'We Women Are No Good at It': Networking in Academia*

ZDENKA ŠADL**
University of Ljubljana

Abstract: In this article the author investigates networking in an academic milieu in Slovenia to obtain information on the academic staff's perceptions of how formal and informal connections in academia influence the success of a person's academic career. The analysis is based on ethnographic research and in-depth interviews with academics in the middle of their academic career. The results of the analysis reveal the existence of two kinds of social networks: one based on patron-client relations, and another based on equal and 'floating' partnership cooperation and autonomy. The article focuses on gendered dimensions of academic networking and criticises the existance and impact of a male network on male and female academic career progression.

Keywords: academia, gender, networking, informal social capital

Introduction

In the dominant western discourses that espouse gender equality and universality, academic institutions are constructed as gender-neutral environments organised around meritocratic principles. According to the Mertonian norm of universalism, personal or social attributes should not be taken into account when judging scientific claims. In this scientific ethos, academic careers should be open to talented individuals and independent of factors such as gender, class, and race-ethnicity. The discourse on meritocracy accordingly assumes that academic rewards are directly related to an individual's performance. Viewed from this perspective, the individual's academic success depends solely and exclusively on individual merit. However, for a successful career merits are not sufficient. As we shall argue below in this article, social networks and associated resources are of equal if not greater importance.

It is a well-worn cliché that it is not only what you know, but also who you know that has a host of implications for a career outcome. Accordingly, for

---

an academic career, it is important that an individual participates in social networks. However, academic culture is not a culture of inclusion but a culture of selection. The academic institutions of higher education, where men dominate (both in terms of number and hierarchy) and act to prevent women from fully participating in and integrating into formal and informal networks, are prime examples of homosocial institution [Etzkowitz, Kemelgor and Uzzi 2000; Fogelberg et al. 1999; Gupta et al. 2004; Hearn 2004; Husu 2004]. Academics generally establish informal connections on the basis of the principle of gender homophily. However, it is predominantly men who form social networks – male academics give support to their male colleagues. Husu [2001] reports that many senior women interviewed in her study observed that their male colleagues supported each other through 'old boy's networks'. These networks, also referred to as the 'invisible college', [O'Leary and Mitchell 1990] involve informal power groups whose members are in a position to make (implicit) decisions about the academic rank, status, and position of an academic. Academic women are often excluded from academic networks, and this often puts them at a disadvantage [Kaufman 1978; O'Leary and Mitchell 1990; Toren 1991; Vazquez-Cupeiro and Elston 2006]. Rees [2001: 256] contends that 'male networks ... are crucial for science organization' and that they are universal across the West European and North American higher education sector and extra-university research environment [Ledwith and Manfredi 2000]. Gatekeeping, much like networking, is a gender practice, or, as Husu [2004: 70] put it, '[s]tudying gate-keepers in academia means studying élite groups and studying men – until recently these gate-keepers have been predominantly male'. Members of male network groups, particularly senior male academics, act as gatekeepers, obstructing women's academic career progression. The term gatekeeper is used as a metaphor to describe a type of doorman who determines who is nominated and who is excluded. Gatekeepers therefore influence and contribute to the (re)production of gender inequality in academia. The universalist Mertonian norm is therefore an idealisation rather than an accurate reflection of academics' experiences with career opportunities. According to Knights and Richards, the meritocratic systems of inequality 'reflect and reproduce the discursive practices of masculinity that present disadvantages to a majority of women and some men' [2003: 231].

Given this situation, it is important to examine academics' experiences of informal academic networks as they struggle to develop their careers. The aim of my survey among the academic staff of a higher education institution in the social sciences was to establish whether gender differences in access to social capital and benefits existed within that particular institution. This article analyses academics' experiences of social networks. Particular attention is devoted to the question of whether and how the inclusion in or exclusion from networks in academic organisations (re)produces (sexually) discriminatory practices detrimental to academics' career advancement. Mali [2001: 91] notes that 'old boy's' networks and gatekeeping are evident in the small academic community in Slovenia. Although

many Slovenian researches have been dedicated to the studies of women's academic careers in Slovenia [Jogan 1998; Zaviršek 2001; Luthar and Šadl 2008], none of the studies so far has focused on networking practices, perceptions of the impact of networking on academic career progression, and gendered dimensions of informal networking. This study is the first in Slovenia to explore this topic.

Proceeding from descriptions of the academic community as a male-dominated culture, one of the main goals of this article is to investigate the role of gender within networks. The article posits, first, that there are differences between male and female academics in access to and participation in social networks, and second, that these differences affect their academic careers. It further posits that the (self-)exclusion of women from informal networks (re)produces gender inequality and discriminatory practices in academic organisations.

Social capital theory and social inequalities

The theoretical framework for this study draws upon social capital theory. Social capital is here understood as a resource that results from an individual's participation in social networks. Relationships and social networks are a valuable asset in that they can provide intangible and tangible benefits and supports. Nahapiet and Ghoshal [1998: 252] pointed out that network ties provide access to information and social resources. As mentioned above, social networks and social capital matter for participation and career outcomes in academia. An important consequence of participation in academic networks, these being important providers of information, is the increased opportunity to exchange knowledge, learn, and improve work performance, which all enhances an individual's career outcomes. The second benefit of participation includes influence, control, solidarity, and status, which may also be significant for career success. Such benefits allow academics to accomplish things and achieve their various goals, which would be impossible to achieve without social capital, or would be achievable only with significant costs attached.

However, these benefits are not distributed equally. To conceptualise social capital and to explain the connections between social capital and social inequality and power, I draw on Bourdieu's resource-centred and conflict-centred view of social capital. In Bourdieu's understanding of the term, social capital is seen as a resource that is connected with a stable network of relations and group membership. Or, in Bourdieu's [1986: 248] own words, social capital is 'the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition'. Bourdieu [1986: 249] also underlines the fact that a network of relationships is not given, but 'is the product of investment strategies, individual or collective, consciously or unconsciously aimed at establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long term [...]'.

The reproduction of social capital presupposes the endless effort of sociability, a continuous series of exchanges in which recognition is endlessly affirmed and reaffirmed and which promises benefits sooner or later.

Bourdieu's conceptualisation is helpful for the present study because of its attention to and special emphasis on power function and conflicts. One of Bourdieu's main insights is that social capital increases one's ability to advance her/his interest in the competition between individuals. Useful relationships can secure material or symbolic 'profit', which establishes a concrete base for the growth of solidarity [Bourdieu 1986: 249]. By using the term 'profit' to refer to the stream of benefits that result from participation in groups, Bourdieu suggests that group members enjoy certain privileges they have not necessarily earned. This point is important because it proposes the existence of a non-meritocratic academic reality, where promotion is a function of social networking rather than of one's merit, a profit arising from useful connections with quality 'nodes' rather than an earned privilege.

Viewed from Bourdieu's perspective, social capital can be a powerful personal asset that gives individuals access to useful resources and can improve their own position vis-à-vis others. This conflict theory perspective of social capital considers the effect of social capital at an individual level, but Bourdieu also explained how social capital (in interaction with other forms of capital) can be the source of social advantage and social differentiation. Bourdieu stresses that social capital benefits are unequally distributed across society and that they tend to accumulate in certain social groups, this being strongly associated with the division of power in that society. Social capital as a collective asset can be drawn upon to advance a social group's interest. Bourdieu views social capital as the investment strategy of the members of the privileged class (as a group or network) in their effort to reproduce group solidarity and its domination. He also suggests that closure of the group, that is, the unceasing effort to produce and reproduce homogeneous relationships, is required if the resources of the socially powerful are to be preserved and reproduced. We can say that academics with high social capital have the means to exclude others and an interest in doing so.

The point of departure for the study of academic social networks was the realisation that university organisations are generally hierarchical systems, with policies and activities determined by the top individuals and with a culture built on competition for economic (financing), social (sociality), and symbolic (visibility, scientific recognition and prestige/honor) capital, to use Bourdieu's [1986] terminology. In this environment, formal and informal networks[1] function as specific social and cultural structures that offer social capital and access to the resources

---

[1] Formal and informal networks not only co-exist in a formal work organisation, but they often overlap, since workmates frequently create informal relations to collaborate and satisfy their informational, psychological and practical needs. Informal networks are to some degree elitist (workers use them to create insiders and outsiders who do not belong to an in-group) and they lack transparency, structured communication and checks which are characteristics of formal networks.

held by networked individuals. As different resources reside at different levels of the social hierarchy, academics need to associate with their colleagues of both lower and higher status. However, academics prefer to interact with those who share similar characteristics or those at higher positions in the social structure (the homophily and prestige principles). Networks also provide the opportunity to become known within the complex hierarchical system. As such, they are key to maintaining a competitive edge in an academic setting, while the lack of social networks increases vulnerability to becoming socially excluded and invisible.

The major premise of this study is that gender matters for academic careers and in the academic mileu, and particularly in academic networking. As Mählck [2003] established, men more easily adjust to the academic way of functioning, partly because they can identify and interpret masculine culture at universities more easily than women. Men seem to be more aware of the necessity of self-promotion and they are more inclined to take as a challenge the need to prove their competence to others and to themselves. As Krais says [2002: 414-5], 'agonal' motivation in academic institutions is more developed in men. Accordingly, they respond to evaluation contexts by promoting their talents, skills, or achievements, which is in effect the performance of 'career masculinity' [Bagilhole and Goode 2001: 168]. The differences between women and men are not seen here as resulting from biological differences between female and male bodies, but as socially formed. Attitudes, behavioural dispositions or orientations, skills and capabilities are indicators of the gender position of individuals and the 'habitus' [Bourdieu 1990] in which they have been raised. In other words, they reflect gendered social and cultural realities. Therefore, it is important to focus on women and men as gendered rather than sexed (generic) beings and to ask which social practices underlie, legitimise, and reproduce differences, both outside and inside academia. Accordingly, my discussion of academic networks and their role in reproducing social inequalities will include the gender perspective alongside social capital theory. Drawing on the leading organisational theorist Acker [1992: 250], I see gender as a term denoting 'socially produced distinctions between female and male…it is a daily accomplishment …that occurs in the course of participation in work organizations as well as in many other locations and relations'. In keeping with the social construction approach, I have also found Wharton's [2005] theoretical model to be useful for analysing gender issues within work organisations. She suggests that gender is a multilevel 'system of social practices that constitutes people as different and that organizes relations of inequality' [ibid. 2005: 53]. First, the social practices that constitute gender operate at the individual level and gender is reflected in how people behave; as a result, it might be imagined that male academics are more assertive or have a more aggressive competitive attitude towards peers than women. Second, gender operates at the level of social interactions and relationships. Wharton [2005: 55–64] has identified three perspectives within the interactionist framework: the ethnomethodological approach – 'doing gender', status characteristic theory, and the homophily approach. Viewed from the 'doing gender' perspective, individuals in organisations 'do' gender

(men 'do' 'career masculinity', men present themselves to others as 'one of the old boys'). Within the perspective of status characteristics theory, men within an academic community are generally accorded higher status than women; women are consequently considered less competent than men and their contribution less valuable. Viewed from the perspective of homophily, men prefer to collaborate and interact with other men and feel uncomfortable collaborating with women. Finally, gender is embedded in and reproduced through the structures, cultures, and practices of organisations and social institutions; this framework provides a useful point of departure for analysing the male-oriented structure of academic institutions and male academic culture as a source of women's marginalisation.

There is considerable evidence of the existence of various obstacles to women's academic careers at Slovenian universities. The most obvious indicator of the unequal position of women in the academic world is surely the low percentage of women with high academic titles. In 2004, of all the full professors at the University of Ljubljana, only 14% were women. But some aspects of the position of women in the institution covered in this study have changed significantly in recent years. In 2004, a pioneering change occurred: a female dean was appointed for the first time ever in the 40 years of the institution's existence. This change led to the appointment of another female dean in 2006 and also opened up new opportunities for women to be appointed to middle-management positions. However, the appointment of female deans was related to the newly introduced lump-sum funding method and the centralisation of funding and material resources management. Observing that these changes have left deans with fewer financial responsibilities, some interviewed women commented that this consequently makes the position of dean less appealing to men. Those job positions that involve the management of independent funds are as a rule occupied by older men, in contrast to those that do not involve financial responsibilities, which are occupied by younger women. Men also greatly outnumber women as heads of research centres in the institution. The area of graduate studies is well funded and men have always greatly outnumbered women as coordinators of graduate study programmes. The gender division of financial power is also evident in the case of department chairs, where women greatly outnumber men. During the academic year 2006/2007, of the institution's twelve departments only four were chaired by (mainly younger) men, while the other eight were headed by younger women. They work under relentless pressure, and given the amount of work they actually perform their wages seem just symbolic.

Methodology

On reviewing the literature, I identified social capital theory and gender theory as the most appropriate basis for the theoretical framework used in the study. Bourdieu's work on social capital provides insights into social networks as structures that are both enabling and constraining (every inclusion also constitutes an exclusion). In addition, it describes how social networks serve to create and per-

petuate social inequality. On the other hand, different gender perspectives offer insight into the ways that gender has left its mark on academic culture and the structures and differences in scientific careers. Many previous research studies have already established that women typically lack the strong networks essential for academic careers. This study provides a further test of the theories that served as a basis for my research.

The concept of gender draws attention to the social construction of masculinity and femininity. Yet we should also be aware of differences within gender groups and avoid over-generalisation. This occurs when we conclude that what has been observed for one group of women or men is true for all or most women or men, which can result in stereotypes. Furthermore, many theorists have pointed out that it is inappropriate to assume homogeneity within a male or female group sharing a common experience. Gender as a social marker of difference intersects with other bases of distinction and stratification, such as age, class, race/ethnicity, sexuality, and disability. In discussing the category of women as socially constructed, a useful reference could be Brown's [1995] critique of paradoxical inconsistency in modernist feminist theory. Brown [1995: 41] argues that feminist theorising contains 'the sharp but frequently elided tensions between adhering to social construction theory on one hand, and epistemologically privileging women's accounts of social life on the other'. While most feminist theorists acknowledge that femininity is fabricated and constructed under patriarchy, they are reluctant to overthrow the very unified and coherent subject, which they have challenged for its masculine construction. Brown [1995: 42] elaborates these 'symptomatically modernist paradoxes' in relation to MacKinnon's work and writes: 'while women are socially constructed to the core, women's words about their experience… are anointed as Truth, and constitute the foundations of feminist knowledge… even when social construction is adopted as method for explaining the making of gender, "feelings" and "experiences" acquire a status that is politically if not ontologically essentialist – beyond hermeneutics'. Therefore, claiming that women's experiences, the experience of women academics in our case, are sources and certifications of the 'truth' of oppression not only results in the paradox described above, but it also 'requires suspending recognition that women's 'experience' is thoroughly constructed, historically and culturally varied, and interpreted without end' [ibid. 1995: 40]. Brown [1995: 40] does not reject the concept of gender altogether, but proposes 'that gender can be conceived as a marker of power, a maker of subject, an axis of subordination, without thereby converting it to a "center" of "selves" understood as foundational'.

Feminist/gender theorists are grappling today with the complexities of gender issues and the need to develop coherent and clearly defined concepts. Nevertheless, it is important not to move beyond gender as such. In this paper I follow Di Stefano's argument [1990: 78] that 'gender is basic in ways that we have yet to understand, that it functions as a "difference that makes a difference" even as it can no longer claim the legitimating mantle of *the* difference'. Gender remains one of the most important aspects of academic institutions; as already ar-

gued above, gender-linked differences exist in the distributions of resources and rewards in academia. These gender relations and arrangements are seen as circumstances in which people have opportunities to act or 'do' an academic career; as documented by research in various countries [see, e.g., Poole, Bornholt and Summers 1997; Leathwood and Read 2009], these circumstances are frequently sources of injustice and harm for women. Gender has practical implications for both women and men academics and continues to be a theoretically and politically relevant concept. In other words, 'there are pragmatic political reasons for insisting on the possibility of thinking about women as some kind of group' [Young 1994: 713–714].

This study uses the feminist methodological framework [Letherby 2003]. I formulated the research questions based on the feminist argument that men in an androcentric society have been able to promote their own interests, and that, as a result, the academic structure and culture primarily exhibit and value male characteristics. The questions are as follows: Do men and women academics have equal access to networks and the resources these contain? How do they themselves experience their network membership (and the power dynamics of the networks in which they participate) or non-membership? Do men and women network differently? What kind of (formal and informal) support, if any, do they receive from more experienced colleagues? How do they evaluate the benefits of membership support and mentoring? Aware that personal (gender, age, class, race, and so on) and theoretical (choice of theories and research literature) positionality shape research and may enable or inhibit certain research insights, I feel it is important to reflect on my positionality as a researcher and how it may have influenced my research and shaped the 'knowledge' I produce. I have been working at the same institution for twenty years now, teaching different courses. My decision to study the subject of networks was motivated by the feelings of social isolation and outsiderness that have accompanied me throughout my work and career. One of the questions related to positionality is whether one is an insider or an outsider. As an academic I am inevitably an insider to the academic culture/structure and share the attributes or experience under study. As a cultural insider I had the advantage of understanding the 'language' of the interview, participants' perspectives, and their way of functioning. In addition, a number of my personal characteristics are similar to those of the participants in the study (education, income, ethnicity, class, age). As a woman, I have certain experiences that gave me an insider perspective on the women I interviewed.

I have occupied positions where I was included as insider, but simultaneously, in some dimensions, was positioned as an outsider. For example, although I am/was part of the culture under study and a member of the group studied, I did not participate in networks, and knew nothing about the 'network subculture' being studied. Accordingly, I was an outsider to the category of participants who had personal experiences of networks. However, my outsider position did not prove to be a problem – some of my most open and informative discussions

came from these categories of participants. In keeping with the basic goals emphasised in feminist research [Letherby 2003] I have documented oppressive acts and negative attitudes towards women and witnessed certain male academics demonstrating that equal opportunity is not available in academia. My research was motivated by my conviction that positive change is possible, so my articulation of gendered networks and networking within academia is also a statement of my commitment to the feminist struggle.

Interviews with middle-aged academics of both genders were conducted to find out whether informal networks existed and, if they did, how they worked. There are many other ways to gather information about informal networks [e.g. Hlebec and Ferligoj 2001]. In 2002 and 2005 we collected data using the in-depth interview method, with participants recruited through personal connections. Our interview sampling was purposive, with participants being selected on the basis of potential contribution as information-rich cases for in-depth study [Patton 1990]. We selected 22 assistant professors and associate professors, 12 women and 10 men aged 35–45, who at the time of interviewing were in the middle of their academic careers, and who we believed could provide the best information about the power and authority mechanisms experienced by junior academics at a Slovenian university. The fact that the researcher knows the respondents may affect the research process. On the one hand, the participants may prove to be more open in communication, but on the other, the information they provide may be selective out of apprehension that it could be leaked to their immediate circle. As a researcher, I made every necessary effort to ensure the confidentiality of personal data and maintain high professional and ethical standards throughout the research process.

Initially, the research focus was not explicitly on respondents' experiences with informal networks, yet it became clear during the analysis of interview data that networking experiences, or the lack of them, represented a significant dimension of their academic life. Although some of the data on social networks were collected in 2002 and 2005 (but not interpreted at the time by the authors), a number of additional semi-structured interviews were held in 2008 to gain more insight into the participants' networking experiences and their views on the operation and benefits of informal networks in an academic setting. The question that arises here is how much the situation, or the people, have changed over the six years. It should be taken into account that certain ties are durable, while others are not. Informal ties at a workplace may be stable or change over time; they are frequently a combination of weak and strong ties. Changes in the perception of academics may also have occurred. To explain the dynamics, in 2008 I asked two additional questions: if any changes had occurred related to networking and social capital in their academic organisation, and if they saw this issue differently than they had in 2002 and 2005.

Studies examining academic careers and network experiences tend to be women-focused, meaning that research is mainly conducted with female aca-

demics. However, in order to fully understand gender relations and gendered networking in academia it is also important to study men's accounts of these phenomena and how they narrate their stories of academic achievements and networking practices. The issues of male academics' behaviour in networks and their actual networking practices are important, though under-researched. Since we were addressing a sensitive topic, the already established contacts and trustful relationships with some male interviewees were of great help.

Social capital: partnership and patronage

The interviews with both men and women clearly showed that social networks did exist in their work organisation, and that they operate as a useful and instrumental support infrastructure and an exchange platform. The discussions with participants indicated that they were themselves embedded in both formal and informal networks and that some of them intentionally created informal bonds to satisfy practical needs.

Female interviewee:

> Networking helps a lot, helps dramatically, it creates opportunities, how else could we publish anything. (Interview No. 6, 2007)

Male interviewee:

> I engage in informal exchange to get information needed to perform my tasks. (Interview No. 7, 2005)

Some interviewees also have consciously established and use informal ties and channels of communication to gain political power and advantage in organisational politics. Below is the testimony of a male interviewee:

> I immediately established contacts with every dean ... I supported every one of them wherever they needed support. For example, I supported XX when he came in conflict with YY. I did it openly, publicly, and I even prodded him into action, because I knew that it meant much to him. And in other respects, too, I think it is okay to take sides. The only one I didn't have anything to do with was XY, but once he became the dean we talked and mutually recognised these statuses in a way. And I always had support in crucial moments. (Interview No. 1, 2002)

Networking in this sense should not be perceived as a benign instrumental practice but as a process that shapes the very functioning of academic institutions, as is evident from the same interviewee's concluding thoughts on networking:

And you know, if you consent to being led, the logic is completely different than when you lead the game. You have to hold the reins. What is of key importance is the main current, and you must direct it. (Interview No. 1, 2002)

Besides the 'abundance of social support' enjoyed by the male interviewee quoted above, it is also evident from his statement who is considered a desirable informal ally – the most attractive are those with high-status positions, because such positions typically come with authority, power, and control over resources. As Bourdieu said, people in high-status positions are sought out by others, and, because they are well known, they are worth knowing. We can also clearly see from the interviewee's remark that network membership and full participation are not automatic; these are the products of deliberate strategies of investment. Social networking is very time- and energy-consuming, so it is easy to understand why the respondent tries to economise the energy he spends on mentoring his protégés:

I observe the minimum criteria so that everything functions fine. Not to the maximum extent, I won't write down details, for instance, how she quoted something, although I must say that sometimes I get carried away. But that is not good. It is dangerous. You know what the problem is? If you put excessive emotional energy into it, then your energy leaks away. And you have to learn that! (Interview No. 5, 2002)

Below is another statement that shows the political value of investments in informal networks:

I came to the faculty as a politically savvy person. I already mastered political discourse so I did not have that sort of problem with decoding. I also worked on establishing channels through which I could speak up. (Interview No. 5, 2002)

It is important to emphasise that social capital in itself does not always lead to 'profitable' outcomes. Individuals have to be able to draw the productive value from the networks to which they belong – only this makes social capital truly *capital*. A male interviewee described how he mobilised support from his superior for the purpose of extending his graduate student status, despite resistance from a female executive.

So I took XX to YY's office, who was untouchable. And we had two-on-one talks. But XX started to retreat, so I said 'Hey, ... what's going on here ... I'll be a student for another two months. Period.' And then YY said: 'You can't.' 'XX says that I can, so I will stay. Period.' (Interview No. 5, 2002)

His intention was not only to extend his student status, but also to outdo a female executive, that is, to improve his standing in relation to the 'untouch-

able'. Social capital ('XX says that I can, so I will stay') is an indispensable prerequisite for achieving certain goals, but without 'agonal' motivation [Krais 2002: 414] action may not lead to winning results. By combining his social capital and conflictual and adversarial behaviour this male academic was able to win and consequently reach his goal:

> Then she said: 'You won't speak to me like that.' I replied 'And you won't speak to me like that.' … I hit the table so hard that it started to shake and I shouted at her as I had never shouted at anyone before that. And she left the meeting. But, I did what I intended to do, there was an effect, for me it was an important effect. (Interview No. 5, 2002)

From the statements above it is evident that a relationship within a network can be more or less balanced, with both parties contributing equally to the connection. Another type is a hierarchical relationship following the 'bow tie' communication pattern, where an individual in a powerful position provides advice, security, or other resources to lower-ranking colleagues in exchange for loyalty or political support. This type of relationship is more often one of patronage than of partnership. A number of our male and female interviewees spoke of a particular social network to which they themselves belong, where members are dependent upon a single colleague (but not upon one another) and where the senior academics control the flow of resources, which places them in a position of greater power. These stable and durable networks of strong ties overlap with the formal academic networks in the research centres at the work organisation under study. The descriptions bellow allow us a look at how the expectations and rankings are created. The statement below by a male respondent also points to the advantages of the inclusion in academic social networks.

Male interviewee:

> This unusual situation stems from the fact that our boss isn't a part of that group of tyrants and blood-suckers who traditionally terrorise people in this institution. Something more refined was at work. In this kind of economy you have to respond in an informal manner, because you also obtain things in an informal manner. No doubt, we received support, but it was clear that we were in a junior position, because everyone knows who accepts the offers, who makes the decisions, who assigns the roles, and who provides the money in the end.... This was completely conscious opportunism, which eventually turned into a profitable business. (Interview No. 10, 2002)

Female interviewee:

> I was included in my female superior's informal networks, but my place was clear, I communicated through her. It was stifling. In fact, you're someone's proxy. Problems were not discussed, access to information was limited, applications for research projects were mysterious, you'd always get elusive answers. That environment stimulated my desire for perfection, but less so for learning. It did not allow

me to learn from my own mistakes, but these were used to discipline me along the lines of 'you don't know what you're doing, you're a beginner, listen to me.' (Interview No. 6, 2008)

Our interviewees talked about an environment in which (usually male) senior academics tend to be the ultimate authority, creating a 'father knows best' kind of atmosphere. These networks were based on a system of traded favours and strong ties, but information was not necessarily obtained or could not always be obtained from close allies, as the case above clearly illustrates. Junior academics were allowed to build new links only through their boss's contacts. The female interviewee cited above felt that it would have been beneficial for her if she could have collaborated with other academics more freely, which would have enabled her to have a much larger set of weaker social ties. Another female interviewee, who reported being included in an informal network run by a male collegue, her superior, also described a similar patron-client-like structure of relationship that limited her freedom of action:

As an obedient girl, I, in a way .... was an implicit ally of XX. For example, I implicitly felt that I couldn't, and I still cannot, strongly oppose an issue that he supports in the Senate. (Interview No. 1, 2005)

This 'paternalistic' social capital can be explained by the lack of inter-institutional mobility and by the given system of higher education, which historically derives from the Central European university model, where one's professional career is almost entirely dependent on tenured senior faculty members and where the hierarchical rigidity of the academic institutions impacts one's academic life. New academics and researchers are chosen chiefly from among persons who receive their graduate training at the same institution. 'Academic inbreeding', as it is often referred to, is a traditional feature of Slovenian higher education arising from the small size of the academic community and insufficient international mobility of the staff. All of our respondents had been the students at the institution for which they were now working, and many of them, after completing their doctoral studies, continued their research work in collaboration with their former mentors or professors. Such a long-term 'unhappy marriage' is detrimental to the autonomy of junior academics and researches.

Gender differences in informal networks

Women reported lower levels of embeddedness in informal networks than did their male peers, and they typically lack the strong networks essential for academic success. There was a general agreement among female participants that male academics engage more in informal networking than women and that women are often excluded from their networks:

Our female professors were excluded from this men's game. (Interview No. 4, 2005)

It's what older men do; older women did not do that, and so and so this is where their deficit lies, and it's apparent/obvious ... Older men networked with younger men and involved them in the existing old boy networks. (Interview No. 2, 2002)

The combination of age and gender hierarchy doubly deprives younger women academics, while in the case of their male colleagues their disadvantageous position in the age hierarchy (the seniority principle) is offset by their privileged position with regard to the gender hierarchy. Another woman drew attention to the price of isolation, which affects intellectual and information exchange:

Actually you need information, perhaps you need an assistant and things like that, and you are absolutely marginalised. My initial feelings were of utter isolation. I always missed team work, too. In fact, I still don't know much about goings-on at the faculty ... I was not included ... but they should have included me ... and they didn't ... that is called non-involvement. (Interview No. 7, 2002)

Those female academics who have experience in executive positions are also frequently excluded from the informal networks through which male power holders maintain their power in decision making. Below is an example:

During the time I held an executive position ... my status, despite my work, was never proportionate to my efforts or achievements, and the words of members of male networks had greater weight. (Interview No. 8, 2002)

Male networks, as informal structures, are not obliged to adhere to the principle and practices of equal opportunity and can therefore use discriminatory (gendered) criteria in building network membership and distributing network resources and in evaluations and implicit decision-making processes. Based on the informal evaluations of the talents and competences of academics, the members of male-dominated networks select, promote, and reward all members of academia. Older male gatekeepers clearly prefer to give support to (younger) men. Gatekeeping practices mainly take place during the recruitment phase, when a university department starts searching for eligible candidates. This is exemplified in the following account:

There was some staffing issue, who was to become a lecturer, a male or a female colleague, both equal according to research indicators. When the superior learnt about the pay difference (a lecturer is paid more because the funds are not provided from the budget of the institution, author's note) he named the man. (Interview No. 8, 2002)

As we can see, gender was enough to eliminate the female candidate for the job opening. When a male interviewee who was a member of formal organisational structures (which overlap with informal structures) was asked about how judgments were made and how candidates' qualities were assessed, it became obvious that personal attributes such as gender were taken into account. Of particular note is the interviewee's statement on academic hiring practices:

> When XX [a male – author's note] came and said: 'She has two children, she has no business being at the faculty ... she earned her MA, but it's a question whether it has any value!' I first tought that he was kidding, you know, 'she has two children', so I said: 'Wait! Are you kidding?' 'No,' he said, 'She has no business [here] indeed'. (Interview No. 1, 2002)

This excerpt offers a clear illustration of the constricting ways in which women are constructed in predominantly male committees. Women are seen primarily as mothers and as less competent in academic roles than men. This kind of representation is commonly used to support claims that men are naturally better academics, while women's strengths lay primarily in the family. Such a gender bias in recruitment neglects the scientific qualifications and skills of a candidate and violates the universalist norms of science and academic competence. This finding provides supportive evidence for the homophily approach, which argues that homophilous networks of male gatekeepers can have a negative impact on women's chances in male-dominated organisations. It also confirms the status characteristics theory, which argues that women are stereotyped as less competent than men. In addition, it confirms the theory's assumption that differential performance expectations are manifested very effectively in male-dominated fields such as academia. The possibility of women obtaining recognition for scientific excellence is also very small:

> When we talk, for example, about recognition, women are left out. And only then you look around and see that there are no women around. We talked about the recognition of younger colleagues and we were able to recall XX [a younger male – author's note] and YY [a younger male – author's note], but not one woman. (Interview No. 1, 2002)

Senior academics' criteria for providing support can depend upon their own gender and that of their network members. Women are often indirectly excluded from networks in academia in that their requests for support have lower priority for their network members. A female interviewee spoke about an explicit form of gender discrimination in the habilitation process, where she did not get support from a male mentor with whom she was associated in a formal/informal network. Her mentor displayed little tolerance for her situation and failed to provide her with guidance through the problematic process. Moreover, he 'advised' her that she should not have taken maternity leave if she wanted promotion:

I had to accomplish the same amount of work within a shorter time than my male colleagues! Men don't take maternity leave because they want to further their career, that's clear! At that time I considered going to court and filing suit, but then I changed my mind. You don't file suit against your boss, do you? (Interview No. 2, 2002)

Other women also believed that promotion criteria were different for them than for their male peers, and several of them mentioned the case of a junior male academic who had been promoted, not on the basis of merit, but simply because he was perceived as a 'good young boy' and had received informal support from his senior male colleagues. This case provides a stark illustration of the way in which gatekeepers make sure that the 'right' people get into a club. The academic gatekeeping that takes place in informal scientific networks is, as Husu [2004] notes, of dual nature. On the one hand, it can function as exclusion or control, and on the other, it can also provide opportunities and resources. Gatekeeping can thus be analysed as ways in which 'social hierarchies, social divisions, and persistent distinctions are produced, reproduced, and sometimes challenged, ameliorated and changed' [ibid. 2004: 73].

Exclusion from networks that ensure information and intellectual exchange, personal contacts, and reputation brings isolation that has negative implications for one's career. In the words of one respondent:

In my opinion women in this institution are so handicapped that in reality we cannot do serious work. (Interview No. 2, 2002)

Network support is one of the crucial determinants of one's career (and our participants strongly supported this explanation), but of equal importance is one's willingness to follow the rules of 'the academic game', to attract visibility and engage in competition with each other for positions and reputation, since influential colleagues have to be aware of the ambition, skills, or accomplishments of younger academics. Interview data reveal that men use different ways to attract attention and visibility and to enhance their chances and opportunities (for example, confrontation with colleagues, refusal to follow taken-for-granted practices, using public relations strategies).

If they basically see you as a loser, to them you stay a loser, no matter what you do. You have the option of saying 'I won't', I won't do that. As for myself, if I decide to do something, I'll do it. (Interview No. 1, 2002)

I had the opportunity to make a confrontation, and I did it. I wasn't afraid of it. The conflict with my superior was even productive ... had we not come into conflict, he would have considered me unable to stand up for myself. I gained something by showing resistance. (Interview No. 4 , 2002)

Such concrete situations, writing of minutes, searching for literature, patting people on the back ... these were situations I was able to respond to quickly in such a way that they would never come up again. (Interview No. 5, 2002)

I say to them: 'Sorry, my dears, my text was published here', or I say 'I've been taking part in this research', and if they say that I haven't accomplished anything in the past year, I say, 'You know what, I held a workshop, and now, at the end of the year, the proceedings will be published'. (Interview No. 4, 2002)

Women argued that their male peers express a high level of self-promotion and self-confidence: 'they even think that they've achieved more than they actually have'; 'their perception of their own success is far from realistic'; 'they engage less frequently in self-reflection, they don't question themselves again and again asking "am I good enough?"', 'they do not burden themselves with that as much as – if I generalise – our generation of women does'. These comments suggest that women dislike this kind of behaviour and are reluctant to use self-promotion to make themselves more visible.

Networking in an academic institution: continuities and discontinuities

One purpose of this study was to determine how, if at all, academics' experiences have changed over time, whether academics' perceptions of the gendered networking practices in their institution have changed, and how their perceptions may have changed as a result of the changes in the academic community itself. First, I was interested in how changes at the management level a year ago affected, if at all, the perceptions and experiences of the participants in this research. As noted above, a certain feminisation of management occurred at the middle management level – this change could be seen as an opportunity to make important contacts and new networks inside and outside the organisation. Furthermore, I situated participants' experiences and perspectives within the larger context of the marketisation and neo-liberalisation of public higher education. Higher education institutions in many parts of the world are now being re-structured through the introduction of new managerial and marketing techniques and attitudes [Canaan and Shumar 2008; Leathwood and Read 2009]. Slovenia is no exception in this respect. The University of Ljubljana is experiencing demands for increased accountability, improvements in 'quality', and efficiency, which have recently become more insistent than before. The neo-liberalisation of universities is seen in literature as having created an individualistic and competitive academic climate. Furthermore, the emphasis on entrepreneurial skills and the creative individual in the discourse of new managerialism is understood to imply that women will be able to make successful careers by their own ability, without support from powerful male networks. How do these aspects of neo-liberalisation impact the role of networks and the gender gap in academia?

The old order, with old boy networks still in place, continues to prevail throughout the work organisation under study. As one woman said:

> Men formed principled and unprincipled coalitions in order to obtain certain job positions or participate in research projects. Those who did not have close relationships collaborated when they found it necessary. Men form alliances. We women are no good at that, no good indeed. (Interview No. 2, 2008)

As the above quotation suggests, opportunities for job and research still rely on informal networks and this collective networking is, as Leathwood and Read [2009: 136] stress, still very much a masculinised aspect of academic culture and persists despite the dominance of the individualistic ethos in neo-liberal academia. It also suggests that there is a tendency for women to remain somewhat passive in their networking activities. However, this same participant, and others as well, noted that women are not totally excluded from influential male networks. This has been especially so over the last years when some women have been let into the informal networks of powerful middle-aged men:

> We now have middle-aged men who have already reached power positions. They are closely connected, friends. That circle now governs the faculty. It is very powerful and also includes some women. (Interview No. 2, 2008)

It is evident that some changes regarding the ways in which academics connect and relate to each other have occurred since we conducted the first set of interviews in 2002. With the change in status of (some) women academics (e.g. women largely assumed control of the institution's managerial and leading positions), their position within the network has improved, meaning that they have taken a small step away from the periphery and closer to the centre. It goes without saying that women deans are rich network investments and thus become more integrated into the networks composed of individuals who hold power in an organisation. Undoubtedly, women in middle management positions also have an opportunity to broaden their social connections, for example by exchanging information with colleagues. They can be quite influential (as they were, for example, during the implementation of the Bologna reform, when new courses were proposed and many colleagues were dependent on their support), but in comparison to heads of research centres and programmes they have no financial resources at all to pay their colleagues to implement the plans they have in mind. Being 'young' and having no control over funds, they have no real authority. Without the same financial power and authority as men, they may be less sought after as someone who can provide colleagues with resources, opportunities, and access to information, and so their networking, when they do network, is less productive. It is also clear that all women (and men) who become academic middle managers now have a very extensive set of responsibilities placed upon them by

the student affairs office and the leadership of the faculty. These responsibilities include the managing of their own area of administration, new responsibilities in the context of the Bologna reform – which is being implemented with enormous speed at our faculty – and meetings, dealing with students, teaching and other time-consuming and exhausting activities. I'd like to draw readers' attention to a proposition by Leathwood and Read [2009: 134], who, citing Prichard and Deem [1998], note that 'women may be brought into middle management positions to "smooth the passage" of new managerialism – and perhaps this is also applicable to HE [higher education – author's note] with notions that women's 'people skills' will enable them to make stroppy academics comply with new bureaucratic and quality procedures.'

Some women now try to establish stronger ties with their colleagues. One woman (Interview no. 9) commented that informal contacts established with male colleagues helped some of her women colleagues obtain senior posts. Our interviewees are now also more included in international research networks than they were in the past:

> As to international connections, my male superior put me in contact with his networks, and the new boss also encourages everyone around … once you enter international networks, once you're within these networks, then it becomes cumulative. (Interview No. 7, 2008)

The woman quoted earlier in the text, who felt that her network environment did not allow her to learn, reported that she had left her previous research centre because of the paternalistic attitudes towards her. Now she has more diverse ties within the organisation and a better opportunity to access diverse network resources. We can see that women are not passive victims; they make choices and develop strategies. Some women agree that they need to become more assertive about their aspirations and some of them have adapted to the new managerialist culture that reinforces male competitive behaviours [Leathwood and Read 2009: 132]. For example, some among them assume male behavioural patterns:

> I think that I've come to behave like men over time. That's what we need, their schemes in certain situations. You have to adopt male attributes to a certain extent. (Interview No. 2, 2008)

> The change in management has recently enabled women to speak up more easily. They're more assertive, they make room for themselves … I'm now in middle age and I hold many more power levers than I did ten years ago, so I speak up. (Interview No. 7, 2008)

The same interviewee pointed out that at the moment a much greater problem is the fact that changes in the gendered division of labour within the private

sphere have been slower than the changes in the division of work and power in the public sphere, which causes problems for women with family obligations.

> I'm afraid of this intensification of work. This terrible intensification and bureaucratisation is easier for a person without children. At our faculty we are consenting, out of a wish to be the highest quality institution, to academic culture being transformed into a bureaucratic and business-oriented environment. (Interview No. 7, 2008)

Although the new managerialist working practices opened up opporunities for some women, these potentials can be inhibited by the stress of a culture of long working hours and pressure to work more, better, and faster. Given the social expectations about women's domestic responsibilities, women academics have found themselves in a situation where they are beginning to doubt their ability to perform.

However, there are still marked gender differences in networking approaches. As is evident from some of the male interviewees' accounts quoted above, the need for information and political manoeuvring were conscious reasons for the creation of informal connections; this was also confirmed by our female interviewees, who regarded their male colleagues, both senior and junior, as very strategic and deliberate in their networking activities. Throughout the material we have gathered, the male respondents' shrewd political manoeuvring and the practical and purposive nature of their information-seeking practices stand in contrast to the female respondents' 'no-planning' approach to social networking. As one interviewee commented, she had 'fallen into' networking:

> I've never planned networking, I simply found myself networked through my work.... An older American professor was of great help, he was mentioning networks, building new circles of people who could be of help. I thought it was unbecoming. (Interview No. 7, 2008)

In addition, network partners tend to be chosen not for their ability but for their likeability:

> I've started to network only recently, but only with the colleagues I like, with whom I enjoy working. I never calculate along the lines of 'this one can be of some help here, that one there'. (Interview No. 4, 2008)

Whilst closed male networks require critical examination if the feminist struggle for the equal integration of women in academia is to proceed, network support can be a positive experience and a key factor for a successful career. The quotation above confirms Leathwood and Read's finding [2009: 176] that many women academics continue to 'construct a "space of their own" within academia that provides many pleasures, comforts and rewards'. While at the time of the

first interview (in 2002) only one visible formal/informal women's network was present within the institution under study (one interviewee described it at the time as small, closed, and lacking influence), new female groupings have emerged over the past few years. They provide primarily emotional but also instrumental support. These women's networks are less influential than men's or than mixed male/female networks, and they have fewer material resources at their disposal.

Conclusion

This article examined whether at a particular organisation selected for study informal networks exist, whether networking and gender are intertwined, and whether network involvement provides career opportunities. We found that networks do exist; our interviewees more or less explicitly talked about the benefits of being involved in formal and informal networks. The results indicate the presence of two types of informal groupings. The first type are networks based on professional interactions important for professional academic careers. These durable networks of strong ties were predominantly seen by interviewees as overprotective and controlled by (usually male) senior academics. This 'paternalistic' social capital is embedded in networks of power and domination, thereby allowing seniors to prescribe what is right and what wrong. Not only women are discriminated against, some younger men are too. While gender is a social construct that limits academics' achievements, so is the age hierarchy. The problems here are linked more to the hierarchical power structure of the academic institution in general (and of intergenerational hierarchies in particular) and to low inter-institutional mobility than to gendered conflicts within social networks. As a result, both male and female junior academics have to deal with the misuse of power. However, the establishment of new universities in Slovenia and the opening of the EU higher education sector also create new employment opportunities beyond the institution from which students/future academics graduate and it enables the formation of more flexible social networks.

The second type of social networks constitutes what we can call an institution within an institution, where alliances are formed and conspiracies plotted. Such social connections are based on temporary partnership cooperation, not prescription. It is more typical of men (junior and senior academics), who build durable or loose networks and ties in their political manoeuvring. One of the concerns of such old boy networks is to obtain support for individual academic careers. Male-dominated networks are ultimately the most powerful gatekeeping system in the work organisation under study, predominantly to the benefit of men.

All female interviewees agreed unanimously that the making of alliances was a gendered practice. Male networks, which often fail to include women in their informal contacts, act as the gatekeeper groups and support younger men

at building a career while hindering younger women from doing so. As promotion and evaluation procedures still often result from informal male networks, women's accomplishments are often undervalued. It is not, therefore, that faculty alone determines the level of their rewards, as meritocratic fundamentalism would have it. Our data clearly show that men support one another and thus promote their own group's interests. Or, to use Bourdieu's [1986] terms, the privileges of high-status people are reinforced by their social networks.

In my research I have also tried to document and analyse the perceptions and experiences of women academics in the context of a rapidly changing academic environment. A key aspect of neo-liberalisation is the greater surveillance and monitoring of teachers and researchers' achievements, bureaucratisation, more administrative or secondary activities such as writing reports on one's work [see Ball 2003: 221], and the ever present neo-liberal discourses that support and legitimise surveillance and competitiveness [Luthar and Šadl 2008: 237]. These new forms of regulation and control are designed to make institutions and individuals more transparent and accountable for their actions. As Leathwood and Read [2009: 137] argue, whilst problematic in many ways, the rising dominance of new managerialist working practices can be seen as beneficial to women: 'its emphasis on transparency and accountability working to make women academics' achievements more visible, and minimize the influence of nepotism and the "old boys" network in academics' career trajectories'. While my research confirms Prichard's [1996: 234] observation that in a managerialist context there are, in some cases, 'opportunities to achieve managerial positions and to manage/act in different ways', it also reveals that new managerialism has not changed the radically gendered inequalities and male model of academic success. Women's visibility and promotion prospects are still based on influential male networks. The research also found that women are less strategic in their approach to networking and tentative about using network resources. The disadvantages of the 'no-planning' approach women take to social networking are amplifying because of the ever-increasing importance of network resources, which are essential to getting by in the current neo-liberal context of higher education in Slovenia. If women academics in Slovenia refrain from strategic networking, their achievements will remain invisible to the (male) academic milieu. Yet, there is agency: women engage in male-dominated networks for career issues and opportunities and in women's networks for friendship and affective support. By using both male and female networks, women empower themselves and gain visibility and support. The question remains as to whether traditional male-dominated networks can be comfortable with a feminist perspective, given that they have been criticised for reproducing social structures and academic culture traditionally oppressive to women.

Zᴅᴇɴᴋᴀ Šᴀᴅʟ *is a lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. In 2009, she published the book* Dirty Work between Stigma and Pride: Paid Domestic Workers in Slovenia *(in Slovene). Since 2004 she has been head of the Gender Studies Programme at the same faculty. Her current research interests are in the area of gender and emotion, paid domestic work, and emotional support in social networks.*

References

Acker, Joan. 1992. 'Gendering Organizational Theory.' Pp. 248–260 in *Gendering Organizational Analysis*, edited by A. J. Mills and P. Tancred. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bagilhole, Barbara and Jackie Goode. 2001. 'The Contradiction of the Myth of Individual Merit, and the Reality of a Patriarchal Support System in Academic Careers.' *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 8 (2): 161–180.

Ball, Stephen J. 2003. 'The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity.' *Journal of Education Policy* 18 (2): 215–228.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. 'The Forms of Capital.' Pp. 241–258 in *Handbook for Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J. G. Richardson. New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*, trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brown, Wendy. 1995. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Canaan, Joyce E. and Wesley Shumar (eds.). 2008. *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University*. New York and London: Routledge.

Di Stefano, Christine. 1990. 'Dilemmas of Difference: Feminism, Modernity, and Postmdernism.' Pp. 63–82 in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, edited by L. J. Nicholson. New York and London: Routledge.

Etzkowitz, Henry, Carol Kemelgor and Brian Uzzi. 2000. *Athena Unbound: The Advancement of Women in Science and Technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fogelberg, Paul, Jeff Hearn, Liisa Husu and Teija Mankkinen (eds.). 1999. *Hard Work in the Academy. Research and Interventions on Gender Inequalities in Higher Education*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Gupta, Namrata, Carol Kemelgor, Stephan Fuchs and Henry Etzkowitz. 2004. 'The "Triple Burden": A Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Consequences of Discrimination for Women in Science.' Pp. 41–50 in *Gender and Excellence in the Making*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Hearn, Jeff. 2004. 'Personal Resistance through Persistence to Organizational Resistance through Distance.' Pp. 40–63 in *Gendered Organizations: Analysing the Micropolitics of Resistance*, edited by R. Goodman-Thomas, A. J. Mills and J. Helms-Mills. London: Routledge.

Hlebec, Valentina and Anuška Ferligoj. 2001. 'Respondent Mood and the Instability of Survey Network Measurements.' *Social Networks* 23 (2): 125–139.

Husu, Liisa. 2001. *Sexism, Support and Survival in Academia: Academic Women and Hidden Discrimination in Finland*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Husu, Liisa 2004. 'Gate-Keeping, Gender Equality and Scientific Excellence.' Pp. 69–76 in *Gender and Excellence in the Making*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Jogan, Maca. 1998. 'Akademska kariera in spolna (ne)enakost.' (Academic Career and Gender (In)equity) *Teorija in praksa* 35 (6): 989–1014.

Kaufman, Debra Renee. 1978. 'Associational Ties in Academe: Some Male and Female Differences.' *Sex Roles* 4 (1): 9–21.

Knights, David and Wendy Richards. 2003. 'Sex Discrimination in UK Academia.' *Gender, Work and Organization* 10 (2): 213–238.

Krais, Beate. 2002. 'Academia as a Profession and the Hierarchy of the Sexes: Paths out of Research in German Universities.' *Higher Education Quaterly* 56 (4): 407–418.

Leathwood, Carole and Barbara Read. 2009. *Gender and the Changing Face of Higher Education. A Feminized Future?* New York: SRHE/ Open University Press.

Ledwith, Sue and Simonetta Manfredi. 2000. 'Balancing Gender in Higher Education. A Study of the Experience of Senior Women in a "New" UK University.' *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 7 (1): 7–33.

Letherby, Gayle. 2003. *Feminist Research in Theory and Practice*. Buckingham: Open University.

Luthar, Breda and Zdenka Šadl. 2008. 'Communication and Emotion in Gendered Organization: The Hidden Transcripts of Power in Higher Education.' Pp. 234–255 in *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University*, edited by J. E. Canaan and W. Shumar. New York and London: Routledge.

Mählck, Paula. 2003. *Mapping Gender in Academic Workplaces: Ways of Reproducing Gender Inequality within the Discourse of Equality.* Doctoral thesis, Department of Sociology, Umeå University.

Mali, Franc. 2001. 'Distribucija družbene moči na univerzi in akademski konzervativizem.' (The Distribution of Social Power within the University and Academic Conservativism) Pp. 82–94 in *Ali se univerza vrti v krogu svoje moči?*, edited by K. Majerhold. Ljubljana: Študentska organizacija Univerze in Zavod radio Študent.

Nahapiet, Janine and Sumatra Ghoshal. 1998. 'Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage.' *Academy of Management Review* 23 (2): 242–266.

O'Leary, Virginia E. and Judith M. Mitchell. 1990. 'Women Connecting with Women: Networks and Mentors.' Pp. 58–73 in *Storming the Tower, Women in the Academic World,* edited by S. Stiver Lie and V. E. O'Leary. London: Kogan Page.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Poole, Millicent, Laurel Bornholt and Fiona Summers. 1997. 'An International Study of the Gendered Nature of Academic Work: Some Cross-Cultural Explorations.' *Higher Education* 34: 373–396.

Prichard, Craig. 1996. 'University Management: Is it Men's Work?' Pp. 227–238 in *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Maculinities and Managements*, edited by D. L. Collinson and J. Hearn. London: Sage.

Prichard, Craig and Rosemary Deem. 1998. 'Wo-managing UK Further Education: Gender and the Construction of the Manager in the Corporate Colleges.' Paper presented at the Research Seminar Series at the College of Education, Massey University, New Zealand.

Rees, Teresa. 2001. 'Mainsreaming Gender Equality in Science in the European Union: The ETAN Report.' *Gender and Education* 13 (3): 243–260.

Toren, Nina. 1991. 'Women at the Top: Female Full Professors in Higher Education in Israel.' Pp. 165–184 in *Women's Higher Education in Comparative Perspective*, edited by G. P. Kelly and S. Slaughter. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vazquez-Cupeiro, Susana and Mary Ann Elston. 2006. 'Gender and Academic Career Trajectories in Spain: From Gendered Passion to Consecration in a Sistema Endogamico?' *Employee Relations* 28 (6): 588–603.

Wharton, Amy. 2005. *The Sociology of Gender. An Introduction to Theory and Research.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Young, Iris Marion. 1994. 'Gender as Seriality: Thinking About Women as a Social Collective.' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19 (3): 713–738.

Zaviršek, Darja. 2001. 'Spol na ljubljanski univerzi.' (Gender at the University of Ljubljana) Pp. 69–81 in *Ali se univerza vrti v krogu svoje moči*?, edited by K. Majerhold. Ljubljana: Študentska organizacija Univerze in Zavod Radio Študent.