine gelindiğinde ise erkek akademisyenler akademide cinsel tacize hiç maruz kalmadıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Erkek egemen bölömlerde ise erkeklerin buraları kendi alanları olarak görmeleri sebebiyle kadınların cinsel tacize daha çok maruz kaldıkları ifade edilmiştir. Cinsiyet ve güç ilişkilerinin kendini erkek profesör, kadın araştırma görevlisi ya da öğrenci ilişkisinde var ettiğı de bulgular arasındadır. Katılımcılar erkek profesörler tarafından tacize uğrayan kadın araştırma görevlileri ve öğrencilerden bahsetmişlerdir. Ancak bu güç ilişkileri kadın öğretim görevlisi, erkek öğrenci ilişkisinde tersine dönmekte ve cinsiyet daha önemli bir güç belirleyicisi haline gelmektedir. Bir öğretim görevlisi kadın akademisyen öğrencisinin sözlü tacizine maruz kaldığını ifade etmiştir. Bunun tersine dönen güç ilişkisi dışında bir diğere sebebi de öğretim görevlilerinin akademik hiyerarşinin en alt basamağında yer almalarının cinsiyet stratifikasyonunda kadın olmanın getirdiğı dezavantajla birleşimidir. Benzer hiyerarşi güç ilişkisi de araştırma görevlisi kadınların erkek profesörler tarafından maruz bırakıldıkları cinsel tacizdir. Bu nedenle bu hiyerarşik yapılardan etkilenen toplumsal güç ilişkileri akademideki kadın için de cinsiyet temelli mobbing ve cinsel taciz olarak kendini gösterebilmektedir. Ancak bunlara rağmen kadın katılımcılar yine de medya gibi cinsel taciz açısından daha vahşi diğere iş yerleri ve sektörler ile kıyaslandığında daha güvenli bir alan olduğunu da dile getirmişlerdir. Kadınların akademide kalmak isteme sebeplerinden biri olarak da bu ortaya konmuştur.

Tüm bu tartışmalar içinde kadın akademisyenlerin akademide daha dezavantajlı bir konumda olduğunu gösterirmiş ve bireylerin seçimlerinin çoğı zaman yalnızca kişisel seçimleri olmadığının ve toplumsal yapısal faktörlerin bu seçimler konusunda

belirleyici olduđunun altı çizilmiřtir (Sandberg, 2013). Kadın akademisyenlerin bu zorluklarla bařa ıkma stratejileri ise onların seimleri ile eřitsizliklerin hayatlarındaki etkilerinin en aza dūřurma gayreti iinde olan aktrler olduklarını gstermiřtir. İdeal bir erkek alıřana gre dizayn edilmiř niversitelerde kadınların tutunma, hayatta kalma, ilerleme stratejileri bu aktrlk deneyiminin bir parasıdır. Ancak bu her zaman kolay olmamaktadır. Bu stratejilerde kadınların kendilerinden daha ok taviz vermek zorunda kaldıklarını, erkeklerle aynı bařarıyla ulařmak iin daha ok alıřmak zorunda kaldıklarını, istediklerini elde etmek iin kavga etmek zorunda olduklarını grebilmekteyiz. Benzer řekilde akademik st ynetim kademelerindeki yokluklarını telafi etmek iin de lobicilik, daha gl erkeklerin desteđini alma, iletiřim ađlarını kullanma, blm bařkanlıđı gibi orta ynetici kademelerini kullanma gibi stratejiler izleyerek kendi grnmezliklerini grnr kılmaya alıřtıklarını da bu alıřma gstermiřtir. İř hayat uyuramazlıđı kaynaklı problemlere karřı ise ailelerin kadınların bařarısında engel olmadıđını gstermek iin kadınlar daha ok alıřma, ailedeki diđer kadınlardan yardım alma, kendi yapmak istediklerinden vazgeme gibi stratejiler izlemekteler. Cinsiyet temelli mobbing ve cinsel tacizin olumsuz etkilerinden korunmak adına ise tacizci ile iletiřimi en aza indirme, durumu grmezden gelme, stereotiplere uyarak kabul grmeye alıřma ve daha iř odaklı olma gibi stratejiler kullanmaktalar. Akademideki cinsiyet temelli zorluklar ve bunlarla bařa ıkma stratejilerine bakıldıđında kadınların bulundukları dezavantajlı konumu kabullenmek yerine, onunla bařa ıkmak zerine stratejiler geliřtirdikleri aıka grlmektedir. Bu stratejiler olmaksızın erkek alıřana gre dizayn edilmiř akademide tutunmalarının ok daha zor bir hal alması kaınılmazdır.

Verilerin daha detaylı analizi akademideki cinsiyet eřitsizliđinin bireysel, toplumsal, kurumsal ve yapısal katmanları olduđunu ve katmanların birbirleriyle iliřki iinde olduđunu ortaya ıkarmıřtır. rneđin bireysel katmanda olduđu dřnlebilecek zgven, toplumsal katmandaki toplumsal cinsiyet stereotipleri, kurumların ev ii sorumluluđu olmayan erkek alıřana gre dizayn edilmesi ve toplumsal ve yapısal boyutları olan iř hayat dengesi ile bađlantılı hareket etmektedir. Bařarı toplumun gznde kadınlara atfedilen bir řey olmadıđı iin bu durum kadınların tarafında daha

çok çalışmaya neden olmakta, bu aşamada ev içi sorumluluklarla birlikte iş hayat dengesi kaybolmakta ve kadınlar için “Ben yeterli değilim” durumu oluşmaktadır. Bu da kadınların özgüvenini düşüren bir sonuçtur. Ancak arka plandaki katmanları görmeden kadınları özgüvensiz olarak etiketlemek yanlıştır. Çünkü yapısal, kurumsal ve toplumsal kaynaklardan beslenen cinsiyet eşitsizliğinin sadece bireyler bazında düşünülmesi eşitsizlikleri meşrulaştırmakta, önemsizleştirmekte ve yapısal, kurumsal ve toplumsal değişim gerekliliklerini ortadan kaldırmaktadır. Bu durum kadınların yönetici pozisyonlarındaki görünmezliğini de ilgilendirmektedir. Kadınları bu görevleri almak istememekle suçlamak ya da tercih etmediklerini düşünmek sorunu bireysel katmana indirgemektedir. Ancak bu çalışma göstermiştir ki kadınların bu görevlerdeki yokluğunun altında toplumsal cinsiyet stereotipleri, kadınların içlerine dahil olmasına müsaade etmeyen erkek ağırları gibi toplumsal, kurumsal ve yapısal sebepler yatmaktadır. Bu nedenle akademideki cinsiyet eşitsizliği çok katmanlı bir sorun olarak ele alınmalıdır.

Tüm bunları göz önünde bulundurarak akademide toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliğinin sağlanması için politika önerilerinde de bulunmuştur. Öncelikle üniversitelerde toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliği farkındalığı yaratmak için aktiviteler planlanmalı ve aktiviteler kadınlara yönelik negatif stereotipleri ortadan kaldırmayı, işe alım ve yükseltme işlerini yapan akademik komisyonların olası cinsiyet önyargılarını yenmelerini sağlamayı amaçlamalıdır. Kadınların üniversite içindeki görünürlüklerini artıracak akademik etkinlikler organize edilmeli, ve kadın akademisyenlerin başarıları öğrenciler ve meslektaşları ile paylaşılmalıdır. Özellikle erkek egemen akademik, araştırma ve yönetim kademelerinde geçici pozitif aksiyonlar alınmalı ve kadın kotaları getirilmelidir. Kadınların akademik yönetim pozisyonlarında neden olmadıkları bunun arkasındaki kurumsal ve yapısal engelleri anlamak için araştırılmalıdır. Genç akademisyen kadınların mesleği bırakmasının önüne geçmek için toplumsal cinsiyet farkındalığına sahip ve toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliğini önemseyen akademisyen kadınların genç meslektaşlarına mentorluk yapabileceği programlar geliştirilmelidir. İş hayat dengesini iyileştirmek adına kurumlar kadın ve erkek akademisyenlere çocuk bakım hizmeti sağlamalı,

ebeveynlik izinleri kurumlar tarafından özendirilmeli ve akademisyenlerin bu izinlerden sonra işe dönüşü daha az ders yükü gibi uygulamalarla kolaylaştırılmalıdır. Cinsiyet temelli mobbing ve cinsel tacizle başa çıkmada da kurumlar açıkça cinsiyet temelli mobbing ve cinsel tacizin tolere edilmeyeceğini ilan etmeli, protokoller imzalamalı ve buna yönelik birimler kurmalıdır. Kampüs içinde yaşayan ve çalışan tüm öğrenciler, akademik ve idari personel de dahil olmak üzere herkes cinsiyet temelli mobbing, cinsel taciz ve cinsel tacizin not karşılığı öğrencilerin cinsel tacizi gibi kampüse özel formları konusunda bilgilendirilmelidir. Mağdurlar yaşadıkları olayları bildirmeleri konusunda desteklenmeli ve tacizcilere yasal yaptırımlar uygulanmalıdır.

Özetle, akademideki cinsiyet eşitsizliği çok katmanlı bir bakış açısı ile ele alınmalıdır. Burada bir eğitim kurumu olması nedeniyle akademinin toplumu dönüştürücü gücünün de altı çizilmelidir. Cinsiyet eşitliğine yönelik kurumsal farkındalık aktiviteleri yetişen öğrenciler ve bu öğrencilerin farklı mesleklere dağılımı ile toplumun da dönüşmesine büyük fayda sağlayacaktır. Kurumsal dönüşümlerin toplumsal dönüşümlerle desteklenmesi de onları kalıcı olmasını sağlayacaktır. Bu nedenle hem kadınlar hem erkekler için hem bir işyeri olarak hem de toplumu dönüştürme gücüne sahip bir eğitim kurumu olarak akademideki toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliği çok önemlidir.

## E. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

### ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

☐

### YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : YILMAZ

Adı / Name : ECE

Bölümü / Department : TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET VE KADIN ÇALIŞMALARI / GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : GENDER-BASED CHALLENGES AND  
COPING STRATEGIES IN ACADEMIA IN TURKEY

.....

.....

.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☒

Doktora / PhD ☐

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒

2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two year. \* ☐

3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. \* ☐

\* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.  
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature .....

Tarih / Date .....