This article was downloaded by: *[University of Missouri Columbia]*
On: *17 December 2009*
Access details: *Access Details: [subscription number 906455867]*
Publisher *Routledge*
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Equity & Excellence in Education
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713770316

Playing Soccer on the Football Field: The Persistence of Gender Inequities for Women Faculty

Christine M. Cress [a]; Jeni Hart [b]
[a] Portland State University, [b] University of Missouri,

Online publication date: 11 November 2009

To cite this Article Cress, Christine M. and Hart, Jeni(2009) 'Playing Soccer on the Football Field: The Persistence of Gender Inequities for Women Faculty', Equity & Excellence in Education, 42: 4, 473 — 488
To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/10665680903284523
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665680903284523

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

EQUITY & EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, *42*(4), 473–488, 2009
Copyright © University of Massachusetts Amherst School of Education
ISSN: 1066-5684 print / 1547-3457 online
DOI: 10.1080/10665680903284523

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Playing Soccer on the Football Field: The Persistence of Gender Inequities for Women Faculty

Christine M. Cress
Portland State University

Jeni Hart
University of Missouri

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

Sports metaphor is employed as an epistemic tool for describing psychological, sociocultural, and organizational factors that contribute to enduring gender bias, inequalities, and discrimination faced by women faculty at colleges and universities. Quantitative and qualitative data from two comprehensive institutional campus climate studies show that women and men faculty experience their work lives differently. Based upon our analyses, we argue for restructuring the embedded normative values and processes that inform the academic playbook.

Despite the social and economic advances women have made over the last 20 years, academic women are still underrepresented in both tenured and administrative positions (Bain & Cummings, 2000; Conley, 2005; Hargens & Long, 2001; Pullmann, 2007; Valian, 1999; West & Curtis, 2006). Female faculty are more often housed in disciplines that have access to fewer resources (Bain & Cummings, 2000; Conley, 2005; Pullmann, 2007; Volk, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2001; West & Curtis, 2006), earn lower salaries (sometimes even within the same field) (Bellas, 1997; Curtis, 2005; Perna, 2001; Pullmann, 2007; Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005; West & Curtis, 2006), are employed in institutions that are considered "less prestigious" (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Pullmann, 2007; Valian, 1999; West & Curtis, 2006), and are more likely to report experiences of discrimination in their roles as scholars, teachers, and community members (Astin & Cress, 1998; Cress, Dinnerstein, Miller, & Hart, 2001; Cress & Hart, 2005).

While some progress has been made, for example, women at the assistant professor rank are nearing parity with men in many disciplines, and salary disparities are lessening (Pullmann, 2007; West & Curtis, 2006), the current rate of progress will not result in an equitable playing field for at least another 100 years (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Valian, 1999). Even existing inequities in salary, if apparently minor at face value, over the lifetime of one's career can result in hundreds of thousands of dollars (Reed et al., n.d.). Moreover, salary inequities, coupled with resource imbalances and

Address correspondence to Jeni Hart, University of Missouri—Columbia, College of Education, 202 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211. E-mail: hartjl@missouri.edu

discrimination, contribute to an academic environment that may negatively influence professional success for faculty and learning for students.

THE PROBLEM

Various justifications and rationalizations have been offered as to why gender inequities persist; for example, due to the time spent on family issues, women may be perceived as less serious about their careers and may have fewer publications and/or grant dollars (Fogg, 2003). West and Curtis (2006), on behalf of the American Association of University Professors, challenge the aforementioned reasons by describing a national picture of academe where gender matters in terms of how work life is experienced for faculty. These different experiences among women and men result in powerful inequities that continue to disadvantage women.

Individual institutional analyses need to investigate unfair hiring and promotion practices and unfair distribution of teaching, advising, and service workloads. The problem, however, is that too often colleges have attempted to address issues of inequity almost exclusively from a structural perspective (e.g., increasing the numbers of women in underrepresented academic disciplines [Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998]). When structural diversity is increased without consideration of other psychological and social dimensions of the campus climate, misunderstandings and interpersonal conflicts are likely to result (Hurtado et al., 1998; Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi, & Richards, 2004). The consequence is that opportunities to sustain change are compromised.

Existing research suggests that women faculty often face obstacles that make their work life qualitatively different from that of their male colleagues. For example, Astin, Antonio, Cress, and Astin (1997) and Glazer-Raymo (1999) found that women were clustered in institutions (e.g., community colleges, non-doctoral granting institutions) and disciplines (e.g., education, social work, nursing) that are perceived as "less prestigious," and therefore, they are perceived as less qualified and/or less serious about academic life. In addition, female faculty report undue burdens of service and informal advising that their male colleagues do not experience (Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004). These disparities may be further exacerbated for women of color and lesbian faculty as gender discrimination intersects with racial/ethnic and sexual orientation discrimination (Cress & Hart, 2005; Garcia, 2000; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Padilla, 1994; Turner, 2002).

Moreover, Ibarra (2001) argues that depending on ethnic, familial, and cultural upbringing, faculty differ in their ability and willingness to negotiate a higher education system that is primarily based on a hierarchical, white, Western model (Kolodny, 1998). Academic survival for these faculty (e.g., women, transgender, gay, lesbian, bisexual, faculty of color) is dependent upon individual agency (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) and their ability to derive empowerment from the margins of higher education (Solórzano, Villalpando, & Oseguera, 2005). Unfortunately, agency and empowerment are all too often stymied by traditional rules, regulations, and cultural and socialized norms of the profession (Hart, 2005). The result is that some women (e.g., women of color, lesbians, and women with disabilities) may have to endure multiple levels of oppression within the academy.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

ATHLETIC METAPHOR: A NEW INQUIRY LENS

In order to uncover embedded psychological, sociocultural, and organizational dynamics that reinforce and perpetuate discrimination, a new inquiry lens is needed to examine the explicit and implicit variations of the worlds in which male and female faculty operate. Certainly, the experiences of male faculty of color often more closely mirror those of women faculty than their white male counterparts (García, 2000; Hart & Cress, 2008; Stanley, 2007), but for the purpose of the current argument we are interested in the metaphorical academic playing field upon which female faculty devote their time and efforts. We suggest this playing field needs to be resurfaced.

Athletic metaphor language is often utilized within higher education institutions without a critical analysis of the organizational construct it supports (Johnson, 2009; Osei-Kofi, 2003). For example, faculty scholarship may be referred to as "an ability to play with the big boys." Student talent may be characterized as "being able to take the ball and run with it." Comments, such as, "I'm no fan of qualitative research" and "He's a good team player," are further instances of athletic colloquialisms embedded in academic dialogue as one negotiates the "turf" of academe.

The deconstruction of metaphors has been utilized by Freire (1973) as an epistemic tool to foster critical awareness in understanding cultural constructions. Freire's "culture circle" employed pictorial representations that were decoded by participants. The point was to help individuals see the possibility of previously taken-for-granted aspects of everyday life that could be transformed through their own agency (Tennant & Pogson, 1995).

Similarly, Deshler's (1990) "metaphor analysis" (p. 9) is a technique for reflecting on the constraints and contradictions that exist within organizational cultures. Although individuals alone can rarely transcend or eradicate historical and cultural situatedness, the unpacking of metaphors can identify embedded values and assumptions as well as implications for organized action in creating change. Moreover, Morgan (1997) suggests that metaphor can help explain varying aspects of organizational function and dysfunction.

To wit, we apply an athletic metaphor to a gender analysis of campus culture. We purport female faculty are playing soccer on the male-constructed and male-dominated football field. In the past, athletic analogies have been frequently used to describe male lives and experiences (Morphew, Wolf-Wendel, & Toma, 2003; Osei-Kofi, 2003). In fact, some researchers have argued that intercollegiate athletics represents a microcosm of American higher education (Johnson, 2009; Wolf-Wendel, Toma, & Morphew, 2001). By reclaiming a sports metaphor for women, we are hoping this imagery will provide fresh insight into faculty life and new ways to envision change.

Obviously, the sports parallel is not perfect. Men, as well as women, play soccer and women football teams exist; some women soccer players have even been recruited by college football coaches to function as place kickers (Hilliard, 2007). We argue, however, that gender inequities persist because both types of competition (whether real or perceived) are not equally valued.

For the sake of employing the athletic metaphor as a heuristic device, here are some other interesting contrasts in the nature of the two games. Soccer (a.k.a., futbol around most of the non-U.S. world), involves offensive and defensive teammates in simultaneous play to attempt to reach their goals. While individuals who score goals receive accolades, the emphasis is on the collaborative group process. In comparison, the American football game requires only half the team to play at one time, in either penetrating or defending the goal line. Linemen (sic.) are

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

critical to the team's success, but individuals who accrue the most yards and score the most points are elevated in status.

The analogy to higher education is striking. Ibarra (2001) contends that cultural binaries within colleges shape the value system in higher education and separate women from the dominant culture. "For example, masculine characteristics of achievement and objectivity are valued much more than cooperation, connectedness and subjectivity, qualities traditionally associated with women and minorities" (p. 119).

Since the criteria for academic success were established when most institutional cultures were homogeneous, most departments are reluctant to consider alternative forms of scholarship and teaching. The result, believes Seymour (1996), is that higher education suffers from "paradigm paralysis" and cultural entrenchment. In other words, higher education's ground rules designed by and created for men actively inhibit the psychological, social-cultural, and organizational achievement of women.

Affirmative action and other initiatives may have opened the academic arena to more women, but by focusing our metaphorical binoculars or field glasses, we see clearly that academe is not a level playing field because many women faculty are fundamentally not playing the same game. For example, female faculty are more likely to engage in collaborative research, scholarship, and teaching (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Dickens & Sagaria, 1997). Academe has been slow to value these approaches. Instead, scholarly rigor is usually measured by the number of individually produced publications (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

METHODS

The athletic metaphor is employed to focus on an analysis of psychological, sociocultural, and organizational factors that impact women faculty achievement. Institution-specific research by the authors and national data are blended to form a picture of female faculty work life and provide context for our argument.

Qualitative data were gathered from randomly selected faculty and existing campus faculty groups (e.g., the Association for Women Faculty, Faculty with Disabilities, Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Faculty) at a large public research university as part of a comprehensive campus climate study. The total number of participants ($N = 274$) were distributed relatively equally across academic ranks and represented membership in each of the university's 15 colleges and professional schools, including over 80 departments. Faculty of color and women faculty were purposefully over-sampled to fully investigate their experiences. Faculty were interviewed using a semi-structured protocol in either an individual interview or focus group setting and were asked to focus on three main areas: (a) factors at the university that have contributed to faculty success; (b) factors that have hindered or impeded faculty success; and (c) ideas, strategies, and recommendations for change with regard to policies and practices related to faculty work. Similarly, all faculty at an elite private women's college, referred to in this manuscript as "women's college," were invited to participate in an institution-wide climate study, and approximately one-third of the faculty agreed to participate ($N = 110$) in interviews and focus groups, using a protocol focusing on the same areas outlined above.

At each institution, the data were analyzed using an adaptation of the constant-comparative method. The method "involves comparing one segment of data with another to determine

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

similarities and differences... The overall object of the analysis is to seek patterns in the data" (Merriam, 1998, p. 18). Moving beyond basic description, the challenge was to construct categories or themes that capture some recurring pattern that cuts across "the preponderance" of the data (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 139). While some categories and themes from the interview protocol framed and organized the initial analyses, all existing and emerging themes from the data were checked and compared across academic field, rank, gender, race/ethnicity, focus group type, and discussion group type.

Quantitative data also were available from the research university as part of a national survey in which the institution participated. Specifically, data from the triennial National Faculty Survey (1998–99) from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) included 837 respondents from the research university. Data from the research university are analyzed and compared to other research universities in the U.S., a method for highlighting the national scope of institutional challenges related to inequitable academic playing fields for women faculty.

Qualitative quotations represent the voices of women on these campuses and support the inquiry lens we propose. To protect the confidentiality of participants, female faculty statements were not ascribed by institution, rank, discipline, race/ethnicity, ability status, or sexual orientation. Indeed, some participants were under such duress about potential repercussions for being associated with the study that some interviews were conducted in an undisclosed location, and faculty requested that no identifier labels be associated with their quotes. As such, the quotes are not attributed nor are they meant "to predict what may happen in the future necessarily, but to understand the nature of that setting—what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what's going on for them, [and] what their meanings are" (Patton, 1990, p. 1).

LIMITATIONS

Although the qualitative data from the two campus climate studies are not generalizable, using cases with maximum variation (Merriam, 1998) (a large public research university and a small private elite women's college) makes the inquiry potentially transferable to other campuses. The quantitative data comparisons provide further evidence for the utility of athletic metaphors as a strategy for understanding the nature of gender inequities on college campuses. Still, we recognize a research university and private women's college are not representative of the spectrum of higher education institutions and their attendant challenges.

A critical sociological analysis of the changes wrought by Title IX (Educational Amendments, 1972), such as women's competence, bodily strength, social networks, and possible impact on faculty work life certainly seem worth pursuing (Acosta & Carpenter, 2009). Moreover, an analysis of gender inclusive policies, such as "stop by the clock" for parental leave, would add heartily to our understanding of those elements of faculty culture that have transformed or resisted transformation. Unfortunately, each of these areas is beyond the scope of this particular inquiry. Instead, the intent is to uncover through metaphor the subtle and less tangible elements of faculty work life, such as attitudes, expectations, and stereotypes (i.e., psychological and social dimensions) that become manifested as organizational operating rules and norms, otherwise known as "playing the academic game."

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

RESEARCH FINDINGS

To elucidate the data, an organizational framework adapted from Wilber (1998) and athletic metaphor are embedded as a heuristic devise to compare and contrast three dimensions of academic work life for women faculty: (a) game strategy (psychological ways of knowing and being); (b) team expectations (sociocultural interactions); and (c) playing fields (organizational facilities, costs, and resources). We reemphasize that the interaction of individual beliefs and behaviors mutually shape institutional values and processes, so the differences are often not completely distinct. However, since "reality is not something objective or external to participants" (Tierney, 1987, p. 64), it is perfectly congruent to use faculty perceptions of values, behaviors, and processes to understand the nature of an organization's culture.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

Game Strategy: Psychological Ways of Knowing and Being

In academe, the value of knowledge and knowledge creation has traditionally been venerated through publication in highly esteemed research journals (Hart & Metcalfe, in press). Single authored articles and the scientific method of quantitative analysis have been deemed most prestigious. Moreover, the academic canon selected to shape young collegiate intellects has been dominated by the epistemological perspectives of upper-class, white males (Boxer, 1998; Park, 1996). Therein lays the challenge for women faculty and their ways of knowing. Women are more likely to work collaboratively, undertake qualitative investigations, and pursue studies related to gender and feminist issues (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Creamer, 1998; Dickens & Sagaria, 1997; Gilligan, 1982; Hart, 2006; Worell, 1994). Further, knowledge production is rewarded by promotion and tenure—a hierarchical, albeit often ambiguous process, where more senior faculty evaluate the merits of junior faculty. While the process tends to be stressful for all faculty, women report more difficulty achieving tenure, even when their level of productivity parallels that of male colleagues (DiNitto, Aguilar, Franklin, & Jordan, 1995; Fox, 2005; Leahey, 2006; Perna, 2005). Thus, the pursuits in which women faculty engage are often fundamentally different from those of men. Applying the athletic metaphor of game strategy to academe helps elucidate this gender difference.

Soccer is a game of constant motion. As players pass the ball to one another, the strategy ebbs and flows with nuance and subtle communication between teammates. Quickness of feet and minds are part of the numerous exchanges in organic cooperation where multiple ways of understanding the field are valued. In contrast, football consists of defined plays that are called by the quarterback, sideline coaches, or those who hover above in their climate-controlled box seats. These experts lead the direction for the team. Knowledge is hierarchical and directed. Competition consists mainly of pushing and shoving one another so that the single ball handler can progress.

These metaphorical differences are poignantly stated as lived experiences by women faculty:

> Men are linear thinkers and women think in matrices. Women can do all these different things at once and men are just down the line. It's not that one is really better than the other. But men's ways of operating get valued and validated by the institution.

> The system is so closed that basically if you want to survive you learn to play the boys' game. I beat the boys in some categories. It's real sad that the only way to make it through is to play a certain game.

Quantitative data from the research university's participation in the national faculty survey illuminate distinctions between how male and female faculty view the value of their scholarship by others. Only 70% of women faculty, as compared to 81% of male faculty, believe that their research is valued by their department. Similar to other research, faculty who undertake queer, ethnic, and racial scholarship are viewed as suspect, radical, and outside the norms of academic precedents (Anderson, 1996; Stanley, 2007). These data support Ibarra's (2001) concept of academe as a field of cultural binaries where success and achievement get redefined by race and gender.

> I was told explicitly by the chair that gender has no place in our core curriculum. First of all, it's not rigorous; second of all it's not something our students are interested in, and thirdly, it's not considered academic.
>
> It was a huge homophobia and misogyny related issue with a Women's Studies course and a lesbian book. The University's response was completely over-reactive—putting warning labels on courses to let students know whether or not there would be some objectionable material. Having your narrow perspective on the world challenged is what a university education is all about.

The survey data also indicated over 90% of male faculty at the research university believe gender equity exists on their campus. In contrast, only 57% of women faculty share this view. It should come as no surprise that female faculty are highly anxious about the outcome of the ultimate game strategy—the promotion and tenure process. Data from the research university indicate that 80% of women faculty are significantly stressed about the promotion and tenure experience.

> Research related to gender and feminism is dismissed by other faculty. This is another subtle way that prejudices emerge. When you present to your department and are attacked, rather than being provided with constructive criticism, it is not a warm and fuzzy feeling.

Team Expectations: Sociocultural Interactions

The idea of athletic competition and game playing is often explicit in the academy, as one female faculty noted:

> We've been forced into competition, and it's very gender specific. It comes from our dean and our vice dean, not only in terms of them as males but in terms of their own backgrounds and their fields. Competition is something that they value very strongly. Women see this and say, "Why bother playing the game? I'm never going to win. It's too much time and energy. My nature is collaborative."

Faculty spoke about how gendered norms within social contexts get replayed on the academic playing field:

> The linear, military model of competition and divide and conquer in the institution is a gender issue. If you take the values of caring and support and collaboration and equality and diversity, they are higher on the priority of female educators, and they're being squashed.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

> In a world where women do the primary caretaking, not only of children but of disabled family members, of elderly members of the family, that is not a personal choice. That choice is made within a social context and an economic context that has already laid out the terms of the game.

Women scholars tend to be more collaborative, viewing their colleagues as teammates rather than competitors (Dickens & Sagaria, 1997). Moreover, teaching and service, work too often described as "women's work," are devalued in the academy (Baez, 2000; Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004; Park, 1996). These experiences become further complicated for women faculty of color. Not only do these women face institutional sexism, but the additional bind of institutional racism further contributes to tokenism and insignificance in an academy guided by white, Western, male norms, cultures, and playing rules (Cooper & Stevens, 2002; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998).

Sports metaphor further illuminates social constructions of team expectations. Soccer players are penalized for overt aggression. Give a head butt to an opposing team member and you are certain to be ejected from the game. While players at large institutions may be recruited and offered scholarships, this is not the norm. Professional female soccer players do earn salaries, but with a few exceptions, generally no one expects to make much money, and players simply play for the love of the game.

In comparison, football players are rewarded for crashing into and tackling others. They attempt to stop one another in their tracks and receive large checkmarks on their helmets for doing so. Often, the players are highly recruited: college students are awarded full scholarships, and professionals negotiate for lucrative salaries.

Competition, team membership, and expectations for participation vary greatly in our metaphor and in academic departments. Multiple studies indicate that women are less likely to push hard in negotiations for salaries and other benefits, often carry heavier teaching and advising loads, and serve on more institutional and community committees than their male counterparts (Caplan, 1994; Park, 1996; Sonnert & Holton, 1995; Xie & Shauman, 1998). In other words, while women expect equal collaboration from their colleagues and expect to be offered fair and equitable salaries, along the way, they often end up with more courses, more students, more committees, and lower salaries.

> Women, but it also applies to gays and lesbians, and people of color, have an extra load because we're making up for the years of not being here, so to speak. Our invisibility or non-existence in the institution is having to be made up for by us. Adequate assessment of the real extended work load is critical.
>
> There are only a few males that will take on service, and they do horrible jobs, or they just won't do the work on the committees. It's endemic. They don't show up. They don't read the stuff. So, if you want the department to actually function, then you basically shoulder your load with the rest of the girls.

Moreover, demands from teaching and service often compete with time women faculty need to be productive scholars.

> The associate level is not protected at all. We can't get any work done because we're all doing service. We can't get any research done. In the annual review and the . . . [promotion and tenure] process, I just got clobbered. They didn't even care about all the service I'd been doing forever.

Sociocultural expectations also infuse faculty perceptions and approaches to teaching and learning. According to survey data, male faculty are significantly more likely to give extensive

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

lectures (64% vs. 38%). Women are more likely to incorporate readings on gender (31% vs. 13%) and racial/ethnic issues (30% vs. 13%). Certainly, some of the sociocultural differences can be accounted for by academic disciplines. Still, normative assumptions about knowledge creation, dissemination, and service to the institution shape impressions about colleagues' abilities to balance professional and work life. All too often, women faculty with children are viewed as less serious scholars (Boice, 2000; Drago, 2007).

> One of my colleagues in another department is experiencing discrimination because she has a colleague who thinks that faculty who have children do not have the same commitment to do scholarship as the women who chose not to have children.
> I was told by a senior faculty person . . . how dare I think that I was going to raise children and have this career.

The athletic metaphor further clarifies the paradigmatic sociocultural constrictions in which women operate. The locker room mentality of male domination can permeate interpersonal interactions, thus turning into forms of sexual harassment and discrimination (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Nearly half of all women faculty surveyed indicated that subtle discrimination was a source of stress:

> When I was being evaluated for my annual performance, I basically was told that men could be assertive but women couldn't. I was told that I was too assertive, and I was basically docked down on my annual performance because of that.
> I was discussing a research project when he looked at me and said, "I bet you're good in bed." At that point your entire career becomes genderized.

Certainly, not all men are harassers or promote inequities, and not all women are victims. Rather, it is the internalization of perspectives and unexamined beliefs and values that get incorporated into daily behaviors, decision making, and adherence to institution processes. As such, the organizational structures, governance, and policies that perpetuate inequities have to be evaluated or, using our athletic metaphor, the playing field needs to be returfed.

Playing Fields: Organizational Facilities, Costs, Resources, and Governance

> He puts money into helping his male colleagues all the time. There's like a boy's club that you are not going to be a part of. They always get together before the meetings and prearrange the votes. They prearrange what's going to happen with all the resources that he has. It's not a faculty decision, it's just a decision of this club.

Soccer fields are frequently utilized for golf, archery, outdoor volleyball, and other recreational activities (Carroll Indoor Sports Center, 2008; Irvine Chamber of Commerce Visitors Bureau, 2009), making them widely accessible. In contrast, football stadiums cost enormous amounts of money and take up huge plots of land even though they are used just six to eight days per year for intercollegiate football games (Dawson, 2002).

Often women faculty enter higher education institutions with the assumption that individuals will be treated equitably: Hard work will be rewarded, rules will be followed, and everyone will compete on the same playing field. The realities of academic life can come as a shock to women faculty.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

> I competed against 100 people to get this job; unfortunately, I was a little naïve. They promised me everything and haven't done it. I tend to be a little bit quiet. I thought maybe I'm just not outgoing enough. But a little over a year ago, a new male hire got a significantly different start up package than I did. He's more outgoing. He got a post doc to work in his lab immediately. He's had people in the department help him write papers already. People have gotten him money for research. Nobody made any kind of attempt like that for me.

At Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), like many institutions, women faculty have been paid less, given less laboratory space, provided with fewer research and teaching assistants, and given smaller returns on their grants (Kroener, 1995; MIT, 1999). Similarly, male faculty reported in our survey data that they are significantly more likely to have teaching assistants (30%) than are female faculty (19%). While deans and department chairs may not be making conscious decisions to discriminate, even small discrepancies in salaries and resources can significantly impact faculty careers.

> I have concerns about discretionary choices. We've had seven or eight people hired in the last few years. All the women have come in as assistant professors. The men came in as associates. I asked the dean "What's the standard for when there's an assistant or associate professor," and he said, "We don't have a standard." I thought, "Well, it looks like gender is the standard." They finally put into effect a standard that requires two years of teaching and a major publication. Neither of the men who were brought in as associate professors met that standard. That didn't seem to trouble anyone except the untenured women in my department. It wasn't remedied.

Even policies and procedures that appear to be "gender-neutral," such as soliciting an outside job offer in order to get a salary increase, can severely disadvantage women.

> I have not gone and looked for outside offers, and I don't want to play that game. Why waste my time and the ethics of dealing with whomever else I would be applying to. And all the people I would be asking to write letters. I think a lot of other women share the view that this is a very masculine strategy for achieving success. I think this strategy is a major source of demoralization for women.

In addition, work family policies and practices[1] are inconsistent at best in campuses throughout the U.S. (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). The result is female faculty often wait until after tenure to have children (Mason, Goulden, & Wolfinger, 2006), opt out of family care policies, and hide the fact that they have children (Drago, 2007). Further, when faculty have children, access to convenient childcare is difficult. Although technology costs and building construction increase, on-campus daycare facilities rarely exist for faculty (Drago & Colbeck, 2003; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

> I wanted to go on family leave, but the chair wanted his sabbatical, and this other faculty member should have his sabbatical, so I couldn't take any of it.

A common misconception is that women take more tenure delays (time added to the tenure clock to account for birth, recovery, and caring for a newborn) than male faculty. Our inquiry found on average only about 6% of faculty at the research university and the women's college took a tenure delay, and this number does not differ considerably by gender. Confirming research by Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004), such policies are underutilized, possibly because modifying one's tenure clock may be perceived by others as not committed to one's scholarly pursuits.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

Given that female faculty view and experience ways of academic play (i.e., ways of working), team membership, and application of rules differently from their male counterparts, what can be done? Below we apply a metaphorical "instant replay" to colleges and universities so that rule infractions can be appropriately penalized and game fairness insured for all.

CHEERLEADING FOR CHANGE: RECOMMENDATIONS

> You pick up the faculty newsletter, and it's got pictures of booby little cheerleaders in it. The alumni magazines are about football and sororities. There isn't much else happening other than football, so this is a great big tailgate party. The football players have a car, and the good-looking young blondes shepherd the recruits around campus. It's that kind of old style stuff. What would push them out of that? This is all working for them. This is functional for this part of the country and for these people.

Gender and football (real and metaphorical) stereotypes are deeply engrained in academic culture. This culture embraces the status quo by locking onto modes of operation that focus on resources, reputation, and expertise at the expense of inclusion and innovation (Seymour, 1996). Whenever there is resistance to change in a system, "it almost always arises from threats to traditional norms and ways of doing things" (Senge, 1990, p. 8).

Structural change must be accompanied by systemic thinking that addresses multiple contexts and paradigms. Such approaches use principles, such as collaboration, inclusiveness, and community involvement, that logically empower women and faculty of color (Iberra, 2001) and, by extension, other historically underrepresented faculty, as they often face similar challenges at work (Oldfield & Johnson, 2008). Equally important is the need to redefine the epistemology of faculty work (Braskamp & Wergin, 1998).

Four propositions are postulated below for equalizing the academic opportunities of female and male faculty. Along with gender, insight and sensitivity to additional dimensions of difference (such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, and class) are necessary considerations for success. The recommended strategies address structural as well as cultural realms and are particularly salient since "only when values and their effect on practice are revealed can change agents begin to transform values and modify practice" (O'Meara, 2002, p. 60). Rather than a "Go, fight, win" approach, the recommendations cheer loudly for a "Go, Collaborate, Win" strategy that can be applauded by everyone[2].

Game Strategy and Ways of Knowing

Search and tenure committees need to be educated about criteria for new research areas (e.g., feminist studies, race/ethnicity studies, sexuality studies, community-based and applied inquiry) and about multiple models for faculty success.Institutional leaders (including male and female senior faculty) must challenge committees to reward scholarship that is emergent and to support diverse ways of working. One way to do so would be to educate the promotion and tenure committees about the value of new and developing research methods and scholarship that are often considered "on the margins." Also, policies and practices could be established so that faculty may choose to allocate their time (and be rewarded accordingly) differently from the standard approach of 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. In creating a system that more

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

accurately reflects how time is spent, without compromising the scholarship of discovery and institutional mission, faculty may experience less conflict among their academic responsibilities and ultimately experience less stress.

Team Expectations—Sociocultural Interactions

An annual reporting process to compare faculty teaching and service responsibilities needs to be established. Inequities in responsibilities must be addressed, and department heads must pay particular attention to the burden of informal advising assumed by women faculty. New tracking processes create reliable and consistent data from which to make decisions about equalizing faculty workloads. It is a tangible way to understand "hidden" workloads and set the foundation for future data-driven planning. Many institutions count "significant" committees, such as promotion and tenure and curriculum but often do not include departmental tasks, such as advising, independent studies, student services roles (such as recruiting and admitting students), and other ad hoc committees. Collecting data about all service commitments will cast a more accurate light on how faculty work is allocated and ultimately rewarded.

Playing Fields—Organizational Resources

Compensatory release time and research support for faculty with extraordinary teaching and service responsibilities should be provided. Faculty who contribute disproportionately must be compensated. By rewarding service without compromising research, faculty may begin to see "institutional housekeeping" (Bird et al., 2004, p. 21) as a valued commodity that can be traded for time to focus on research and scholarly endeavors. Hart, Grogan, Litt, and Worthington (2009) argue that institutional service is embedded intellectual work that should be rewarded. For example, creating new diversity courses and advising McNair scholars[3] is intellectual service work most often performed by women faculty (Hart et al., 2009). Such service builds upon existing knowledge and creates new knowledge in ways that match the scholarly goals of most institutions.

Go, Collaborate, Win—New Game Tactics

A research fund that provides support for research and creative activity by faculty who assume heavy teaching and service responsibilities should be institutionalized. Like the teaching and service buy-outs described above, this recommendation provides an innovative opportunity to enhance scholarly productivity. Both recommendations shift the paradigm of service and teaching as burdens to more equitable aspects of the tripartite responsibilities of faculty.

CONCLUSION

No one wants to be standing on the sidelines or feel that they have been left out of the game. Our findings show that women faculty experience the institution quite differently from their male counterparts. To fully understand institutional impediments in faculty lives, we must consider how faculty construct and make meaning of their daily experiences. What may seem to be a

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

harmless jocular remark to one faculty member may feel like a comment of ridicule to another. If we fail to bring into consciousness the possibility of multiple interpretations of experience that comprise an organization, we replicate inequities and domination that inevitably get subsumed into the practices of our teaching, service, and research.

Further, as Wilber (1998) suggests, we can only leverage institutional change when we recognize the dynamic interdependence of individuals and organizations. To facilitate organizational transformation, we must recognize the metaphorical and real cultural realms in which faculty reside. Athletic metaphors are one heuristic device for understanding how academic fields affect faculty. The strategies offered here are adaptable to any organization that is genuinely committed to gender equity.

Obviously, we do not recommend that football fields become soccer fields nor that knowledge creation and dissemination is better in one metaphorical realm than the other, for by making such a recommendation, we only reinforce the divisiveness of the binaries that Ibarra (2001) challenges us to overcome. Instead, the rich array of talents and skills of faculty (as well as students) emerge when individuals are appreciated for their unique abilities and knowledge. Everyone is a valuable player of Team Academe. Perhaps the best solution is to create an entirely new field and a new game where all members of the faculty feel welcome. Until that time, truly leveling the playing field is an academic imperative.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

NOTES

1. Work family policies and practices are established to assist individuals who give birth, adopt, and/or care for children, as well as to assist those who are caring for older adults. Paid maternity or paternity leave and childcare for sick children are examples of work family policies and practices.
2. The idea of collaboration is not a gender exclusive idea, thus can be embraced by everyone. For example, the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines (all male-dominated among faculty ranks) rely on collaborative inquiry in order to advance new knowledge (Fox, 2008).
3. This is a federally funded program to prepare students who show potential but may be underprepared for graduate work. The program provides opportunities for scholarly pursuits with the support of mentors and is intended to increase the Ph.D. attainment among historically underrepresented groups.

REFERENCES

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2009). Thirty-seven years later, Title IX hasn't fixed it all. *Academe*, *95*(4), 22–24.

Anderson, G. (1996). The cultural politics of schools: Implications for leadership. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. W. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (Vol. 1, Part 2, pp. 947–966). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, *23*(4), 373–397.

Astin, H. S., Antonio, L. S., Cress, C. M., & Astin, A. W. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in the American professoriate, 1995–96*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (1998). *A national profile of women faculty in research universities*. Invitational Conference at Harvard University, Committee for Gender Equity, Cambridge, MA.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, *39*(3), 363–391.

Bain, O., & Cummings, W. (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.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic.

Bellas, M. L. (1997). Disciplinary differences in faculty salaries: Does gender bias play a role? *The Journal of Higher Education*, *68*(3), 299–321.

Bird, S., Litt, J., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as "women's work." *NWSA Journal*, *16*(1), 194–206.

Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members: Nihil nimus*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boxer, M. J. (1998). *When women ask the questions: Creating women's studies in America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Braskamp, L. A., & Wergin, J. F. (1998). Forming new social partnerships. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance* (pp. 62–91). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Caplan, P. J. (1994). *Lifting a ton of feathers: A woman's guide to surviving in the academic world*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Carroll Indoor Sports Center. (2008). Retrieved on August 4, 2009, from http://www.carrollcountyindoorsportscenter.com/

Conley, V. M. (2005). Career paths for women faculty: Evidence from NSOPF:99. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *130*, 25–39.

Cooper, J. E., & Stevens, D. D. (Eds.). (2002). *Tenure in the sacred grove: Issues and strategies for women and minority faculty*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Creamer, E. G. (1998). Assessing faculty publication productivity: Issues of equity. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, *26*(2). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Cress, C., Dinnerstein, M., Miller, N. J., & Hart, J. (2001). *The Millennium Project: Summary report*. Research University: Office of the President.

Cress, C., & Hart, J. (2005). The hue and cry of campus climate: Faculty of color and white faculty views on creating equitable environments. *To Improve the Academy*, *23*, 111–129.

Curtis, J. W. (2005). Inequities persist for women and non-tenure-track faculty. *Academe*, *91*(2), 20–98.

Dawson, J. D. (2002). Football stadium costs spiral: What is the final price? It depends on who you ask. *Houston Business Journal*. Retrieved on August 4, 2009, from http://www.bizjournals.com/houston/stories/2002/08/12/story1.html

Deshler, D. (1990). Metaphor analysis: Exorcising social ghosts. In J. Mezirow and associates (Eds.), *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood* (pp. 296–313). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dickens, C. S., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (1997). Feminists at work: Collaborative relationships among women faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(1), 79–101.

DiNitto, D., Aguilar, M. A., Franklin, C., & Jordan, C. (1995). Over the edge? Women and tenure in today's academic environment. *Affilia*, *10*(1), 255–279.

Drago, R. W. (2007). *Striking a balance: Work, family, life*. Boston: Dollars & Sense.

Drago, R., & Colbeck, C. (2003). *Final report from the mapping project: Exploring the terrain of U.S. colleges and universities for faculty and families*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved February 19, 2007, from http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/mappingproject.htm

Education Amendments of 1972. (1972). Title IX. Pub. L. No. 92–318 §901, 86 Stat. 373.

Fogg, P. (2003, June 13). Family time: Why some women quit their coveted tenure-track jobs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A10.

Fox, M. F. (2005). Gender, family characteristics, and publication productivity among scientists. *Social Studies of Science*, *35*(1), 131–150.

Fox, M. F. (2008). Institutional transformation and the advancement of women faculty: The case of academic science and engineering. *Higher Education*, *56*(1), 73–103.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

García, M. (2000). *Succeeding in an academic career: A guide for faculty of color*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hargens, L. L., & Long, J. S. (2001). Demographic inertia and women's representation among faculty in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(4), 494–517.

Hart, J. (2005). Activism among feminist academics: Professionalized activism and activist professionals. *Advancing Women in Leadership*. Retrieved June 7, 2005, from http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/social_justice1/Hart.html

Hart, J. (2006). Women and feminism in higher education scholarship: An analysis of three core journals. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(1), 40–61.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

Hart, J., & Cress, C. (2008). Are women faculty just "worrywarts?" Accounting for gender differences in self-reported stress. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *17*(1/2), 175–193.

Hart, J., Grogan, M., Litt, J., & Worthington, R. (2009). Institutional diversity work as intellectual work. In W. Brown-Glaude (Ed.), *Doing diversity in higher education: Faculty leaders share challenges and strategies* (pp. 61–80). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hart, J., & Metcalfe, A. S. (in press). Whose Web of Knowledge™ is it anyway? The impact of feminist articles on the field of higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*.

Hilliard, J. (2007, November 1). College's first woman football player loves the game. *The MetroWest Daily News*. Retrieved July 6, 2009, from http://www.metrowestdailynews.com/homepage/x1855981801

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(3), 279–302.

Ibarra, R. A. (2001). *Beyond affirmative action: Reframing the context of higher education*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Irvine Chamber of Commerce Visitors Bureau. (2009). USC facilities—Crawford Field. Retrieved August 4, 2009, from http://www.ucirvinesports.com/facilities/crawfield.html

Johnson, R. E. (2009). But can you hit? Where have you gone, Joe DiMaggio? *Academe*, *95*(4), 19–21.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness:" Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(4), 315–342.

Koerner, B. I. (1999, April 5). The boys' club persists: MIT acknowledges it has a female problem: Discrimination. *U.S. News & World Report*, *126*(13), 56.

Kolodny, A. (1998). *Failing the future: A dean looks at higher education in the twenty-first century*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Laden, B. V., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Job satisfaction among faculty of color in academe: Individual survivors or institutional transformers? In L. S. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff: No. 105. New directions for institutional research* (pp. 57–66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leahey, E. (2006). Gender differences in productivity: Research specialization as a missing link. *Gender & Society*, *20*(6), 754–780.

Mason, M. A., Goulden, M., & Wolfinger, N. H. (2006). Babies matter. In S. J. Bracken, J. K. Allen, & D. R. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 9–29). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (1999). *A study on the status of women faculty in science at MIT*. Retrieved January 27, 2000, from http://web.mit.edu/fnl/women/women.html

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morphew, C. C., Wolf-Wendel, L. E., & Toma, J. D. (2003). A response to the rejoinder. *Review of Higher Education*, *26*(4), 497–501.

Oldfield, K., & Johnson, R. G., III. (Eds.). (2008). *Resilience: Queer professors from the working class*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education*, *26*(1), 57–80.

Osei-Kofi, N. (2003). Whose "I/eye" counts? The reproduction of mythical narratives. *Review of Higher Education*, *26*(4), 487–496.

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, *23*(4), 24–27.

Park, S. M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service. Why shouldn't women's work count? *Journal of Higher Education*, *67*(1), 46–84.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Perna, L. W. (2001). Sex differences in faculty salaries: A cohort analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, *24*(3), 283–307.

Perna, L. W. (2005). Sex differences in faculty tenure and promotion: The contribution of family ties. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(3), 277–307.

Pullmann, O. (2007). Just the stats: Faculty gender gap still persists. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved on February 7, 2007, from http://www.diverseeducation.com/artman/publish/article_6136.shtml

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009

Reed, K. L., Bassford, T., Reyna, V., St. Germain, P., Shisslak, C., Wright, A., & Schwindt, L. (n.d.). *The GRACE Project*. Retrieved March 9, 2005, from http://www.medicine.arizona.edu/grace/discussion/grace_presentation_5–15.ppt

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Seymour, D. (1996). Introduction: Another paradigm, another plan. In D. Seymour and Associates (Eds.), *High-performing colleges: The Malcolm Baldridge national quality award as a framework for improving higher education, vol. 1: Theory and concepts* (pp. 72–106). Maryville, MO: Prescott.

Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, *75*(2), 133–160.

Solórzano, D., Villalpando, O., & Oseguera, L. (2005). Educational inequities and Latina/o undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *4*(3), 272–294.

Sonnert, G., & Holton, G. (1995). *Gender differences in science careers: The Project Access Study*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Stanley, C. A. (2007). When counter narratives meet master narratives in the journal editorial-review process. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(1), 14–24.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. C. (1984). *Introduction to qualitative research and methods: The search for meanings* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Tennant, M., & Pogson, P. (1995). *Learning and change in the adult years: A developmental perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W. G. (1987). Facts and constructs: Defining reality in higher education organizations. *Review of Higher Education*, *11*(1), 61–73.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996).*Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Toutkoushian, R. K., & Conley, V. M. (2005). Progress for women in academe, yet inequities persist: Evidence from NSOPF:99. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(1), 1–28.

Turner, C. S. V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(1), 74–93.

Valian, V. (1999). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Volk, C. S., Slaughter, S., & Thomas, S. L. (2001). Models of institutional resource allocation: Mission, market, and gender. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(4), 387–414.

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. E. (2004). Fear factor: How safe is it to make time for family? *Academe*, *90*(6), 28–31.

West, M. S., & Curtis, J. W. (2006). *AAUP faculty gender equity indicators 2006*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.

Wilber, K. (1998). *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*. New York: Random House.

Wolf-Wendel, L. E., Toma, J. D., & Morphew, C. C. (2001). There's no "I" in "team": Lessons learned from athletics to community building. *Review of Higher Education*, *24*(4), 369–396.

Wolf-Wendel, L., & Ward, K. (2006). Faculty work and family life. In S. J. Bracken, J. K. Allen, & D. R. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 51–72). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Worell, J. (1994). Feminist journals: Academic empowerment or professional liability. In S. M. Deats & L. T. Lenker (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy and politics* (pp. 207–216). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. A. (1998). Sex differences in research productivity: New evidence about an old puzzle. *American Sociological Review*, *63*(6), 847–870.

Christine M. Cress is department chair of Educational Leadership and Policy and professor of Postsecondary, Adult, and Continuing Education at Portland State University. Her research interests include the cognitive and cultural contexts of teaching and learning.

Jeni Hart is an associate professor of higher and continuing education in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri. Her research interests focus on women faculty, faculty activism, and campus climate issues.

Downloaded By: [University of Missouri Columbia] At: 19:08 17 December 2009