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**1. Purpose**

This paper reviews the literature on career progression for women in science, including mobility, as part of a research project focussing on a Melbourne research institute as a case study of how to achieve a paradigm shift in the organisational culture through exploring issues of gender and equity, particularly career progression of women and disparity of outcomes.

**2. Design/methodology/approach**

Gender is a social practice that constructs norms, with class privileged men as the neutral and objective standard (van den Brink, Benschop and Jansen 2010; West and Zimmerman 1987). Thus, the concept of a “scientist” is male and the organisational culture of the science workplace remains male. Consequently the linear career path of male scientists has been considered the only route to success (Moir 2006), and thus homosociability has a negative impact on women scientists careers (Husu and Kiskener 2010).

Key issues for women scientists include:

* Examining career progression within the broad context of secondary schooling, undergraduate and postgraduate study (Bell 2009; Hatchell and Aveling 2008) and the relative status of particular fields of science (Yu and Shauman 2003; Ceci and Williams 2011)
* The gendering of careers is consolidated throughout the careers of women scientists (Bell 2009; Dever et al. 2008; Asmar 1999; Birch 2011; van den Brink 2009; Hatchell and Aveling 2008; Etzkowitz and Kemelger 2001; genSET 2010).
* Women are a clear minority in leadership and senior management positions of science institutions (genSET 2010).
* The impact of relationships and children on the careers of women scientists is unclear, but suggests there is not a strong link between children and lower ambition and research productivity. However, the perception of senior colleagues about the research focus of women with children can become an obstacle (Moir 2006; Ceci and Williams 2011; Fox 2005; Fox and Colletralla 2006; Hartley and Dobele 2009; Corley 2005; Mavriplis et al. 2010; Lane 2009).
* Gate-keeping operates through lack of support for women for funding applications and publications, especially being named last author on articles, and a culture of inclusion/exclusion often based on gender (Bell 2009; van den Brink 2009; Husu 2004; van den Brink et al. 2010; Acker and Smythe 2010; Holquist and Sundin 2010; Griffin 2004; Hatchell and Aveling 2008; Barinaga 1992; Fouad and Singh 2011; Husu and Kiskener 2010; Etzkowitz and Kemelger 2001, Stark 2008)
* Strong networks are important in order to ensure career progression and successful promotion (Wroblewski 2010; Husu 2004; Leden et al. 2007; Faltholm and Abrahamsson 2010; Benschop 2009; Sagabiel et.al. 2011; Sabatier et. al. 2006; Fouad and Singh 2011, Bonetta 2010).
* Research quality can be improved by addressing gender analysis in scientific research (genSET 2010, 2011), including consistent, systematic reporting of gender data (Bell, 2009).

**4. Research limitations/implications**

This paper does not report on data that will be collected during 2012.

**5. Originality/value of the paper**

Key issues for career progression were analysed. Mobility was not identified as one of these issues.
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