

Academic employment and gender: a Turkish challenge to vertical sex segregation

Healy, Geraldine; Özbilgin, Mustafa; Aliefendioğlu, Hanife

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Healy, G., Özbilgin, M., & Aliefendioğlu, H. (2005). Academic employment and gender: a Turkish challenge to vertical sex segregation. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 11(2), 247-264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680105053966>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Geraldine Healy, Mustafa Özbilgin and Hanife Aliefendioğlu

Queen Mary, University of London, UK and Eastern Mediterranean University, NORTHERN CYPRUS

Academic Employment and Gender: A Turkish Challenge to Vertical Sex Segregation

ABSTRACT ■ This article explores the paradox of women's academic employment in Turkey. There is a low rate of female labour market participation in the formal sector, yet a higher proportion of women professors than in any of the 25 European Union countries. We use a range of data to set the Turkish labour market and its higher education sector in comparative European perspective, then present findings from two qualitative studies of Turkish professors, concluding that ideological state support rather than legal frameworks of equal opportunities laid the foundations for women's hierarchical achievements in Turkey. However, the explanation is multilayered and lies in the cumulative and interrelated effect of state policy, institutional transparency, increased labour demand, the home–work interface, and the agency of the professors themselves.

Introduction

At the end of 2004, the EU agreed to open accession talks which could lead to Turkey's membership of the Union. Its candidacy, if successful, would realize the key national project of modernization and westernization, which has been central to Turkey's dominant state ideology. Turkey is often excluded from comparative studies of European employment, yet there are good reasons to include it.

There are important paradoxes in employment relations in Turkey: women have one of the lowest rates of employment participation in Europe, yet some benefit from limited vertical segregation which would be envied by their European sisters. In particular, women achieve more hierarchically in the professions and academia than their contemporaries in western Europe and elsewhere (Acar, 1993).

Across the industrialized world, feminist, human rights and civil

liberties movements have achieved legal solutions for the elimination of discrimination against women. In practice, the impact of anti-discriminatory legislation is often limited to widening women's access to employment, but has had less success in challenging vertical segregation. In Turkey, by contrast, anti-discrimination legislation is less advanced, but vertical segregation is lower. We examine this paradox by comparing patterns of women's activity rates in Europe with those of Turkey; then focus specifically on academic employment. To understand what these macro and meso data mean at the level of the actor (that is, the lived experience of professorial employment), we use qualitative studies of professors in Turkish universities.

To situate Turkey in its international context, we use Turkish data from the Directorate General of Women's Status and Problems in Ankara and EU data from Eurostat and from Women in Science. To gain insight into the policies and regulations on Turkish academic employment in general and conditions of advancement to full professorial posts in particular, documentary data were obtained from YÖK (the governing body of the Turkish higher education sector) and the State Institute of Statistics. Lastly, we undertook two qualitative studies, involving 57 semi-structured interviews of Turkish full professors (30 men and 27 women). The research was limited to 'full' professors, defined as academic workers holding professorial chairs at universities subject to YÖK's progression criteria. They were drawn from six universities in Istanbul and five in Ankara, since professors in these cities face fewer structural constraints associated with their geographical career mobility.

The interview schedule consisted of 32 questions exploring the socio-economic and institutional profiles of the respondents and allowing them a degree of freedom to determine the issues that they wished to discuss within a broad framework of sex equality, career development, and higher education in Turkey. Interviews were undertaken in Turkish and the transcripts translated into English.


Women's Activity Rates: Turkey in Comparative Perspective

Turkey has one of the lowest female economic participation rates in Europe — one which actually decreased from 34 percent in 1990 to 23 percent in 1995. The vast majority work in the agricultural sector as unpaid family workers, while employment in the non-agricultural and non-rural sectors is highly marginal not only quantitatively, but also in terms of concentration in traditional female sectors such as textiles and the food industry. Urban unemployment rates for women are more than double those of men; the informal sector provides the greatest work

opportunity for urban women from low-income households, which means that they are typically excluded from the legal and social protection and benefits available in the formal sector.

Figure 1 ranks female economic activity rates as a proportion of men's among European countries, showing that Turkey ranks 23rd, above only Cyprus, Italy, Greece, Spain and Malta. The Turkish experience of liberalization has not increased women's participation in the labour market; rather, its unplanned nature, coupled with high levels of internal migration from rural to urban areas in the past decade, has led to

FIGURE 1. Women's Economic Activity Rates as a Percentage of Men's in Europe



Source: data collated from Human Development Report (2005).

a skewed distribution of employment by gender (Özbilgin and Woodward, 2003).

Male workers in Turkey are over-represented in forms of employment that require lower educational qualifications. Women's relative participation rates increase with their educational levels, and this is particularly marked for those with tertiary-level education. Nevertheless, OECD (2004) data indicate that women with tertiary education still have comparatively low levels of activity: below all other European countries, on a par with Japan, and above only Korea and Mexico.

It is noteworthy that the 12 European countries with the highest activity rates for women are the four Nordic countries and eight of the central and eastern European (CEE) countries. The lowest activity rates tend to be in southern Europe. The extent to which these figures are directly comparable has been questioned by a number of commentators, since different definitions of employment, unemployment, and inactivity significantly affect the data. For example, the southern countries, including Turkey, tend to have a high share of informal-sector work. Within the Eurostat definitions of economic activity, the trend among women is towards increasing employment rates and decreasing inactivity rates (Rubery et al., 1998).

Academic Employment and Gender Equality

Given the very low economic activity rates of Turkish women, and the predominantly Muslim population, it may surprise many western commentators that the proportion of women academics who achieve professorial status is very high (Özbilgin and Healy, 2004; Woodward and Özbilgin, 1998). Thus gender equality in Turkish academic employment can provide comparative insights to relate to the findings of other country-specific studies.¹


A prerequisite of women's success in academia is their prior success in tertiary education. In 2002, the average percentage of graduates who were women was 55.9 percent in the EU-15 and 63.7 percent in the accession countries. In science in general and in engineering and manufacturing, there was a higher percentage of women graduates in the accession countries (48 percent and 25.6 percent, respectively) than in the EU-15 (41 percent and 20.9 percent, respectively). Turkey stands out as having a lower proportion of women graduates (42.9 percent) than any of the EU-25 or associated countries. However, the feminized subject bias is less entrenched in Turkey, with women representing 44.4 percent of science graduates and 34.8 percent of those in engineering and manufacturing (Eurostat, 2004). However, Palaz (2000) argues that recent trends indicate a shift towards a more western style of horizontal gender segregation,

with women entering the arts, humanities and vocational education in greater numbers than in the past.

Figure 2 shows the average percentage of women academics in the EU-25 as 34.8 percent. There is, however, a wide range, from Latvia, where women make up more than 50 percent of academics to Ireland where they are only 24.6 percent. Of the 13 countries above the mean, six (including the top four) are from the CEE, two (Spain and Portugal) from southern Europe, and three from the Nordic countries, together with the UK. Turkey is also just above the mean. There is no clear pattern by groupings of countries; nor does the gendered distribution of academic employment match national rankings of economic activity rates.

Figure 2 also shows that in the EU-25, women are far more

FIGURE 2. Percentage of women academics and professors in Europe (1998–2002)



Source: data collated from WiS (2005).

Note: data for Romania was not available.

under-represented at professorial level, holding on average only 14 percent of such posts. Some 11 countries are above the mean: four from the CEE (of which only Latvia and Bulgaria have a higher than average proportion of women academics) and four from southern Europe, plus Belgium and the UK. At 27 percent, Turkey has the highest proportion of professors who are women in Europe, almost twice the mean. Curiously, countries with a long history of egalitarian policies, such as Norway and Denmark, are below the mean.

Data from the European Technology Assessment Network (ETAN, 2000) show that in many countries the percentage of female full professors slowly increased in the 1990s. In Poland, for example, women were 9.4 percent of titular professors in 1977, 16.6 percent in 1988, 20 percent in 1990, and 21.9 percent in 1996. While these kinds of data are not generally available, its report also provides the example of Germany, where year-on-year-increases are not evident. On average in the EU, percentages of women professors seem to be increasing by 0.5–1.0 percent a year — at this rate it would take a century to attain a gender balance (ETAN, 2000: 12).

There are many possible reasons for Turkish women's academic achievements, many rooted in specific historical, social, and economic contexts. Before turning to these, we pursue a more generic explanation: women succeed when men leave an occupation because the rewards are greater elsewhere. Reskin and Roos (1990) argue that men may vacate certain sectors or occupations if terms and conditions of employment decline, and that women can compensate for the resulting labour shortages. While this argument may have some resonance in particular countries, our own research suggests that it does not hold good if the gendered distribution of professorial appointments is compared cross-nationally with academic pay (adjusted for purchasing power) (Özbilgin and Healy, 2004).

Historical Forces and Women's Achievements in Turkey

The dominant state ideology in Turkey has historically been a major factor in understanding vertical segregation, a factor shared with CEE accession countries. The foundation of the new Turkish Republic in the early 1920s led to a series of reforms aiming to nationalize and secularize the higher education sector. The move from the earlier Seljuk and Ottoman systems to the contemporary university system embodied a shift in emphasis from Turkish-Islamic to westernized models, and from a nationalized system to one which is governed by a neo-liberal internationalist approach (Güvenç, 1997). These changes can be periodized into three phases.

The first phase, in the 1920s and 1930s, led to the entry of women into academic employment through a set of principles (secularism,

republicanism, populism, statism, reformism and nationalism) introduced by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, founder of the modern Turkish Republic. These principles were part of a modernization project later synonymous with the concept of 'Kemalism'. The principles were consolidated in the second phase of transformation from the 1940s to the 1980s, as the number of women academics gradually increased (YÖK, 2004). A relatively stable growth rate of the university sector has been replaced since 1985 by a third phase of rapid expansion.

The first two phases underpinned an ideological sanctioning of women's careers in academia and the professions. The Kemalist principles of republican secularism upheld the value of sex equality over and against a strong tradition of sex segregation originating from the Ottoman times (Öncü, 1981; Özkanlı and Korkmaz, 2000). Legislation requiring sex equality in employment was rudimentary (Özbilgin, 2002; Woodward and Özbilgin, 1999),² but of critical importance was that the dominant ideologies of 'modernization' and 'westernization' gave priority to the elimination of overtly discriminatory policies and practices from the formal processes of public employment.

Though the post-communist countries are also shaped by a state ideology of sex equality, the ideological differences with Turkey are profound. James (1996: 45, 59) asserts that under communist rule, women were strongly encouraged to enter the labour force, but that the policies were designed to foster equal numerical participation in the labour force, not equal access to high-status jobs and wages. To facilitate numerical participation, childcare and maternity leave were heavily subsidized by the government (although this subsidy has been substantially reduced in the market economy). This facilitated women's relatively high economic activity rate. Analogous ideological and practical supports also underlie the high participation rates in the Nordic countries.

Zeytinoğlu (1999) and Kandiyoti (1997) noted that academic careers were historically and socially constructed and sex-typed as 'safe' and 'proper' choices for graduate women in Turkey. Women were socially encouraged to take up professional employment, as opposed to entrepreneurial or commercial careers, since these were considered harmonious with the potent image of 'a respectful Turkish woman'. This ideology was effective in demarcating women's careers in 'safe', 'secure', and 'esteemed' forms of professional employment.

Neo-Liberalism, the Decline of 'State Feminism', and University Expansion

The transformation of the political and social landscape in Turkey threatens to reverse these equality gains in academia and dissolve the impact of

'state feminism' (White, 2003). First, since the 1980s Turkey has pursued a neo-liberal economic programme, weakening government labour market regulation. This has diluted the traditional sex equality discourse of the republican ideology pursued by the state in all sectors, including higher education. Second, there have emerged political parties and economic institutions that advocate sex segregation, in clear opposition to the principles of secularism. Nevertheless, the current leading party, the AKP, despite its Islamic agenda, has adopted a liberal approach and discourse.

These two changes have led to a shift in social attitudes. The image of republican Turkish women, expected to 'self-sacrifice' and 'pioneer' for the advancement of the nation, has lost its influence on a new generation of young women graduates (Özbilgin and Woodward, 2003). It could be argued that, like their counterparts in other European countries, many women in modern Turkey perceive their careers with individualized aspirations rather than a collectivist sense of fulfilling a national duty. Thus, as the nationalistic and republican significance of women's employment in non-traditional disciplines is declining in Turkey, traditional methods of eliminating sex-typing and segregation of academic careers are following suit in higher education.

Alongside the fragmentation of state ideology, there have been significant sectoral changes in the past two decades. The expansion of the university sector since the early 1990s has created greater opportunities for career mobility for both female and male academics. Between 1990 and 2004, the number of universities increased from 29 to 76; the number of state universities almost doubled and there was also an emergence of private universities. The number of academic staff increased from 28,114 in 1989 to 60,129 in 1999, and professorial posts from 2772 to 8804 in the same period, increasing to 10,080 in 2003 (YÖK, 2004). Between 1990 and 2000 the number of full professors increased by 75 percent (Aytaç and Aytaç, 2001: 17). The skills shortages which resulted from this expansion enabled increased access for women and were also largely responsible for mobilizing the upward progression of the otherwise relatively static careers of many academic staff in this sector.

While student participation has increased in Europe, this increase has not necessarily led to comparable career opportunities, given the shift from 'elite' to 'mass' in higher education delivery. Nevertheless, Enders (2002) argues that academic staff in Portugal and Spain benefited from expansion; and as noted above, these are the two southern European countries with rankings for women's academic employment above the European average.

Expansion of the sector in Turkey occurred alongside a deterioration of pay and conditions in the 'old' universities in the state sector, as compared to the 'new' private universities. It is unclear how the growth

of private universities will affect the gender order, given their relatively small share (only 3 percent) in the sector (Aytaç and Aytaç, 2001: 20). Özgüç (1998) suggested that male graduates traditionally pursued careers which offered the best financial prospects and had limited and declining interest in academic careers because salaries were lower than in the private sector. This has resonance with the gender queues argument of Reskin and Roos (1990), which suggests that changing market conditions may lead to the feminizing of previously contested jobs. In the case of Turkey, as in Spain and Portugal, it is new jobs that are offering women opportunities.

Centralization of Rule Making: YÖK

One of the influences on women's academic development involves the institutional level. The governance of the university sector has been transformed from a decentralized system in the 1970s to one of centralization, embodied by YÖK, in the 1980s and the 1990s. YÖK and its various policies, which were often considered gender neutral, had a significant gendered impact on the careers of female professors. Particular changes in YÖK legislation, with a direct impact on the career development of academic staff, defined the performance criteria and mobility requirements that regulated professorial promotions. YÖK has been criticized by many universities, academic staff, and their unions and associations (TUSIAD, 2000: 113), and challenges to its status have resulted in some 30 revisions to its constitution since its establishment in 1981.

Nevertheless, the promotion system in the Turkish higher education sector has a high degree of transparency compared to European countries. YÖK regulations require professorial vacancies to be advertised in one of the five highest circulation daily newspapers in Turkey (Özbilgin and Healy, 2004: 7). Candidates have to provide a portfolio including their CVs, details of their scientific publications, educational and training activities, supervision of research degrees, and overall contribution to their current institution. Three conditions are specified for promotion to full professorship: first, applicants should have served at least five years at associate professor grade in a discipline closely associated with the professorial post sought; second, they should have a portfolio of original research publications produced at an international level; and, third, they should be selected for a professorial post (TUBA, 2004; YÖK, 1998).

These regulations make no implicit or explicit reference to sex equality issues, such as direct or indirect discrimination in promotion or selection processes. Once candidates qualify through YÖK for a professorial chair, they must also be appointed to a chair by their local university in order for their title to be recognized. Each Turkish university, both state and private, has its own promotion system; some are reportedly tougher than

the YÖK procedure, placing heavier emphasis on research output in the form of international publications (Özkanlı and Korkmaz, 2000: 85). This creates a two-track employment system.

Nevertheless, Özbilgin and Healy (2004: 8) argue that this standardized system of recruitment is more open and, in principle, provides greater equality of access to full professorial posts than in many other countries, where such standardization is rare. The appointment of professors in Europe and the US often involves multiple systems; many of these are obscure, allow variable criteria for appointment, and often rely on internal labour markets. The most open systems rely on the requirement for similar attributes to those under the YÖK system. While many western academics assume that their professorial appointment systems are of an equal or superior academic level to those of other, particularly less developed, countries, such assumptions should be questioned particularly in debates on gender equity. The ETAN (2000: viii) report on mainstreaming gender equality in Europe stated that old-fashioned practices permeate employment and promotion procedures in many academic institutions: patronage, 'old boys' networks', and personal invitations to fill posts cut across 'fair and effective employment procedures'.

Despite the greater transparency in the Turkish system, it is important to recognize that competition for posts in particular universities and organizational politics militate against universally equitable outcomes (Özbilgin and Healy, 2004: 8). In this, Turkey shares a common experience with western European and North American university systems.

The Lived Experiences of Turkish Professors

We now turn to qualitative evidence at the microlevel. While we acknowledge women's achievement in academic work in Turkey, it is important to remember that those who achieve hierarchical success are still relatively rare. To explore the perceptions of men and women professors, we focus on two key interrelated elements of their employment relationships: the home-work interface and structures of discrimination.

Home-Work Interface

There are both universal and nationally specific dimensions to our findings. Though Turkish women have attained professional careers for some eight decades, the traditional family ideology and gender division of labour, which assigned carer and domestic roles to women and breadwinner roles to men, remains the main social frame of reference (Peker, 1996). Our study of senior academics reveals a near universal picture of gendered domestic roles and responsibilities. Women are responsible for

managing the household; men ‘help’ rather than sharing domestic tasks. The ‘normality’ of this was indicated by an apparent lack of association between domestic responsibilities and career development. None of our male respondents mentioned family affairs as hindering their promotion (one stated that ‘I’m involved in my own academic tasks usually, sometimes I help her with the housework’), but nor did female professors recognize structural barriers. They reported that they were largely content with (or perhaps resigned to) their dual roles, and often normalized the burden caused by domestic work by failing to question the role distribution.

The following statement by a female professor is typical: ‘Actually family did not hinder me but when my children were younger I had difficulties in doing research, teaching, working and also taking care of the house’. Another explained this paradoxical situation:

I believe that there is equality between the sexes. However, once you enter the academic profession, the difficulties they [women and men] face are different. However much men help, responsibilities of caring for the family and children are expected of women . . . It is very positive for a woman to have an academic career. It has high social status. It is not important if she earns less. However, if men earn less, they are victimized.

The paradox is complicated by the expectation that women will marry upward socially, and those who are highly qualified thus find a reduced pool of potential partners. Accordingly, some 41 percent of women academics are married to other academics (Özkanlı and Korkmaz, 2000: 30). The established gender order in the home constrains such women’s employment ‘choices’ (Healy, 1999). Dual-career families in the study, and other female academics, often employed domestic help to redress the imbalance in the share of domestic work. A male professor explained that ‘having assistance reduces my wife’s domestic responsibilities. We have a commercial cleaning service. My wife is responsible for cooking’.

Female respondents recognized gendered structural constraints for men and suggested that ‘financial responsibilities of being a man’ and ‘compulsory military service’ are the main hindrances for men’s career advancement in the sector. One male professor stated that barriers to career development exist only for men for these reasons, while other men saw marriage and childcare as important barriers to women’s career development. Neither marriage nor childcare appeared to constitute a problem for male respondents.

Women respondents appreciated men’s help and contribution to their career. ‘My mother and father supported me both in material and spiritual ways until I lost them,’ said one. ‘Since I got married, my husband has been supporting me by being understanding about my work and exchanging ideas with me’. Only five of the 30 male professors

acknowledged the support of their immediate families; another five cited support received from their colleagues.³ As well as the support of their immediate families, female professors mentioned friends and colleagues. PhD supervisors were highlighted as important sources of support at both the academic and emotional level.

The role of significant others, particularly partners, is a recurring theme in the literature on women's achievement (Healy and Kraithman, 1996; Ledwith et al., 1991). Deem (2003), in her study of women academics in the UK, found that most women raised gender issues ranging from inequitable household and motherhood responsibilities to sexist behaviour by some male colleagues and discrimination in promotion. The link with the male domestic contribution is important in moving to gender equality. As Esping-Andersen (2002: 124) argues, neither social nor labour market policies alone will produce such equality; he identifies the 'admittedly weak feminization of the male life cycle' as a barrier to equal career opportunities in the Nordic countries.

Structures of Gendered Discrimination

Women in Turkey face further structures of gendered discrimination, yet the perception of gendered disadvantage was not high among our respondents. When asked about barriers that they faced as academic workers, there was, however, a gendered variation. Many male professors claimed to have faced no disadvantages or barriers, but a few identified institutional constraints in the promotion procedures. While many female professors argued that they had not experienced personal barriers to their career development, some did identify barriers to their career advancement, such as lack of support from family and friends, undergoing a divorce, having a child with a disability, and administrative obstructions. In general, while men tended to perceive institutional constraints, women were more likely to perceive familial constraints. One female professor suggested that men have inherited advantages in social life which spill over into academic life: 'I think that women's success is not easily accepted by women and men . . . Men are performing their professional duties more independently compared to women. They are already conditioned to be successful in academic and social life'.

Some male professors accepted that there is gender discrimination in working life, but not in academic life. The belief in the high prestige and reputation of the profession conceals some inequalities, implying a perceived superiority and lack of discrimination in the academic profession. As one commented, 'gender discrimination is not a significant issue here [in the university] and being men or women is beyond question in an academic institution'. The underpinning assumption is that the socially privileged position of academic workers in Turkey, particularly

full professors, must give them some degree of immunity from discrimination: 'I do not believe in discrimination in this profession. Women face discrimination in lots of other sectors but not in the university system'. The issue of gender discrimination is almost invisible to male professors, who are mostly very certain that there is no sex discrimination in university or academic life. 'There are no barriers to women in Turkey in this area. I've never encountered it even in the most conservative places. Male colleagues also do support them [women]'

The belief in the equitable ideal of employment recurs in other Turkish studies, for example of universities (Özkanlı and Korkmaz, 2000: 65) and banking (Özbilgin and Woodward, 2003). This belief is, nevertheless, often accompanied by the view that women academics should work more than men in order to achieve career success. However, this view was not universally shared by women: as one respondent insisted, 'all the discriminatory factors that exist in social life prevail in academic life as well'.

Discussion and Conclusions

Mischau (2001: 25) has remarked that 'there is no university where the percentage of female professors corresponds with the percentage of female academic staff or students'. While Turkish women's progress in academia seems greater than their European counterparts, this success is not underpinned by a critical mass of women academics nor by widespread labour market activity by women. It is evident that strong historical and national forces have been the main incentive for educated women to contribute to the modernization of Turkey; whereas in Europe, the major impetus has come from legislation designed to combat the negative effects of discrimination.

We have concentrated on Turkey, but we recognize that some of the characteristics identified for Turkey may be shared with other European countries, notable those in the CEE. What distinguishes Turkey is the contradiction between women's low labour market participation and their success in the professions, which seems counter-intuitive to the western eye. Most western commentators seek remedial measures for gendered discrimination in the strengthening of legislation. For Turkey, this class of women benefited not from legislation, but from a strong state ideology of equality. This 'state feminism' resulted from the rupture with the Ottoman Empire in 1923. Thus revolutionary change transformed the lives of middle-class women.

Academic women felt the impact of this transformation. At the institutional level, it was underpinned with the introduction of YÖK: the transparency of its employment policies has facilitated women's progress. This transparency is continually sought by feminists in universities in

Europe and North America, but often with at best partial success. Nevertheless, to make an obvious point, for women to achieve hierarchical success in an occupation, they must take jobs from men or must benefit disproportionately from an increase in employment opportunities for both. Part of the cumulative explanation of women's success in Turkish academia could be the exodus of men from the profession, consistent with the interpretation by Reskin and Roos (1990) of the feminization of some North American occupations. Given Turkey's comparatively low level of academic pay and the associated view that academic work is no longer attractive for men, this argument might seem persuasive. However, Eurostat data do not support this interpretation: academic salaries in Turkey, in terms of purchasing power, are not lower than those in countries with a far lower proportion of women academics. It is the expansion of the university sector that has provided new opportunities for both women and men.

Nevertheless, Turkish women face severe career constraints. A strong family ideology continues to result in the underemployment of women with tertiary education. At the same time, the family can have contradictory functions: our study demonstrates its importance in enabling and facilitating women to develop their academic careers. The women professors also demonstrated that they used the degrees of freedom available to develop their careers and allow their 'choices' to become a reality. Their constrained agency was accepted within the societal context, and it appeared that the support they received was conditional on respecting the bounds of the family ideology.

Esping-Andersen (2002) argues that there exists a broad consensus on what constitutes women-friendly policy. It includes affordable day care, paid maternity and parental leave, a right to leave when children are ill, and the ability to match work with school hours. But he adds that this is not sufficient: there is a need to change both gendered choices and societal constraints, including an inducement to men to embrace a more 'feminine' life cycle. Unlike Turkey (and also many CEE countries), Denmark has some of the best 'packages' of equality benefits, and its female employment rate nearly matches that of men's; yet women's share of academic employment, in particular at professorial level, is well below the European average.

The continued hierarchical achievement of women in Turkish academia is under threat at different levels. There is a weakening of the dominant state ideology; greater liberalization in higher education may lead to more 'flexibility' and less transparency. Our study indicates the importance of family; however, balancing work and family roles is also contingent on financial resources to support help with household and childcare tasks. Family is both a constraint and an enabler; in this there are both commonalities as well as national particularities across Europe.

Our study of Turkey is important in the context of the 'New Europe', since it demonstrates the importance of state ideology in promoting gender equality. The explanation of Turkish women's academic success is multilayered and lies in the cumulative and interrelated effect of state policy, institutional transparency, increased labour demand, the home-work interface, and the agency of the professors themselves. This example is, nevertheless, not typical of Turkish women's labour market experience, and it should be emphasized that this article draws on the experience of a highly educated and privileged elite. This does not negate the importance of their experience; after all, it is such women who are at the centre of debates on vertical segregation in the countries of Europe. The Turkish example suggests that the legislatively focused European approach to equality, which Turkey is now adopting as part of its candidacy for EU membership, is necessary, but not sufficient to achieve gender equality.

NOTES

- 1 See, for example, in the United Kingdom, Bett (1999), Ledwith and Manfredi (2000), Farish et al. (1995), and Heward and Taylor (1992); in Europe more generally, David and Woodward (1998); in the Middle East, Arabsheibani (1990) and Toren and Kraus (1987); in Australia, Shoemark (1996) and Burton (1996); and in North America, Konrad and Pfeffer (1991).
- 2 Article 10 of the Turkish Constitution specifies that all individuals are equal, irrespective of language, race, colour, sex and political opinion.
- 3 In the UK, Deem (2003) identified the reluctance of men to ascribe how gender might have affected their careers (though many pointed to support structures given by a non-working partner).

REFERENCES

- Acar, F. (1993) 'Women and University Education in Turkey', *Higher Education in Europe* 18: 65–77.
- Arabsheibani, G. (1990) 'Higher Education and Occupational Status of Women in Egypt', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 15: 3–4.
- Aytaç, M. and Aytaç, S. (2001) *Akademisyenlerin Çalışma Yaşamı ve Kariyer Sorunları*, Uludağ Üniversitesi Araştırma Fonu İşletme Müdürlüğü.
- Bett, M. (1999) *Independent Review of Higher Education Pay and Conditions: Report of a Committee Chaired by Sir Michael Bett*. London: HMSO.
- Burton, C. (1996) 'The Role of Equity Units in the Public Sector and in Universities', *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 55: 118–25.
- David, M. and Woodward, D. (eds) (1998) *Negotiating the Glass Ceiling: Careers of Senior Women in the Academic World*. London: Falmer Press.
- Deem, R. (2003) 'Gender, Organizational Cultures and the Practices of Manager-Academics in UK Universities', *Gender, Work and Organization* 10: 240–59.

- Enders, J. (2002) 'Academic Staff in Europe: Changing Employment and Working Conditions'. Paper to the Academic Staff in Europe project conference, Innsbruck.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2002) 'Towards a Post-Industrial Gender Contract' Symposium, France.
- ETAN (European Technology Assessment Network on Women and Science) (2000) *Promoting Excellence through Mainstreaming Gender Equality*. Brussels: EC.
- Eurostat (2004) 'Science and Technology: Highest Proportion of Graduates in Science and Engineering in Sweden, Ireland and France'. Press Release, 19 January.
- Farish, M., McPake, J., Powney, J. and Weiner, G. (1995) *Equal Opportunities in Colleges and Universities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Güvenç, B. (1997) *Türk Kimliği: Kültür Tarihinin Kaynakları*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Healy, G. (1999) 'Structuring Commitments in Interrupted Careers', *Gender Work and Organization* 6: 185–201.
- Healy, G. and Kraithman, D. (1996) 'Different Careers – Equal Professionals: Women in Teaching', in S. Ledwith and F. Colgan (eds) *Women in Organisations*, pp. 186–220. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Heward, C. and Taylor, P. (1992) 'Women at the Top in Higher Education: Equal Opportunities Policies in Action?' *Policy and Politics* 20: 111–21.
- Human Development Report (2005) http://hdr.undp.org/statistics/data/indic/indic_246_1_1.html
- James, K. (1996) 'Women in Transition: The Role of the Woman in the Czech Republic and Slovakia Post 1989', *Human Affairs* 6: 45–62.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1997) *Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar: Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Dönüşümler*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Konrad, A.M. and Pfeffer, J. (1991) 'Understanding the Hiring of Women and Minorities in Educational Institutions', *Sociology of Education* 64: 141–57.
- Ledwith, S. and Manfredi, S. (2000) 'Balancing Gender in Higher Education: A Study of the Experience of Senior Women in a "New" UK University', *European Journal of Women's Studies* 7: 7–32.
- Ledwith, S., Colgan, F., Joyce, P. and Hayes, M. (1991) 'The Making of Trade Union Leaders', *Industrial Relations Journal* 21: 112–25.
- Mischau, A. (2001) 'Women in Higher Education in Europe: A Statistical Overview', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 21: 20–31.
- OECD (2004) www.oecd.org/edu/eag2004
- Öncü, A. (1981) 'Turkish Women in the Professions: Why so Many?' in N. Abadan-Unat et al. (eds) *Women in Turkish Society*, pp. 181–93. Leiden: Brill.
- Özbilgin, M.F. (2002) 'The Way Forward for Equal Opportunities by Sex in Employment in Turkey and Britain', *International Management* 7(1): 55–67.
- Özbilgin, M.F. and Healy, G. (2004) 'The Gendered Nature of Career Development of University Professors: The Case of Turkey', *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 64(2): 358–71.
- Özbilgin, M.F. and Woodward, D. (2003) *Banking and Gender: Sex Equality in the Financial Services Sector in Britain and Turkey*. London: IB Tauris.
- Özgüç, N. (1998) 'Türkiye Üniversitelerinde Kadın Coğrafyacılar', in N. Arat

- (ed.) *Aydinlanmanın Kadınları*, pp. 177–201. Istanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitap Kulübü.
- Özkanlı, Ö. and Korkmaz, A. (2000) *Kadın Akademisyenler*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi.
- Palaz, S. (2000) ‘Gender Segregation in Institutions of Higher Education Employment’. Paper presented to the International Association for Feminist Economics Conference, Istanbul, August.
- Peker, M. (1996) ‘Internal Migration and the Marginal Sector’, in E. Kahveci, N. Sugur and T. Nichols (eds) *Work and Occupation in Modern Turkey*, pp. 7–37. London: Mansell.
- Reskin, B.F. and Roos, P.A. (eds) (1990) *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women’s Inroads into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Rubery, J., Smith, M., Fagan, C. and Grimshaw, D. (1998) *Women’s Employment in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Shoemark, L. (1996) ‘Equal Opportunity Units: Change Agencies’, *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 55: 129–31.
- Toren, N. and Kraus, V. (1987) ‘The Effects of Minority Size on Women’s Position in Academia’, *Social Forces* 65: 1090–100.
- TUBA (Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi) (2004) *Üniversitelerde Akademik Yükselmeler. Bilimsel Toplantılar Serisi: 4*. Ankara: TUBA Yay.
- TUSIAD (2000) *Yüksek Öğretimin Finansmanı*. Istanbul: TUSIAD.
- White, J.B. (2003) ‘State Feminism, Modernisation and the Turkish Republican Women’, *National Women’s Studies Journal* 15(3): 145–59.
- WiS (2005) Women in Science: Statistics and Indicators: http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/women/wssi/index_en.html
- Woodward, D. and Özbilgin, M.F. (1998) ‘İngiltere ve Türkiye’de Fırsat Eşitliği’, *Öneri* 2: 35–40.
- Woodward, D. and Özbilgin, M.F. (1999) ‘Sex Equality in the Financial Services Sector in Turkey and the UK’, *Women in Management Review* 14: 325–32.
- YÖK (Turkish Council of Higher Education) (1998) *Regulations Concerning Selection and Promotion in Academic Employment*. Ankara: YÖK.
- YÖK (2004) www.yok.gov.tr
- Zeytinoğlu, I.U. (1999) ‘Constructed Images as Employment Restrictions: Determinants of Female Labour in Turkey’, in Z.F. Arat (ed.) *Deconstructing Images of ‘The Turkish Woman’*, pp. 183–97. New York: Palgrave.

GERALDINE HEALY is Professor of Employment Relations, Queen Mary, University of London.

ADDRESS: Queen Mary, University of London, Centre for Business Management, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK.
[e-mail: g.m.healy@qmul.ac.uk]

MUSTAFA ÖZBILGIN is Senior Lecturer at Queen Mary, University of London.

ADDRESS: Queen Mary, University of London, Centre for Business Management, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK.
[e-mail: m.ozbilgin@qmul.ac.uk]

HANIFE ALIEFENDIOĞLU is Assistant Professor at the Eastern Mediterranean University, Faculty of Communication and Media Studies, Gazi Magusa, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

ADDRESS: Eastern Mediterranean University, Faculty of Communication and Media Studies, Gazi Magusa, TRNC, via Mersin 10, Turkey.

[e-mail: hanife.aliefendioglu@emu.edu.tr]