Managerialism as the "new" discursive masculinity in the university

Author: Ana M. Martínez Alemán

Managerialism as the "New" Discursive Masculinity in the University

Ana M. Martínez Alemán

Through its increasing corporatization in the last two decades, the university in the United States has implemented an organizational ideology that has created a climate unfavorable for women faculty. By overvaluing and intensifying managerial principles, the university in the United States has strengthened discursive masculinity and has worsened women faculty's likelihood of professional advancement. Consequently, the adoption and implementation of managerialism in higher education in the United States is a question of gender equity for the academic profession. Feminist educational scholars have been relatively quiet on the growth of managerialism in the university and its impact on gender equity. In particular, feminist scrutiny of managerialism's discursive masculinity and its effects on gender equity in the university has been lacking. This conceptual article presents a feminist analysis of managerialism and its implications for women faculty in the United States; it examines how managerial culture and practices adopted by universities have revived, reinforced, and deepened the discourse of masculinity.

Keywords: discourse / feminism / gender equity / managerialism / sexism / women faculty

Introduction

In the United States, we seem to operate under the misguided confidence that *gender equity* has been achieved in the university.[1] The increase in women students and in women faculty and administrators since the 1960s has been touted as evidence that the university has achieved gender equity. There is no

doubt that the current anti-feminist/anti-woman mood that has buoyed recent efforts to undermine women's reproductive freedoms, our right to fair wages, and protections from sexual violence provides supplementary discursive scaffolding for the university's "post-feminist" bearings: the assumption that feminism and feminist aims are now irrelevant or no longer needed in the university because of gains made by women in the academic profession.[2] Mary Douglas Vavrus (2010) urges us to reestablish the term *sexist* into our analyses in order to expose the myth that women, *as women*, are no longer subjugated. Elizabeth A. St. Pierre (2000, 484) reminds us that feminism requires that we pay attention to the perpetuation of gender inequity, and that we give responsible consideration to essentialist discourses that produce "real, material structures" that discipline for conformity and penalize change.

In this spirit, my feminist critique of *managerialism* in the university is about exposing the university's "new" masculinity as its "new" sexism, and in exposing this "new" masculinity as the latest challenge to gender equity for women faculty. As a feminist critique, it aims to understand the nature of gender inequity in the US university, an institution that is historically gendered and in which women have had subordinate status.

A basic assumption of this feminist critique is derived from Joan Acker's (2006) work on organizations as gendered institutions that support "inequality regimes." According to her, organizational regimes of gender power and privilege produce and maintain gender inequality.[3] As Acker points out, organizations are not gender neutral and do systemically maintain differences "in power and control over goals, resources, and outcomes; workplace decisions such as how to organize work; opportunities for promotion and interesting work; security in employment and benefits; pay and other monetary rewards; respect; and pleasures in work and work relations" (443). These regimes are "patterned" through and by gender norms that distinguish between men and women, and masculinity and femininity (Acker 1990, 146). In particular, organizational culture creates barriers that make women's advancement difficult. Paternalism, wage discrepancies between men and women, disparity in resource allocation between women and men, having different standards for men's and women's performances, and overlooking the need to attend to work/family issues are but a few of the obstacles women face in corporate cultures (Acker 2006).

Corporations and their management are ideologically governed by managerialism; as an ideology, it is a "belief system of ends and values" that managers follow (Scott and Hart 1991, 40). Through managerialism, institutions can advance managers' interests over workers' interests and preserve relations of power and control in the hierarchy of the corporation. The desire for efficient production, and the need to control the methods and processes of production and its valuation, characterizes managerialism (Burnham 1941; Enteman 1993). The managerial institution privileges standardization as a means to "maximize predictability and reliability of services and products" (Friedson 2001, 217),

and efficiency is given priority over equity and public service (Welch 1998). Through managerialism, institutions apply "market logic" broadly, across all of their endeavors (Frederickson 1999).

In what follows, I assert that the discourse of *masculinity* as an organizing theory constitutes university organizational culture and its managerial practices, and, as a consequence, academic work is regulated and ordered by masculinity's discursive principles. This consideration emphasizes how discourses regulate meaning, how discursive practices function to order and normalize individual and group behavior, and how the discursive privileging of rationality, objectivity, and efficiency in faculty performance metrics challenge feminist aims. In the United States, the "new" masculinity circulated through managerialism in the university today is the latest interference with and interruption of women's advancement in the academic profession, an occurrence not so unpredictably well-timed to suppress women's further advancement in the profession.

Foundation

In 1995, Estela Mara Bensimon put forward a "rebellious reading" of the suitability of *total quality management* (TQM) for higher education in the United States. Her feminist critique was that in the university, TQM is a discourse of inequity. This late-twentieth-century feminist critique rested on the claim that TQM was buoyed by patriarchal discourses rooted in collegial culture, and simultaneously strengthened by TQM's inequitable bureaucratic and corporate norms. As an organizational strategy, TQM relied upon "objective" metrics that ignored the social and cultural contexts of students, staff, and faculty, and that gave priority to efficiency and lack of variation—all principles and strategies that sustained the university's "tendency to value conformity" in its "standards of knowledge, quality, and legitimacy" (608). Thus, concluded Bensimon, as an operational philosophy, TQM would undoubtedly undercut existing equity programs and policies and weaken the development and institutionalization of gender and race-equity practices.

Bensimon warned that a managerial university would create "an institutional climate that affects women adversely" (607). Although in the United States the research university never fully embraced TQM as an organizational strategy, the university did adopt corporate and managerial principles embedded in TQM, such as a valuing of efficiency in production and the delivery of services and broadly applied benchmarking procedures to increase competition among institutional actors. In the university, these TQM principles intensified the discourse of masculinity in academic life through managerial processes. Bensimon's rebellious reading of the precursor of today's managerialism asserted that equity for women and all other marginalized groups in higher education would require the university to reject its mimetic isomorphism of the corporation, thereby effectively rebuffing the reconstitution of sexist discourses.

More than a decade later, Amy Scott Metcalfe and Sheila Slaughter's (2008, 81) feminist critique of "academic capitalism" asserted that the university's shift from one "prestige system" to another has produced an environment in which men can "recapture some of the historic privilege" found in higher education. They argued persuasively that in the college and university, professional status and standing is now determined not by "expert-based power," but by "market-based power" anchored in "academic capitalism." By reorganizing professional power and privilege so that academic advancement is secured through market-based criteria that comprise academic capitalism, Metcalfe and Slaughter acknowledged that academic women are once again disadvantaged by professional values. Rationalistic and entrepreneurial, academic capitalism, they reasoned, handicaps many women faculty and undermines equity. The corporate university is governed by an ideology that relies upon the pursuit of prestige through quantifiable metrics of production. In this scheme, faculty publication is "objectively" measured in quantity, and not quality, of publication. Among women in the ecological sciences, for example, studies have suggested that their lower publication rates may be attributable to greater time investments in fewer publications—a more qualitative approach to production—but when coupled with more teaching and family duties, this lower rate of production can contribute to lower rates of grant success and slower rates of promotion (Cameron, Gray, and White 2013).

I argue that the basis of these findings lies in the discursive construction of academic capitalism in the corporate university. Although it is not Metcalfe and Slaughter's (2008) intention to unpack the discursive character of academic capitalism, by identifying the rationalistic, individualistic, and competitive nature of market-based power and privilege in the university, they allude to an under-examined area of twenty-first-century feminist critique: the discourse of masculinity in the *corporate* university. As in other corporations, the university's organizational culture operates through the masculinity of management practices and policies that sexualize women and exclude them from senior positions (Wajcman 1998).

Although recent feminist critiques of women's lives as academics has brought to light both macro- and micro-inequities (Neumann 2009; Ward and Wolf-Wendel 2012), the intensification of discursive masculinity brought on by the US university's corporatization and adoption of managerial culture has escaped feminist scrutiny. There have been no focused feminist analyses of the discourse of masculinity in the university's managerial culture, or of how the corporatization of the university in the country has revitalized and reinforced gender norms that have been historically troublesome for women faculty. Although many scholars have examined, analyzed, and addressed gender inequities for women faculty (for example, Cress and Hart 2009; Glazer-Raymo 1999, 2001; Perna 2001), these investigations either did not intend to or could not capture the adoption of managerial culture by universities and its

intensification of masculinist principles. However, Carmen Armenti (2004) used a critical feminist framework on maternity in the academic profession to imply that masculinity characterizes the discursive framing of the academic profession as a profession that "does not allow women a significantly different career path than the standard one developed around the male life course" (229). For the most part, feminist examinations of discourses in the academy have focused on leadership and modalities of power (Allan 2003; Allan, Gordon, and Iverson 2006)—unquestionably attributes of discursive masculinity—but these examinations have not fixed their attention on the mutually dependent relationship between discursive masculinity and its intensification in the managed and corporatized university in the United States.

In the United States, feminist criticism of discursive masculinity as the underpinning of and mechanism for managerialism and its manifestations in the university (for example, academic capitalism, accountability metrics) has been overlooked. In feminist scholarship by UK researchers, however, the adoption of *new public management* (NPM) discourse has been examined as a feminist concern (Davies and Thomas 2002; Deem 1998). A product of 1980s Thatcherism, NPM policies intend to make public-sector institutions more efficient and cost-effective through market-oriented management. Feminist scholars in the UK have argued that under NPM, managerialism has reinforced regimes of inequity that preserve gender bias in the university and the academic profession. Scholar Suzy Harris (2005) extended this critique to the forms of governance instituted in UK universities, stipulating that the "central signifiers of academic identity"—autonomy and vocation—have been challenged by neoliberal ideology. Neoliberal organizational ideology, argues Harris, values and reifies the "market-based power" of academic capitalism through "instrumentalist" managerial practices that compromise academic practice (430). The implication here is that managerial practices are manifestations of a discursive system that proves difficult for many women faculty (Metcalfe and Slaughter 2008).

In the UK, Rosemary Deem and Kevin J. Brehony (2005) observed that the "new managerialism" of higher education is defined by an ideology that advances managerial interests over workers' interests, and that preserves relations of power and control that are by-products of the modernization of corporations. The desire for efficient production, and the need to control the methods and processes of production and its valuation, characterizes this managerialism. More significantly for women faculty, by emphasizing customer service, a culture of competition, and a rise in and a broadening of "hard" management approaches (Deem 1998; Deem and Brehony 2005; Prichard and Deem 1999), managerialism has introduced a "new masculinity" and a new set of gender inequities. Most notably, this new masculinity introduced by corporatism as an organizational model in UK universities has, not surprisingly, coincided with the lack of advancement of senior women into academic leadership positions and the ghettoization of academic women in the middle-lower academic

administrative levels, such as department and program chairs and student services offices (Deem 1998).

I contend that, in the United States, a comparable condition now exists in the university. Although institutionally diverse, the research university in the United States shares discursive DNA with the new masculinity that corporatized the organizational model in UK universities. Olga Bain and William Cummings (2000) corroborate this contention in their global study of organizational barriers to the career advancement of women. Despite the more "egalitarian" nature of US universities, the authors posit that it is organizational factors that have the most influence on academic women's advancement in universities worldwide. Metcalfe and Slaughter (2008, 81) come to the same conclusion. By the "recasting of the value systems of higher education" through overvaluing and intensifying business and managerial principles by university administrators and boards of trustees, they allude to the realization of discursive masculinity in the lives of women faculty.

Managerialism is characterized by a culture of power and hierarchical relationships that are gendered. Managerial relationships epitomize a hegemonic masculinity in which command structures are palpable and preserved, and in which positional power (rank) is supported and endorsed (Cartwright and Gale 1995). As an organizational ideology in which managers and those in high-ranking positions have control over institutional resources and purposes, and in which power and wage differences are gendered to privilege men and masculinity (Acker 1990, 2006), managerialism enacts a discourse of gender that is inimical to feminist aims. The culture of power and hierarchy central to managerialism should be of particular concern to feminists, given that the power over relations, which characterizes managerial processes, is inequitable. Feminists should examine the varied and multifaceted forms that power takes in the managerial university in order to pinpoint the insidious forms of power that support and reinforce sexism and gender injustice (Allen 1999).

In the United States, women faculty now face amplified professional inequality as a consequence of managerialism's strengthening of discursive masculinity—a discourse that informs professional norms and expectations for academic advancement. Like the "inequality regimes" in corporations identified by Acker (2006), the managerial university is a site in which women faculty often have little power to determine standards of professional merit; their opportunities for promotion are regulated by inequitable gender-blind practices and policies, and their pay and other monetary rewards lag behind those of male peers. Moreover, reanimated by managerialism's discursive masculinity, professional sex-segregation has been revived and is proving consequential for women faculty's advancement.

The Discourse of Masculinity

To say that masculinity is a discourse is to claim that it is a system of signs—language, images, actions—that communicates norms for individuals and institutions. Regulatory discourses communicate standards for normative behavior and performance (Bourdieu 1977, 1990). By assigning meaning and value to certain principles, a discourse "disciplines" individuals and, by extension, regulates the structure of organizations and institutions. Those in power or in control of the discourse normalize certain principles and ways of being through discourse to perpetuate norms, and to demand compliance, conformity, and submission to these norms. As a type of discourse, therefore, masculinity is composed of sequences of signs about gender and sex that give value and meaning to certain knowledge, particular ways of thinking and performing in the university. By doing so, those who control the discourse in the university have the power to control and regulate faculty and their work accordingly.

Rationality, objectivity, instrumentality, autonomy, hierarchy, and homosociality compose the ideology of hegemonic masculinity and its discursive acts (Burris 1996; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). As Raewyn Connell (1995, 76) warned, masculinity's hegemonic property, although not an essential disposition but rather a "position" in a "pattern of gender relations," operates in the cultures of human societies and most effectively in their institutions. For example, in the United States, "patterns of gender relations" as manifestations of hegemonic discursive masculinity script the tradition of tenure review that has historically discriminated against women (Glazer-Raymo 1999). As a transhistorical ideal, hegemonic forms of masculinity have imbued social institutions like the university with forms of worker subjugation acceptable within institutional hierarchies. Principles and standards of masculinity have validated those forms of power that maintain institutional order (primarily hierarchical) and worker categorization and ranking (Anderson 2009; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Hegemonic forms of masculinity feature "[c]ultural consent, discursive centrality, institutionalization, and the marginalization or delegitimation of alternatives" (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 846), attributes that mark the managerial university today. Guided by these norms, worker socialization reproduces gender norms and stereotypes and enforces worker compliance, especially within gender-segregated work "ghettos" (Charles and Grusky 2005).

For the academic professional, masculinity has discursive centrality. The academic profession has evolved from Western Europe's medieval guilds and monastic orders whose quasi-vocational identity is consistent with the principles of hegemonic masculinity and the ideal professional. With its monastic heritage and paternalistic DNA, the academic profession has been an identity and performance that is a discursive challenge for women. Faculty work and production are discursively masculine and in accordance with men's experiences (Morley

1999). As a performance of hegemonic masculinity, the academic profession has presented women with a discursive paradox, subjecting them to professional challenges and incongruities confirmed and corroborated by research performed over the course of the last forty-plus years.[4]

Masculinity in the academic profession works discursively to configure a value system that embeds ethics and standards that maintain academic women's subordinate status in the profession, while simultaneously profiting from women's discursive gender roles. Women faculty must perform in a professional climate in which the persistence of gender roles defined by discursive masculinity insists that women perform their historic gender functions and embody their corresponding stereotypes as a way to accommodate their contradictory position in the profession. Because a woman cannot logically or categorically be an academic professional/man, because she does not have the essential attributes of masculinity, and because she often does not perform socially constructed attributes of masculinity, she will be expected to take on aspects of the profession that are her discursive "fit." Women faculty must negotiate the gender-stereotyped work of the profession that will reward them less than men, and that often provokes a delay in tenure, produces lower rates of promotion to full professor, and suppresses salaries—all material outcomes reflective of women's discursive gender classification in the academy (Krefting 2003).[5]

Presumed to be best-suited for the relational and domestic functions of the profession (teaching, advising, and service qua housekeeping), women in the academic profession are expected to engage in gender-appropriate work that most mimics the work in the discursively regulated private sphere.[6] Professional prestige and metrics of compensation and promotion do not wholly encompass the domestic/feminized work of the academic profession, such as teaching, advising, and service. The relational and domestic work of university faculty is undeniably "undervalued" in the academic profession (Lester 2011a, 174).[7] The prevailing role of "maternal teacher" (175) and the collection of service and teaching activities performed disproportionately by women faculty (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006; Terosky, Phifer, and Neumann 2008) reveal the material effects of discursive masculinity on women faculty. Although Stephen Porter (2007) suggested that his analysis of the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) revealed few differences in departmental and university committee participation between faculty women and men, he did submit that women and faculty of color do share a disproportionate load of institutional service, and that, given the measures of institutional service used in the study, we really do not have a full view of how faculty actually spend time on service duties. Porter's caveat suggests that it may well be the case that the time-intensive labor of advising and other student-centered and personnel-centered work (for example, the work of department and program chairs) requires much more time than does simply attending committee meetings. Certainly, this theme dominates the current blogosphere of women academics.[8]

The discourse of masculinity in the academic profession obliges, compels, and enforces women faculty's adoption of "mom work," creating a psychology and sociology of "cultural taxation" for academic women (Tierney and Bensimon 1996).[9] The "linear military model of competition" essential to faculty culture (Cress and Hart 2009, 479) and the economics of faculty productivity that privileges market-like behaviors and empirical metrics to assess faculty merit and the production model of teaching (Martínez Alemán 2008) serve as discursive practices of masculinity that impact the professional lives of women in academe. Academic life is gendered by these discursive practices, and the adoption of managerial ideology by the university serves to reinforce these practices and further sexism in the profession.

Managerialism and Discursive Masculinity in Academic Life

As scholars Deem and Brehony (2005) have observed, the modern university extracted its managerial mindset from the modern corporation, and relegated power to the managerial-administrative cadre who advance its own managerial interests. US higher education scholars Jack Schuster and Martin Finkelstein (2006) concur with the assertion that this business model is *the* organizational theory of the university today, and add that as a result, the university's structure is now intended to provide "services" to "clients" and not to sustain the historic vocational undertakings of the academic professional. The recent firing and rehiring of University of Virginia president Teresa Sullivan brought this ideological shift into the public eye. As professor Siva Vaidhyanathan (2012) commented on Slate.com, the university's overseers desired a president "who would act more like a corporate CEO," and who would lead "a rapid transition to a consumer model of diploma generation." The overseers' wish to hitch the university to the wagon of for-profit online education signaled an ideological shift from a vocational and public-serving social institution to a privatized and corporate entity. Doing so would undoubtedly restructure the university faculty's functions to serve the institution's corporate and managerial ends and not its historic vocational purposes (Gumport 1997).

The university's ideological shift to a corporate institution has transformed the primary functions of the faculty; research has become production and teaching has been commodified. Consequently, the "business-like production" of research and teaching has become "the centerpiece of the university's performance" and the university's perceived position among its peers and competitors (Martínez Alemán 2012, 95). In the managerial university, the masculinist assumptions of research culture (Bell and Gordon 1999) have mobilized and escalated the values of autonomy and individual achievement in research production. Rosabeth Kanter (1977) first identified this discourse as the "masculine ethic" that standardizes rationality and instrumentality in the performance of work in corporations, and as the presumptive belief in the neutrality or

objectivity of determining professional merit. At the same time, these discursive principles have downgraded lower-level administrative "housekeeping" service activities—predictably relational, collaborative, and communal in nature—to activities that have no substantive compensatory value. Discursively, these service activities, which include teaching and advising, are women faculty's work, and the associated merit for performing these activities reflects the gendered order and segregation of such work.

In the privatized, corporate, and entrepreneurial university in the United States (Washburn 2005), managerialism is *the* organizational ideology, its internal logic guided by discursive masculinity that, in turn, determines managerial practices. Ordered by instrumental reasoning, the "managed" university favors efficiency in systems and processes. Using objectivist social science to determine methods of appraisal for its many and varied functions, the managerial university employs "law-like generalizations," whether or not these principles oversimplify complex and subjective human activities (Deem and Brehony 2005, 223). These organizational generalizations about the conduct and value of work favor those activities that can be more efficiently measured; managerial organizations value maximum productivity that is efficient (Denhardt and Denhardt 2007). The goal in the managed university is to maximize predictability and reliability for the purposes of efficiency in production, and to value the means of production more than how those means may impact institutional purposes or individual faculty's professional intentions. Because efficiency is valued over the quality of what is produced in managerial organizations, the university's managers will give more weight to those processes that can be reliably (quantifiably) measured; accumulating verifiable products is endorsed. Consequently, these processes must be tangible, able to be empirically verified, and must contain relevant value to the institution's managerial goals (Martínez Alemán 2012).

Like all managerial organizations, then, universities must have an organizational structure that is intended for efficient production. As a strategy of "mimetic isomorphism" (Bolman and Deal 2003), universities imitate and reproduce the operations and structures of business and the principles of managerialism, trusting that these operations and structures will correspond to the university's own functions. Confidently believing that knowledge production, teaching and service, and all such functions that are variable, contextual, and capricious though still necessary university work can have business (profitable) value and conform to and be assessed by business practices, the managerial university embraces the culture and structure of business, replicating its conventions and procedures. If these functions are incongruous with managerial ideology—that is, if they are context-specific, variable and unpredictable, or constituted by intangibles and, thus, unlikely to be accurately captured by managerial tools—they will not be privileged in the university's reward structures. Instead, these goods and services—teaching, advising, and housekeeping administrative service—are commodified to meet the production needs of the

institution, but are not given the prestige and remunerative incentives granted to knowledge production (research).

The discursive masculinity that guides the economy of the managerial university situates teaching and service as paradoxical activities to production, thereby categorizing those who perform these tasks as subaltern workers. In contrast, "men's work" in the managerial university—research and scholarly production—does not carry the symbolic weight and market depreciation of femininity. In delineating the economy of production, managerialism's discursive masculinity normalizes and venerates the university's production value, rendering teaching and service activities as necessary, but unmistakably subordinate professional functions. Thus, since women faculty perform more of these "commodified" services in the university (Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011), it stands to reason that their rate of production activities and correlate rewards—promotion, meritorious salary upgrades—would be compromised. Only when academic services are conceptualized as sites for "critical agency," when these services are understood and valued in the professional reward structures (Baez 2000), can teaching and academic service carry professional and institutional power.

The value of teaching in the managerial university is undeniably gendered through discursive masculinity. Idiosyncratic, inefficient, and concerned with means and processes, teaching and associated services, or administrative "glue work," are feminine activities. As "women's work," its discursive meaning dictates its remunerative value in the economy of production and exchange (Grumet 1988; Martínez Alemán 2008; Park 1996). Teaching and educational relationships (advising, student support services) in the university are consequently attached to their discursively gendered meaning as activities that are undervalued (or remuneratively devalued) because of their domestic or feminine "nature." Thus, because teaching is considered women's work in the managerial university—relational, inefficient, subjective—compensation and merit structures will not favor these activities.

In the managerial university, teaching is professional work that is inefficient, difficult to measure, and lacking in production value, but because of its centrality to the mission of the institution, it does hold some value as a service. As a marketable service, teaching is a commodity in the managerial university. As commodities, teaching, advising, and other student service activities are in demand by institutional "markets," and universities will "sell" these commodities in markets to obtain revenue in the form of tuition; as commodities, these relational functions of the professoriate are positioned as products in an economy of exchange that is incongruous with the relational, personal, and sympathetic (feminine) character of teaching and service (Martínez Alemán 2007). As a contractual obligation of the institution, what is important in the contractual exchange is the commodity, not the "sociology of giving" that more accurately represents the labor-intensive, sympathetic, relational, particular

character of teaching and student service (575). Teaching, advising, mentoring, and service—all functions difficult to measure empirically and inaccurately evaluated and, consequently, devalued—are fungible commodities of the managerial university (Gould 2003). As commodities, they are produced simply for sale in the market and, thus, have little qualitative differentiation in the university's reward systems. Unlike faculty's research and scholarly productivity, in the managerial university, teaching and other service activities are fungible products expressly sold in the university's marketplace. Although valuable to the institution in the sense that teaching and service are its necessary operations, they do not have exchange value and, consequently, hold little actual remunerative or compensation value for those who engage in it (Bauer 2002). Part of the university's "glue work," these activities have little professional status in the managerial university, and because it is "relational work," it is overlooked, disregarded (Eveline 2004, 4) and ineffectively appraised.

In adopting managerial values and structures, the university has employed practices that measure its production in an economy that advantages efficiently measureable outputs, and disadvantages variable and incalculable work. Circulating in an economy of exchange, the managed university can measure, reward, and leverage research production through the use of objectivist tools. These same tools will be used to quantify and evaluate faculty's teaching duties, despite their subjective character. These faculty functions will be quantified and accounted for by efficient empiricist measures that are "an end run around the gendered epistemological constraints" of managerialism's discursive masculinity (Martínez Alemán 2008). As discursively feminine functions, teaching, advising, and service in the managerial university must be "normalized" (that is, made compatible with masculine discourse) through empirical measurement, despite the epistemic contradiction. Instrumental tools meant to measure the tangible products of faculty—research production and grants acquisition—are employed to calculate these intangible, subjective functions, yielding calculations that are, at best, incomplete approximations. This is the university's "hard" managerialism that justifies its performance, and is free of the context-heavy "soft" management of academic culture that had historically recognized and appreciated the subjective nature of teaching and service, as identified by Martin Trow (2010). The devaluation of the personal and idiosyncratic nature of teaching by the managerial university frames the love of teaching as professional deviance to be hidden from view. As one women faculty member in Anna Neumann's (2009) narrative on academic careers noted, her love of teaching had to be "closeted" prior to attaining tenure, the professional appraisal period when the "hard" metrics of productivity are at their most acute.

In the managerial university, women faculty must now negotiate professional norms that are gendered further by managerialism's hegemonic masculinity. Women faculty must adhere to compulsory norms that require unprecedented quantities of productivity and increased dedication to an economy of

exchange (Davies and Petersen 2005). Simultaneously, academic women must perform increased levels of unproductive/undervalued service work (teaching, advising, service) that corresponds to traditional gender work-segregation undervalued by masculinity's/managerialism's keen fixation on production. In addition, many academic women must also perform nonwork obligations (personal, parental, familial) that have been conventionally relegated to women as gender-specific duties (Jacobs and Gerson 2004) and that negatively impact time spent on production (Armenti 2004).

Without question, in the managerial university, women faculty find their professional identities and progress challenged by the discourse of masculinity that is circulated and intensified by managerialism and its practices. Jaime Lester (2011a) asserts that women faculty engage in gendered performances that are reactions to the gender discourse dominant in the university. Women faculty negotiate gender expectations that are circulated by discursive masculinity, which, on the one hand, devalues the work that they are most likely and expected to do—"women's work" like teaching, advising, and lower-level administrative service—and, on the other, values "men's work"—research and scholarship—that comprises expectations set by managerial values. Women faculty must perform both in women's and men's professional spheres: they must do the maternal and relational work that historically characterizes femininity, as well as the masculine work of research and scholarly production. In the managerial university, women faculty must perform the devalued work of maternal caregiving and service, but gain professional and institutional rewards from their execution in the economy of research and scholarly production. But time dedicated to women's work in the managerial university is time taken away from men's work (research production), a phenomenon that is, in some part, responsible for the "ivory ceiling" that hampers women faculty's promotion (Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011). Consequently, academic women's professional identities have contradictory conditions and obligations that require constant monitoring (Ropers-Huilman 2000)—a professional yoke that is discursively masculine and enforced by managerial regulation in the university.

Academic women must also contend with managerialism's normative construction of the "ideal worker" who can free herself of personal responsibilities and dedicate herself to scholarly production (Drago 2007). The ideal academic professional sets aside both the demands of home and family and the responsibilities of institutional women's work to focus her time and energy on valued production. The university, as a family-*un*friendly sector, can institute large penalties on women (Nielsen, Simonsen, and Verner 2004), and its work/family climate has been shown to be negatively perceived by university faculty (Anderson, Morgan, and Wilson 2002). In a recent study on the effects of motherhood among academic women, 91 percent of women faculty have spouses with full-time jobs, while 52 percent of their male peers have stay-at-home wives,

leading researchers to conclude that women faculty bear a heavier burden of time-intensive family responsibilities than their male peers (Mason and Goulden 2003). These same researchers further affirm that having babies matters a great deal for most women, especially with regard to achieving tenure through valued production, where an evident gender gap exists. The data on the dual roles of mother and professor show that stress, anxiety, and guilt characterize the lives of academic mothers and are not the norms of the ideal academic (Ward and Wolf-Wendel 2012, 253). A primary assumption of this norm is that personal responsibilities, or "nonwork," is not "identity affirming," but rather "identity discrepant" for professionals (Thompson and Bunderson 2007, 19). Tasks associated with parenting, home life, and family are assumed to carry little meaning—or, more accurately, have less "salient personal meaning" (ibid.)—to faculty than their professional production. For many academic women, nonwork responsibilities can be both identity affirming and professionally discrepant.

The university's managerial culture circulates language, images, and practices that communicate, reinforce, and venerate this norm, disciplining and penalizing the behavior of academic professionals. The ideal academic learns that some share of personal/nonwork life must be forfeited in order to dedicate long hours to research production. This message is delivered through socialization in graduate school, and is intensified in the assistant professor's journey toward tenure. For example, although the workweek for faculty is not authoritatively enforced, its norm is communicated discursively. The message that long hours dedicated to research and scholarship production is the professional standard in the managerial university is circulated through senior faculty modeling, self-promotion, public articulation of time-pressures, publicizing of workloads, and the administrative tools of faculty accountability. In the managerial university, the discursive imposition of a "performative ethos" and its "audit culture" presents professional standards and expectations that implicitly demand forsaking some measure of nonwork responsibilities and call into question faculty's dedication to teaching and service. The audit of faculty productivity in the managerial university has unsurprisingly created more hurdles and caused more difficulties for women faculty (Archer 2008, 399). Regulated by a discursive masculinity as "women workers" and also by managerialism's inherent masculine ethic that esteems rationality, instrumentality, efficiency, and objectivity, women faculty appear particularly affected by the managerial university's "dominant performative ethos" (385).

For women faculty in the managerial university, the discursive norm of the academic professional often elicits "bias-avoidance behaviors" that seek to reduce the time spent on family commitments and to create more time for production work. Women faculty will often conceal their spousal and maternal responsibilities in order to be perceived as fully committed to production (Drago 2007). Because masculinity has discursively normalized the performance of the academic professional in the managerial university, women faculty must always

"manage impressions" (Lester 2011b). Younger women faculty, in particular, are compelled to engage in behaviors that are "unrelated to—or which could even counter—their own notions of [professional] authenticity and success" (Archer 2008, 398). For example, younger women faculty may delay child-bearing or adoption. If they do have children, they may steer clear of conversations about them in formal and informal professional meetings; they may not make public their work/home conflicts or disclose that parenting responsibility conflicts with professional duty. Academic women will often minimize or hide parenting obligations and avoid bringing children to campus. These behaviors or practices of unproductive bias-avoidance (Drago 2007) are enacted to both appear productive, as well as to actualize productivity. Academic women seek to simultaneously actualize the ideal of the academic professional in the managerial university by reducing time dedicated to parenting, and to engage in deception about those parenting responsibilities that they do perform.

Gender segregation in the university is mobilized by enhanced discursive masculinity and appears more conspicuous with the implementation of managerial culture. For example, women faculty are performing more of the service and teaching roles than men (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006), and report that they feel obliged to perform the university's women's work (Lester 2011b). During the last two decades, women faculty are engaging in more lower-level administrative work (for example, serving as associate deans, department chairs, program directors) (Danowitz and Agans 2010, 320). The "accumulated disadvantages" that persist for women faculty in higher education (AAUP 2006) suggest that discursive forces in managerial practices in the university during the last thirty years have negatively impacted women's professional progress. With higher levels of teaching and service, lower and slower rates of tenure and promotion, persistent wage gaps, and resource imbalances (ibid.; Cress and Hart 2009; Meyers 2011; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011), women faculty find themselves professionally compromised.

The Managerial University's Gender Fallout

For women faculty, what are the consequences of the heightened discourse of masculinity brought to the university by managerialism? Broadly speaking, managerialism's discursive masculinity in the university is characterized by its cultural permission and its centrality in the institution through reward structures and professional standards, and through the marginalization and delegitimation of feminized work. These attitudes, practices, and principles permeate the university and the professional lives of women faculty. Specifically, three major effects can be identified. First, the tools of accountability used in the managerial university largely impact women faculty negatively. Second, the managerial university's need for professional production *and* for providing client services negatively affects women's professional value; that is, the cost of

service work is professionally insidious for women (Bird, Litt, and Wang 2004). And finally, the discursive masculinity that guides managerialism concentrates women in lower academic administration positions, creating a new form of "pink-collar ghettoization" in academic women's careers.[10] In the pink ghettos of the university, women faculty's advancement is limited.

The Tools of Managerialism

In the United States, the managerialism adopted by the university in recent decades has brought to the university "efficient" tools and technologies that have oriented faculty to particular forms of production and teaching performances. The managerial university's need to efficiently tally faculty productivity and systematically account for teaching and learning has led to the use of metrics and evaluation instruments that are more relevant to business production than education. These metrics and evaluations can only capture the tangible aspects of teaching—measures that cannot really verify the teacher's effect on student learning. Standard university course or teaching evaluations make instruction instrumental by converting the relational nature of instruction to hard quantitative norms. Ill-suited for assessing teaching, these instrumentally rational tools fit discursive masculinity and managerialism's emphasis on evidence-based decision-making, but they offer very little in the way of meaningful evidence for improving teaching quality. Although certainly a problem for both men and women faculty, but because women faculty teach more and academic women spend more time than academic men on the relational activities that impact student learning (the ancillary teaching tasks) (Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011; Schuster and Finkelstein 2006), women faculty are particularly disadvantaged by evaluation tools that do not collect and compile the complexities of teaching and the labor and time required to perform it effectively. The difficult, complex, and labor-intensive nature of teaching goes unrewarded in the economy of production and undervalued through its evaluative tools, and is, consequently, miscalculated in the metrics for promotion and professional advancement. Performed disproportionately by women and normalized for them by managerialism's discursive masculinity, teaching is perversely punitive for women faculty in the managerial university and can decelerate their professional advancement.

Managerialism's imposition of efficient and objective tools for assessing teaching disadvantages women faculty in yet another way. For decades, researchers have identified gender bias in course evaluations, linking poor ratings to gender-related personality traits, gender-based student expectations, and gender-related approaches to teaching (Anderson and Miller 1997; Basow 2000; Centra and Gaubatz 2000). The personally evaluative nature of student evaluations of teachers is shown to impact women differently (Kogan, Schoenfeld-Tacher, and Hellyer 2010), begging the question of these evaluations' true utility for women

faculty and their professional advancement. The heightened emphasis on these evaluations in faculty accountability, and merit evaluations in the managerial university, constitutes insidious gender bias. The more the managerial university values those tools that fail to fully capture academic women's labor and, instead, discredit it, the more that women faculty will be professionally victimized. Discursive masculinity's emphases on the rational, technical, and empiric exploit academic women's work in the managerial university (Davies and Petersen 2005). The managerial tools of faculty accountability support a system that advantages those who most execute the norms of the ideal academic professional—those whose production is easily measured by "objective" metrics.

The Pernicious Irony of Client Services

By implementing the more intense and robust discursive masculinity of business that emphasizes client services and the student-as-customer, the managerial university reinforces and narrows gender norms that prove difficult for women faculty (Davies and Thomas 2002). By characterizing the student as client or customer, the managerial university circulates a view of teaching that corresponds to an economy of production, and not an economy of relationships and giving that distinguishes teaching. Products purchased by customers and the services rendered to clients are material and empirical constructs that can be itemized and given value. Teaching and service in the production economy of the university are sold to customers and clients as commodities despite their indeterminate and variable nature. The subjective nature of teaching and the relational character of education—conditions that are inconsistent with efficient tangible production—make these commodities ill-suited for an economy of production (Martínez Alemán 2007). Yet, the managerial university must employ some efficient means to account for these commodities, regardless of their appropriateness and ability to accurately assess them. The inaccuracy and imprecision of assessing teaching and advising as customer service further devalues these professional tasks, which is work feminized in the managerial university and is disproportionately done by women faculty.

Although the managerial university publicly communicates the importance of concern for the student-as-customer, the disparity between the real value placed on research and scholarly production and the commodification of teaching and related services renders this paradigm ironic. In this managerial economy, actual "service" to students/customers has no production value and, consequently, there is little material incentive for faculty to engage in it and little professional reward for providing it. As a result, for those who do give this service and/or take on "institutional housekeeping" (Bird, Litt, and Wang 2004), professional merit and career advancement are compromised; time spent teaching and performing its related services in the managerial university is professional effort without corresponding professional currency. Arguably, faculty's

base salary compensates teaching, advising, and service, but given managerialism's privileging of productive processes both in the awarding of merit-based pay and the garnering of professional and institutional prestige, these client services do not factor into real opportunities for career and professional advancement for those who disproportionately perform it—namely, women faculty.

The Managerial University's New Pink Ghettos

As women continue to undertake the academic housekeeping and service work of the managerial institution, whether teaching, advising, or lower-level administrative tasks, they find their professional identities narrowed by the regulatory masculinist discourse of managerialism. In the managerial university, women faculty engage in professional work that is gender-appropriate and gender-normative in heightened ways, constituting a regime of inequality in the academic profession. As in all other discursively masculine organizations, these "inequality regimes" enact "interrelated practices, processes, actions, and meanings" that maintain gender inequality (Acker 2006, 443). "Homosociability," "fratriarchal loyalties," and "authoritarian and entrepreneurial masculinities" characterize the managerial university concerned with efficiency, production, and prestige (Prichard 1996).

The emphasis and need for efficiency in discursively masculine managerial institutions give rise to the hierarchical structures that segregate and marginalize women faculty. In the managerial university, power is concentrated in top-level managers/administrators who maintain the institutional focus on gender-biased efficient and productive processes in order to sustain and improve on institutional prestige and its competitive positioning in the marketplace (Scott and Hart 1991). As masculine organizations with steep professional hierarchies, managerial universities employ a military model of operation and culture that impedes women's progress (Acker 2006; Cress and Hart 2009; Valian 1998). By organizing women's work horizontally and men's work vertically (Newman 1995), the managerial university enacts its gendered discourse so that "advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity" are arranged in terms of gender and sex categories (Acker 1990, 146). Thus, the disparities of status and wages are regulated by managerialism's gendered discourse, as are gendered and sexualized meanings that determine other invisible gendered hierarchies (Newman 1995, 15–16). This form of "gender typing" (Britton 2000) has resulted in academic women's professional segregation and marginalization.

This segregation and marginalization has occurred in several ways in the managerial university. Women faculty's higher levels of service and advising (Cress and Hart 2009; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011), lower wages and higher levels of teaching (Meyers 2011; Schuster and Finkelstein 2006), slower rates of promotion, their under-representation in senior academic

leadership (AAC&U 2012; Deem 1998), and their concentration in lower levels of program and departmental administration (Danowitz and Agans 2010; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011) are attributable to discursive masculinity and its managerial practices.

In an organizational discourse that advantages production in systems of remuneration and prestige, it stands to reason that women's rates of promotion and tenure would be lower than men's and they would earn less than men, and the research data bear this out. Sarah Winslow's (2010) examination of gender inequality among academic faculty is one example. She found that women faculty spend a greater percentage of their workweek on teaching and a smaller percentage on research, despite Schuster and Finkelstein's (2006) earlier prognostication that women's higher teaching load may be disappearing. Paul Umbach's (2007) assessment of equity and faculty salary acknowledged that research productivity is positively related to faculty earnings, and that women faculty are likely to earn less than their male peers. Women's mean salaries continue to lag behind men's, with women making no more than 92 percent of their male peers' salaries across faculty rank (*Almanac of Higher Education* 2012). Women's negative salary differentials are typically $10,000 at the assistant and associate ranks, with the greatest differential—$20,100—at the full professor rank (ibid.). Women are still not as likely as men to be full professors (AAUP 2006; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011; Perna 2001), a career time frame in which typically gender-salient contexts like family formation cannot account for gender disparity in promotion (Wolfinger, Mason, and Goulden 2008). Women continue to experience a "gender penalty" in the promotion from associate to full professor (Wolfinger, Mason, and Goulden 2008). In universities, women faculty are 10 percent less likely to be full professors (Perna 2001); after all, women often dedicate more time to functions outside of the economy of production, thereby decreasing their earnings potential.[11] Time dedicated to teaching and its related tasks in the university's production economy is tantamount to counterfeit currency for professional promotion in the managerial university. Not surprisingly, it is in the research university—the most corporate academic institutional sector—that the salary gap between men and women full professors is the widest (AAUP 2011).

As a result of academic women's segregation and horizontally structured work in the managerial university, new pink ghettos have been established. Women are now concentrated in lower-level administrative positions that carry most of the advising and teaching-related service work and the work of departmental and programmatic accountability, and little (if any) institutional power (Berryman-Fink, LeMaster, and Nelson 2003). As universities adopted and enacted managerial principles and policies, lower-level administration has become a feminized sphere of service workers (Danowitz and Agans 2010). The managerial university's need for workers who can attend to the time-intensive commodified services of teaching, advising, and program and

curricular development, and the accordant discursive masculinity that has gender-typed this work as women's work, has created a lower-status, little-structural-power sector that is primarily occupied by women. This sector's low position in the university's gendered hierarchy is regulated by the discourse of masculinity and the tools and practices of managerialism, enabling such things as bullying behavior by presidents and provosts to regulate work norms and realize their compliance (Lester 2011b). This is the sector that engages mainly in relational work that is often invisible though essential to the institution's operation (Eveline 2004).

Craig Prichard and Rosemary Deem (1999, 324) recognized this development in the corporate colleges of England, noting that there is an "interdependent feminization" of work that is "subordinate" in the managerial university. Managerialism instituted the technologies and tools like auditing and strategic planning, and relegated these tasks to subordinate classes of workers. Women are "best-suited" for this work because, discursively, the managerial university relies upon masculinist ideals of gender-appropriateness in work and, ironically, the "skills and knowledges" exercised by women in teaching and service. These skills and knowledges receive "little or no recognition or reward" (339). Segregated and disadvantaged by the time constraints of the responsibilities of this sector, women faculty's careers risk stalling or leveling-off, the phenomenon referred to as the "ivory ceiling of service work" (Bain and Cummings 2000; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, and Agiomavritis 2011). Additionally, given the evidence that the bureaucratic demands and tasks of universities contribute to burnout among faculty (Crosmer 2009), it stands to reason that women faculty may be at greater risk of suffering professional burnout. It seems, then, that by constructing a pink ghetto of teaching and service activities populated predominantly by women faculty, the managerial university can defend against the further vertical progress of academic women. The slower and lower rates of women's promotion to full professorships and the low percentage of women presidents (26 percent) support this assertion (AAC&U 2012; AAUP 2006). Conspicuously, female presidents are significantly less likely than their male counterparts to be married or have children (72 versus 90 percent) (AAC&U 2012). Despite the increase of women in the academic profession during the late twentieth century, in universities today, roughly 72 percent of all full professors are men (*Almanac of Higher Education* 2011). It appears that in the university, many academic women have been under-professionalized.

Conclusions

Has the enhanced discourse of masculinity brought to the university by managerialism ostensibly undermined gender equity and exacerbated sexism in the United States? The narrow and increasingly segregated academic role that women are performing in the managerial university would seem to suggest

so. Ghettoization in teaching and service sectors proves disadvantageous for women's professional promotion and merit rewards. Professional autonomy is narrowed and undermined because of the university's pink ghettos' lower priority and subordinate rank within the discursive and structural hierarchy. Historically a source of "subtle discrimination" of women faculty and faculty of color (O'Meara 2002), the devaluing of teaching and service among faculty, and in particular as conditions for promotion and tenure, now appears heightened by the university's discursive masculinity and the implementation of managerial values and tools. It stands to reason that the discursively charged "market-based criteria" of Metcalfe and Slaughter's (2008) managed corporate university can only exacerbate gender inequity.

Almost two decades after Bensimon's (1995) call for a rejection of business values' implicit suggestion that masculinist discourse would undermine equity in the university, the university has done quite the opposite. In the United States, the university may be more sexist and gender inequitable than ever before for women faculty. By intensifying its discursive masculinity through its new managerial practices, the university is not positioned to develop more equitable policies for women faculty; in fact, the state of academic women's advancement and position in the university today suggests that gender discrimination and sexism in the academic profession have been deepened. Energized by managerial practices, it appears that discursive masculinity has rebooted sexism and gender inequity in the academic profession.

Ana M. Martínez Alemán is a professor and chair of the Educational Leadership and Higher Education Administration department at the Lynch School of Education of Boston College. She is the editor of Educational Policy *journal, coauthor of* Online Social Networking on Campus: Understanding What Matters in Student Culture *(2008), and coeditor of* Women in Higher Education: An Encyclopedia. *Her scholarship has appeared in the* Journal of Higher Education, Teachers College Record, Educational Theory, The Teacher Educator, Feminist Interpretations of John Dewey, Educational Researcher, *and* Review of Higher Education. *Her most recent book is titled* Accountability, Pragmatic Aims, and the American University *(2012), which explores our apprehension about accountability and its impact on the university's democratic imperatives. She can be reached at alemanan@bc.edu.*

Notes

1. In this analysis, I use *gender equity* as a term/construct that captures the multiple intersections of sociocultural inequities experienced by women faculty. The term holds *gender* as an inclusive category of feminist analysis in which the constructions of identities and their historic positions circulate. Women faculty may encounter racial and ethnic inequities; they may be targets of injustices derived from social and cultural

proscriptions of sexuality or physical ability, for example. As research bears out, women of color and lesbian faculty members are compound counter-normative identities in which sexism is salient (Bilimoria and Stewart 2009; Turner 2002). As used throughout this article, gender equity assumes that women's identities are historic and fluid, never separate or pure. Most importantly, it necessarily assumes that women's "difference" is varied and variable and that its regulation is multifaceted.

2. The Paycheck Fairness Act (S.3772), the Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act (H.R.3541), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (H.R.4970), and the Respect for Rights of Consciences Act (the Blount Amendment) (S.1813) are symptomatic of the nation's anti-feminist mood. Each of these legislative acts has brought anti-feminist claims to bear on our national discussion of rights; some have been successfully defeated, while others not.

3. Joan Acker (2006) conceptualizes inequality regimes as *intersectional*—that is, that class, gender, and racial inequality are interconnected and overlap in organizations.

4. For example, Judith Glazer-Raymo (1999, 2008) and Laura Perna (2001) document this.

5. Linda Krefting (2003, 269) notes that Susan Fiske and Peter Glick (1999) identified "ambivalent sexism" as the "underlying dynamic consistent with the evidence on gendered academic life and resistance to equity initiatives."

6. A correlate phenomenon occurs with faculty of color in the university, who are expected to perform diversity service as a condition of their discursive positions.

7. It is important to note that the academic profession has evolved from a focus on teaching and knowledge reproduction to one in which the most esteemed members are those whose work time is dedicated to knowledge production or research. This is a phenomenon of the middle-late twentieth century in US universities. Faculty research and scholarship as privileged work in the US research university coincides with the professionalization of the faculty, the rise of the sciences and large research institutions and systems, and the funding of research by the federal government and the private sector. See Ana Martínez Alemán (2012).

8. Blogs like FemaleScienceProfessor (http://science-professor.blogspot.com/), reassignedtime2.0 (http://reassignedtime.wordpress.com/about/), and bluelabcoats (http://bluelabcoats.wordpress.com/) frequently contain this narrative and the narratives of time constraints, work/life balance, and gender discrimination in academic disciplines.

9. William G. Tierney and Estela Mara Bensimon (1996, 117) argue that "cultural taxation is also exacted on faculty of color and GLBT faculty."

10. "Pink-collar ghetto" was first iterated by Karin Stallard, Barbara Ehrenreich, and Holly Sklar (1983) in *Poverty in the American Dream: Women and Children First.* The authors examined the "feminization of poverty" and the limits on women's advancement as workers.

11. Women faculty's salary discrepancy is attributed to a constellation of "observable characteristics," including rank, discipline, and institution type (Ginther 2006). The "AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators, 2006" identified women's salary gap as "a series of accumulated disadvantages," suggesting that sexism impacts women faculty's potential earnings throughout their careers.

References

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4 (2): 139–58.

———. 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations. *Gender & Society* 20 (4): 441–64.

Allan, Elizabeth J. 2003. "Constructing Women's Status: Policy Discourses in University Women's Commission Reports." *Harvard Educational Review* 73 (1): 44–72.

———, Suzanne P. Gordon, and Susan V. Iverson. 2006. "Rethinking Practices of Power: The Discursive Framing of Leadership in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*." *Review of Higher Education* 30 (1): 41–68.

Allen, Amy. 1999. *The Power of Feminist Theory: Domination, Resistance, Solidarity*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Almanac of Higher Education. 2011. "Percentage of Full-Time Faculty Members by Sex, Rank, and Racial and Ethnic group, Fall 2009." http://chronicle.com.proxy.bc.edu/article/Percentage-of-Faculty-Members/128518/.

———. 2012. "2012 Faculty Salary Survey." http://chronicle.com/article/faculty-salaries-data-2012/131431#id=144050.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 2006. "AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators, 2006." http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/research/geneq2006.

———. 2011. "The Annual Report in the Economic Status of the Profession, 2010–2011." http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/Z/ecstatreport10-11/TOC.htm.

American Associations of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). 2012. "The American College President 2012." http://www.aacu.org/aacu_news/aacunews12/june12/facts_figures.cfm.

Anderson, Donna M., Betsy L. Morgan, and Jennifer B. Wilson. 2002. "Perceptions of Family-Friendly Policies: University versus Corporate Employees." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 23 (1): 73–92.

Anderson, Eric. 2009. *Inclusive Masculinity: The Changing Nature of Masculinities*. New York: Routledge.

Anderson, Kristi, and Elizabeth D. Miller. 1997. "Gender and Student Evaluations of Teaching." *Political Science and Politics* 30 (2): 216–19.

Archer, Louise. 2008. "Younger Academics' Constructions of 'Authenticity,' 'Success' and Professional Identity." *Studies in Higher Education* 33 (4): 385–403.

Armenti, Carmen. 2004. "May Babies and Posttenure Babies: Maternal Decisions of Women Professors." *Review of Higher Education* 27 (2): 211–31.

Baez, Benjamin. 2000. "Race-related Service and Faculty of Color: Conceptualizing Critical Agency in Academe." *Higher Education* 39 (April): 363–91.

Bain, Olga, and William Cummings. 2000. "Academe's Glass Ceiling: Societal, Professional/Organizational, and Institutional Barriers to the Career Advancement of Academic Women." *Comparative Education Review* 44 (4): 493–514.

Basow, Susan A. 2000. "Best and Worst Professors: Gender Patterns in Students' Choices." *Sex Roles* 43 (5–6): 407–17.

Bauer, Dale M. 2002. "Academic Housework: Women's Studies and Second Shifting." In *Women's Studies on Its Own: A Next Wave Reader in Institutional Change*, edited by Robyn Wiegman, 245–57. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bell, Sandra, and Jane Gordon. 1999. "Scholarship—the New Dimension to Equity Issues for Academic Women." *Women's Studies International Forum* 22 (6): 645–58.

Bensimon, Estela Mara. 1995. "Total Quality Management in the Academy: A Rebellious Reading." *Harvard Educational Review* 65 (4): 593–611.

Berryman-Fink, Cynthia, Brenda J. LeMaster, and Kristi A. Nelson. 2003. "The Women's Leadership Program: A Case Study." *Liberal Education*. http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-wi03/le-wi03Perspective.cfm.

Bilimoria, Diana, and Abigail J. Stewart. 2009. "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell': The Academic Climate for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Faculty in Science and Engineering." *NWSA Journal* 21 (2): 85–103.

Bird, Sharon, Jacqueline Litt, and Yong Wang. 2004. "Creating Status of Women Reports: Institutional Housekeeping as 'Women's Work.'" *NWSA Journal* 16 (1): 194–206.

Bolman, Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal. 2003. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*, 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*, translated by Richard Nice. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Britton, Dana M. 2000. "The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization." *Gender & Society* 14 (3): 418–34.

Burnham, James. 1941. *The Managerial Revolution: What Is Happening in the World*. New York: John Day Company.

Burris, Beverly H. 1996. "Technocracy, Patriarchy and Management." In *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*, edited by David. L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn, 61–77. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Cameron, Elissa Z., Meeghan E. Gray, and Angela M. White. 2013. "Is Publication Rate an Equal Opportunity Metric?" *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 28 (1): 7–8.

Cartwright, Susan, and Andrew Gale. 1995. "Project Management: Different Gender, Different Culture? A Discussion on Gender and Organizational Culture." *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* 16 (4): 12–16.

Centra, John A., and Noreen B. Gaubatz. 2000. "Is There Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching?" *Journal of Higher Education* 71 (1): 17–33.

Charles, Maria, and David B. Grusky. 2005. *Occupational Ghettos: The Worldwide Segregation of Women and Men*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, Raewyn W. 1995. *Masculinities*. London: Polity Press.

———, and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society* 19 (6): 829–59.

Cress, Christine M., and Jeni Hart. 2009. "Playing Soccer on the Football Field: Persistence of Gender Inequities for Women Faculty." *Equity and Excellence in Education* 42 (4): 473–88.

Crosmer, Janie Lynn. 2009. "Professional Burnout among U.S. Full-time University Faculty: Implications for Worksite Health Promotion" (PhD diss., Texas Woman's University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, UMI no. AAT 3367226.

Danowitz, Mary Ann, and Lyndsay J. Agans. 2010. "Academic Career Patterns." In *Gender and Higher Education*, edited by Barbara J. Bank, 315–21. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Davies, Annette, and Robyn Thomas. 2002. "Managerialism and Accountability in Higher Education: The Gendered Nature of Restructuring and the Costs to Academic Service." *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 13 (2): 179–93.

Davies, Bronwyn, and Eva B. Petersen. 2005. "Intellectual Workers (Un)doing Neoliberal Discourse." *International Journal of Critical Psychology* 13: 32–54.

Dean, Diane R., Susan J. Bracken, Jennie K. Allen, and Claire Van Ummersen, eds. 2009. *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Deem, Rosemary. 1998. "New Managerialism and Higher Education: The Management of Performances and Cultures in Universities in the United Kingdom." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 8 (1): 47–70.

———, and Kevin J. Brehony. 2005. "Management as Ideology: The Case of New Managerialism in Higher Education." *Oxford Review of Education* 31 (2): 217–35.

Denhardt, Janet V., and Robert B. Denhardt. 2007. *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Drago, Robert W. 2007. *Striking a Balance: Work, Family, Life.* Boston: Dollars & Sense.

———, and Joan Williams. 2000. "A Half-Time Tenure Track Proposal." *Change* 32 (6): 46–51.

Enteman, Willard F. 1993. *Managerialism: The Emergence of a New Ideology.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Eveline, Joan. 2004. *Ivory Basement Leadership: Power and Invisibility in the Changing University.* Crawley, Western Australia: University of Western Australia Press.

Fiske, Susan T., and Peter Glick. 1999. "Ambivalence and Stereotypes Cause Sexual Harassment: A Theory with Implications for Organizational Change." *Journal of Social Issues* 51 (1): 97–115.

Frederickson, H. George. 1999. "Ethics and New Managerialism." *Public Administration and Management* 4 (2): 299–324.

Friedson, Elliott. 2001. *Professionalism, the Third Logic: On the Practice of Knowledge.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ginther, Donna K. 2006. "The Economics of Gender Differences in Employment Outcomes in Academia." In *Biological, Social, and Organizational Components of Success for Women in Academic Science and Engineering*, edited by Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering, 99–112. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Glazer-Raymo, Judith. 1999. *Shattering the Myths: Women in Academe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2008. *Unfinished Agendas: New and Continuing Gender Challenges in Higher Education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gould, Eric. 2003. *The University in a Corporate Culture.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Grumet, Madeline. 1988. *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Gumport, Patricia J. 1997. "Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives." *Higher Education* 39: 67–91.

Harris, Suzy. 2005. "Re-thinking Academic Identities in Neo-liberal Times." *Teaching in Higher Education* 10 (4): 421–33.

Jacobs, Jerry A., and Kathleen Gerson. 2004. *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender Inequality.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kogan, Lori R., Regina Schoenfeld-Tacher, and Peter W. Hellyer. 2010. "Student Evaluations of Teaching: Perceptions of Faculty Based on Gender, Position, and Rank." *Teaching in Higher Education* 15 (6): 623–36.

Krefting, Linda A. 2003. "Intertwined Discourse of Merit and Gender: Evidence from Academic Employment in the USA." *Gender, Work & Organization* 10 (2): 260–78.

Lester, Jaime. 2011a. "Acting on the Collegiate Stage: Managing Impressions in the Workplace." *Feminist Formations* 23 (1): 155–81.

———. 2011b. "Regulating Gender Performances: Power and Gender Norms in Faculty Work." *NASPA Journal about Women in Higher Education* 4 (2): 142–69.

Martínez Alemán, Ana M. 2007. "The Nature of the Gift: Accountability and the Professor–Student Relationship." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 39 (6): 574–91.

———. 2008. "Faculty Productivity and the Gender Question." In *Women in Academe: The Unfinished Agenda,* edited by Judith Glazer-Raymo, 196–225. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2012. *Accountability, Pragmatic Aims, and the American University.* New York: Routledge.

Mason, Mary Ann, and Marc Goulden. 2003. "Do Babies Matter? The Effect of Family Formation on the Lifelong Careers of Academic Men and Women." *Academe* 88 (6): 21–27.

Metcalfe, Amy Scott, and Sheila Slaughter. 2008. "The Differential Effects of Academic Capitalism on Women in the Academy." In *Women in Academe: The Unfinished Agenda,* edited by Judith Glazer-Raymo, 80–111. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Meyers, Laura. 2011. "Gender Pay Equity: How Predictors of Salary Vary by Gender and Primary Activity." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New Orleans, 9 April 2011.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hickes Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. 2011. "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work." *Academe Online.* http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2011/JF/feat/misr.htm.

Morley, Louise. 1999. *Organizing Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Neilsen, Helena S., Marianne Simonsen, and Mette Verner. 2004. "Does the Gap in Family-Friendly Policies Drive the Family Gap?" *Scandinavian Journal of Economic* 106 (4): 721–44.

Neumann, Anna. 2009. *Professing to Learn: Creating Tenured Lives and Careers in the American Research University.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Newman, Janet. 1995. "Gender and Cultural Change." In *Gender, Culture and Organizational Change: Putting Theory into Practice*, edited by Catherine Itzin and Janet Newman, 11–29. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2002. "Uncovering the Values in Faculty Evaluation of Service as Scholarship." *Review of Higher Education* 26 (1): 57–80.

Park, Shelley M. 1996. "Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count?" *Journal of Higher Education* 67 (1): 46–84.

Perna, Laura. 2001. "Sex and Race Differences in Faculty Tenure and Promotion." *Research in Higher Education* 42 (5): 541–67.

Porter, Stephen R. 2007. "A Closer Look at Faculty Service: What Affects Participation on Committees." *Journal of Higher Education* 78 (5): 523–41.

Prichard, Craig. 1996. "Managing Universities: Is It Men's Work?" In *Men as Managers, Managers as Men; Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*, edited by David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn, 227–38. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

———, and Rosemary Deem. 1999. "Wo-managing Further Education: Gender and the Construction of the Manager in the Corporate Colleges of England." *Gender and Education* 11 (3): 323–42.

Ropers-Huilman, Becky. 2000. "Aren't You Satisfied Yet? Women Faculty Members' Interpretations of Their Academic Work." *New Directions for Institutional Research* 2000 (105): 21–32.

Schuster, Jack H., and Martin J. Finkelstein. 2006. *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Scott, William G., and David K. Hart. 1991. "The Exhaustion of Managerialism." *Society* 28 (3): 39–48.

St. Pierre, Elizabeth A. 2000. "Poststructural Feminism in Education: An Overview." *Qualitative Studies in Education* 13(5): 477–515.

Stallard, Karin, Barbara Ehrenreich, and Holly Sklar. 1983. *Poverty in the American Dream: Women and Children First. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.*

Terosky, Aimee LaPointe, Tamsyn Phifer, and Anna Neumann. 2008. "Shattering Plexiglass: Continuing Challenges for Women Professors in Research Universities." In *Unfinished Agendas: New and Continuing Gender Challenges in Higher Education*, edited by Judith Glazer-Raymo, 52–79. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thompson, Jeffrey A., and J. Stuart Bunderson. 2007. "Work–Nonwork Conflict and the Phenomenology of Time: Beyond the Balance Metaphor." *Work and Occupations* 28 (1): 17–39.

Tierney, William G., and Estela Mara Bensimon. 1996. *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Trow, Martin. 2010. "Managerialism and the Academic Profession: The Case of England" (1994). In *Martin Trow: Twentieth-Century Higher Education—Elite to Mass to Universal*, edited by Michael Burrage, 269–98. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes. 2002. "Women of Color in Academe: Living with Multiple Marginality." *Journal of Higher Education* 73 (1): 74–93.

Umbach, Paul D. 2007. "Gender Equity in the Academic Labor Market: An Analysis of Academic Disciplines." *Research in Higher Education* 48 (2): 169–92.

Vaidhyanathan, Siva. 2012. "A Much Higher Education." *Slate*. http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2012/06/teresa_sullivan_reinstated_as_the_president_of_the_university_of_virginia_.html.

Valian, Virginia. 1998. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vavrus, Mary Douglas. 2010. "Unhitching from the 'Post' (of Postfeminism)." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 34 (3): 222–27.

Wajcman, Judy. 1998. *Managing Like a Man: Women and Men in Corporate Management.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ward, Kelly A., and Lisa Wolf-Wendel. 2012. *Academic Motherhood: How Faculty Manage Work and Family.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Washburn, Jennifer. 2005. *University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of Higher Education.* New York: Basic Books.

Welch, Anthony R. 1998. "The Cult of Efficiency in Education: Comparative Reflections on the Reality and the Rhetoric." *Comparative Education* 34 (2): 157–75.

Winslow, Sarah. 2010. "Gender Inequality and Time Allocations Among Academic Faculty." *Gender & Society* 24 (6): 769–93.

Wolfinger, Nicholas H., Mary Ann Mason, and Marc Goulden. 2008. "Problems in the Pipeline: Gender, Marriage, and Fertility in the Ivory Tower." *Journal of Higher Education* 79 (4): 388–405.