
NSF ADVANCE Project: Resources on Gendered Differences in Resource Allocations

1. West, M.S., and Curtis, J.W. (2006). *AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved October 22, 2013 from <http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/63396944-44BE-4ABA-9815-5792D93856F1/0/AAUPGenderEquityIndicators2006.pdf>

In this report, the AAUP describes data on gender equity indicators, including salary equity. See Figure 6 on p. 11. This shows full-time female faculty's average salary by rank, as a percent of full-time male faculty's average salary by rank, for 2005-2006, by institutional type. The authors point out that other studies have found an "unexplained" disadvantage of several percentage points for women faculty's salaries, even when controlling for many different variables.

2. Roos, P.A. (2008). Together but unequal: Combating gender inequity in the academy. *Journal of Workplace Rights*. 13(2):185-199.

This article focuses on gender inequity in an Arts & Science unit of a large public university (Rutgers). It is based upon personnel data and faculty interviews. The author found evidence that administrators have different expectations for male and female faculty in the promotion process. Female faculty believe that they need more solid credentials to be promoted to full professor and feel that they need to work twice as hard as their male colleagues to get promoted. In addition, female faculty see that male faculty are given more out-of-cycle merit raises and other discretionary funds by their units than they are. Several of the faculty interview comments published in this article are very interesting and insightful. See, in particular, pp. 190-195 of this article.

3. Monroe, K., Ozyurt, S., Wrigley, T., and Alexander, A. (2008). Gender equality in academia: Bad news from the trenches, and some possible solutions. *Perspectives on Politics*. 6(2): 215-233.

This article analyzes interviews with 80 women faculty at a large research university (UC Irvine) to reveal that individual and institutional gender discrimination still exists. Respondents describe their perceptions of inequity, and they provide recommendations for improving equity at their institutions. See, in particular, the faculty responses to the interview questions on p. 227 of this article (focusing on a lack of established institutional policies for filing complaints about gender bias in the review process, as well as a lack of established policies for addressing salary inequity).

4. Curtis, J.W. (2010). "Faculty Salary Equity: Still a Gender Gap?" *On Campus with Women* (Association of American College and Universities), Spring 2010 (Vol. 39, No. 1). Available at: http://www.aacu.org/ocww/volume39_1/feature.cfm?section=2

This report (click on the URL) follows up on AAUP's 2006 report (described above) and shows that inequity still exists in male vs. female faculty salaries. John Curtis, the author of this article and the director of research and public policy at the AAUP, examines reasons why so little progress has been made toward closing the gender gap in faculty salaries, and he asserts that the salary equity study process must be open and involve faculty in a meaningful way.

5. Gardner, S.K. (2012). "I couldn't wait to leave the toxic environment": A mixed methods study of women faculty satisfaction and departure from one research institution. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*. 5(1): 71-95.

This study conducted a mixed methods analysis of women faculty departure at one research institution (University of Maine), using Hagedorn's model of faculty job satisfaction. The study, which used findings of an institution-wide survey and interviews with women faculty who had left the institution, identified the following themes: a lack of resources to support faculty work, a lack of consistent and quality leadership, a lack of work-life balance policies and an environment to support them, and overall negative institutional and departmental environments.

See Table 3 on p. 83 for a list of items in which there were significant differences in survey responses by gender. These differences include differences in perceived resource allocations.

6. Settles, I.H., Cortina, L.M., Buchanan, N.T., and Miner, K.N. (2013). Derogation, discrimination and (dis)satisfaction with jobs in science: A gendered analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 37(2): 179-191.

This study surveyed 353 faculty members (male and female) at the University of Michigan, as part of the University of Michigan's NSF ADVANCE program. Women faculty described significantly more formal gender discrimination (e.g., unequal access to resources), informal gender derogation (e.g., disparaging comments), and organizational sexism toward women than male faculty. All three types of gender mistreatment related to lower job satisfaction, via perceptions that the work environment was negative and alienating.