

Gender Equality in the Age of Academic Capitalism: Cassandra and Pollyanna Interpret University Restructuring

Myra Marx Ferree^{1,*} and Kathrin Zippel²

This paper explores the intersections of gender equality politics with liberal and neoliberal reform projects in universities. Ongoing struggles over governance of higher education provide the context to assess the challenges and opportunities gender equality advocates find in both academic capitalism and globalizing liberal modernity. Focusing on how diversity management and gender mainstreaming enter higher education systems, we use the claims raised about accountability and excellence in universities to highlight how seeking gender equality reforms neither simply co-opts feminist concerns to neoliberal projects, as Cassandra warns, nor supports an idealized form of global humanism, as Pollyanna hopes.

Feminists have long targeted universities as crucial sites for creating gender equality. Gender equality advocates have found unparalleled opportunities in recent years to enter the governance structures of modern higher education systems, but have also been deeply critical of the premises and overall direction of changes in academic governance (Currie, Thiele, and Harris 2002; Luke 2001; Riegraf et al. 2010). “Academic capitalism,” the shift toward managerial authority, accountability to economic productivity standards, and quantitative performance auditing, has introduced norms and values that disrupt those of the classic liberal–humanistic university, including its elitist professorial authority relations, “old boy” networks, and internalized disciplinary standards (Slaughter and Leslie 1999).

Advocates of the classic liberal university are struggling in many countries to resist the advances of the neoliberal university model. Such resistance is vulnerable to nostalgia, failing to recall that this classic model had to be massively reformed by feminists and other activists through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to take its present shape, which is still not one of gender equality. In

¹Alice H. Cook Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

²Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA

*mferree@ssc.wisc.edu

both models, the position of women and of feminist perspectives remains contested and in flux (Allan 2012; O'Connor 2014). We stress that both classic liberal and neoliberal university models are flawed: both largely reflect the interests of privileged populations, even though their meritocratic and governance principles differ.

On the one hand, many feminists are longstanding critics of how classic liberal academia is organized by hierarchies of nation and class and reproduces gendered, racialized, and other inequalities. As the new wave of academic capitalist transformation hits universities, some see opportunities to disrupt entrenched elites (DeWelde and Stepnick 2015). On the other hand, the newer, neoliberalized system's preference for marketability, scientism, competition, and quantification empowers managerial elites with little regard for faculty as self-determining professionals. Resistance to the less secure and less autonomous conditions of intellectual labor generated by this restructuring mobilizes feminist concerns for social solidarity and intellectual freedom (Tuchman 2009). Either system opens doors only to women who excel in its own biased terms (van den Brink and Benschop 2012).

We argue that struggles over the model for higher education in the twenty-first century are still very much in process, and resist the temptation to evaluate these changes as either a Pollyanna who sees only the opportunities they could offer or a Cassandra who assumes all the battles will be lost. We extend to universities the critical consideration paid to feminist engagement in governance in other institutional contexts, such as international development (Prügl and True 2014), criminal justice (Bumiller 2008), and trafficking (Bernstein 2010; Halley et al. 2006). Looking at the contested strategies of gender mainstreaming and diversity management as they have entered university reform politics, we pay particular attention to how Cassandra and Pollyanna understand and hope to affect neoliberal and classical liberal systems of assessing merit.

First, we address higher education as an institution that has always been shaped organizationally by contestation over its meaning and purposes. Universities are enormously complex organizations for producing and reproducing knowledge as a form of power, and are therefore important sites for struggle. We argue that universities are today being reshaped not by neoliberalism alone but also by the globalizing aspirations of classic political liberalism and the continuing critique of its gendered and racialized exclusions. We focus on gender equality claims raised in relation to these contested transformations.

Second, we consider how gender equality measures are brought into university governance systems. We look at two powerful and contested claims for inclusivity that intersect with liberal and neoliberal discourses: the Anglo-American "diversity management" model being globalized in the corporate sector and the "gender/diversity mainstreaming" approach the UN and EU have institutionalized in the state sector (Prügl 2011). The relevance and attractiveness of these models vary across different kinds of higher education systems, but both address academia only imperfectly. The research university

has an institutionally distinctive role in knowledge production and transfer and is not merely a state agency or a business operation, even when it is regulated and reformed as if it were.

Third, we ask how these corporate and state models for advancing equality shape and are shaped by specific discourses of merit in higher education. We highlight accountability and excellence as terms whose meritocratic meaning is particularly contested since they connect gender equality differently to the systems of value that prioritize liberalism (individualism, modernity, democracy, humanism) and neoliberalism (efficiency, productivity, managerialism, scientific–technological control). We conclude by emphasizing the strategic nature of the choices facing those who would de-gender universities and promote feminist knowledge production in the twenty-first century.

The History of Gender and University System Reforms

The classic liberal university is the social formation of higher education as a means for self-determined pursuit of knowledge and self-development of the capacities of the individual and “his” society (Wellmon 2015). Originally defined as exclusively male, the ideal of political liberalism was rooted in the aspirations of the bourgeoisie of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and formed the norms undergirding the organization of universities in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Liberal universities supported participatory self-government, freedom of discovery and expression, and professional autonomy for the tiny fraction of the population that had access to them. These originally elite values were only gradually expanded to broader populations (Ramirez and Boli 1987).

Stretching back into the eighteenth century, and remarkably energized in the twentieth, feminists have invested their energies into expanding educational opportunities for women and promoting women as researchers, scholars, and professors (e.g. Bailyn 2003; Rossi and Calderwood 1973). These struggles have been about including both gendered bodies and gendered expertise, critiquing elite men’s claims to abstract universal knowledge, and introducing knowledge about science, gender relations, and human experience that is grounded in alternative standpoints. Twentieth-century feminist claims on institutions of higher education have been successful in increasing the numbers of women students, establishing self-governed departments of gender and women’s studies, and challenging male definitions of importance and expertise in fields as diverse as literature and medicine (e.g. Evans 1997; Nicolette and Jacobs 2000). However, this progress has been uneven across the disciplines; in the United States and many other countries, philosophy, economics, and engineering lag well behind other fields (Institute of Medicine et al. 2007).

For feminists, universities are sites of struggle over knowledge, social value, and individual merit as well as the inclusion or exclusion of specific categories

of embodied individuals as students or workers. Feminists have never been unified in how much conformity to dominant standards was appropriate, but feminist resistance has also shifted over time as the aims and practices of universities in advanced economies have changed (Evans 1997). The social welfare states emerging after World War II used higher education systems to produce opportunities for working-class people (David 1991; Ramirez and Boli 1987). The “massified” university that resulted became a “minor transit camp for many displaced people” (Stanley 1997, 13) who were leaving small towns, colonial cities, and marginally bourgeois class positions, and whose diversity contributed to opening new spaces for critical knowledge in the 1960s. But as higher education became a means for economic and social mobility, it was also subjected to intensified application of capitalist norms of productivity and evaluation. Attention directed to ongoing changes in how universities work also raises questions about the position of feminist politics in relation to both the classic liberal and emerging neoliberal modes of knowledge production (Stanley 1997; Teelken and Deem 2013).

The current moment is one of intensified institutional transformation in the field of higher education (Deem 2007; Slaughter and Leslie 1999). Universities have always been simultaneously local, national, and global institutions, based on the movement of ideas as well as of students and researchers (Stichweh 2009). Moreover, higher education as a transnational cultural and economic field remains strongly structured at the national level, where state policy continues to play a significant role: for example, allowing tuition fees to rise in the United States and United Kingdom, or abolishing tuition fees entirely and providing stipends for students in Germany. Brenner, Peck, and Theodore (2010) argue that neoliberalism is best understood as a collection of nationally specific, importantly different projects with some common elements. Globalization, too, is a “modernizing” force that has been shaping these national institutional fields in different ways at least since the nineteenth century; its effects depend on how each nation fits into the contested transnational field of knowledge production and transfer (Ramirez and Christensen 2013).

This global field is characterized by the classical liberal principles of the world polity, which foreground the role of diffusion of ideas through mobilized NGOs, expanded technologies of communication, and freedom of research and expression, producing international norms of knowledge and rights (Ramirez and Tiplic 2014; Schofer and Meyer 2005). Both “science” and “women’s equality” are culturally powerful assets in this competitive but anti-hierarchical field of discourse, which might be called “the world is flat and getting flatter” (Friedman 2005). The globalizing extension of liberal ideals of human rights, civility, and self-governance is a disruptive force in the field of higher education, challenging the patriarchal and colonial authority relations actually embedded in nominally democratic institutions like faculty senates and peer evaluations and creating a “new normal” discourse of inclusivity

(Meyer et al. 1997; Ramirez, Soysal, and Shanihan 1997). As in other institutional spheres, the “common sense” of women’s inclusion has been won by extending liberal norms about rights and formal equality (DeWelde and Stepnick 2015; Wotipka and Ramirez 2008). Those who focus on these transformations tend to become Pollyannas who predict a continuing spread of inclusion and social equality.

Neoliberalism enters this field as a different kind of principle of internationalization, one in which naked competition and steep hierarchies are treated as forces for good in a deregulated “winner take all” system. The discourse imagining capitalism as a force for efficient production surely shapes higher education in the current era (Berman 2012), but neoliberalism as a concept is often used vaguely to encompass all forms of economic domination. Analytically, as Elizabeth Prügl argues, “Neoliberalism has become somewhat of a master variable, an explanatory hammer that fits all nails, used to account for a multiplicity of contemporary phenomena. . . . In order to make neoliberalism methodologically useful, it is necessary to transcend the reification of the concept, recall the indeterminate way in which doctrines circulate and are resisted, and [address] the process aspect of any class and governance project” (Prügl 2014, 616). Its advocates are no more specific, since “those who advance a neoliberal agenda do not defend neoliberalism qua neoliberalism. . . . Neoliberalism is in this respect rather like patriarchy: few openly speak its name” (Evans 2015, 41). When neoliberalism is invoked, it is in Cassandra’s terms of danger and warning.

Prügl (2014) suggests taking apart the portmanteau of neoliberalism to identify the specific processes at work in particular contexts. In academia, neoliberalism is especially associated with managerial governance and commercialization of knowledge, adapting corporate practices and ideologies to higher education (Deem 2007; Tuchman 2009). “Academic capitalism” as a concept acknowledges the managerial and cultural aspects of this shift for universities without framing neoliberalism as a totalizing ideology (Slaughter and Leslie 1999). Academic capitalism is recognized as internally differentiated and inconsistent; political decisions about how to compete and for what purposes remain nationally specific, despite the proliferation of international tools and discourses of legitimation (Sliwa and Johansson 2013; van den Brink and Benschop 2011).

It is equally important to specify what aspects of university systems still need reform. Opponents of academic capitalism often defend the classic liberal university as if it offered freedom of research and teaching, inclusive self-governance, and peer evaluations based on universal and idealized standards of merit (Newfield 2008). They would do well to remember the many feminist critiques of the exclusion of women and less privileged men from its precincts, the colonial expansion of higher education in the service of empire, and the unacknowledged positionality that infuses standards of supposedly value-free science. Hard struggles over the boundaries of political liberalism in the late

twentieth century were necessary to expand notions of citizenship, equal treatment, self-governance, and human rights to parts of the human race—especially but not exclusively female-bodied people—previously excluded in whole or in part from these norms. These struggles continue today in a changing context.

Rather than seeing academic capitalism as a bulldozer that flattens out the existing structures of liberal academia, we see academia as undergoing new, emotionally charged struggles in which faculty, students, and citizens at large all have different stakes. Recent feminist reform strategies in Europe and the United States have encouraged close scrutiny of universities as gendered organizations, including male-dominated peer decision-making processes and formal or informal quotas and benchmarks for inclusion in faculty positions (AAUW 2013; European Commission 2013; Institute of Medicine et al. 2007). Not only do current reforms take advantage of the neoliberal turn toward managerialism and performance monitoring, they are situated at the more privileged and professionalized end of a continuum of feminist change strategies, along with the proliferation of state feminisms, gender mainstreaming mandates, and the NGOized form of political mobilization in civil society (Alvarez 2009; Outshoorn and Kantola 2007; Thayer 2010). These feminist strategies are shaped in part by the same set of opportunities and incentives for using expertise, collecting comparative quantitative data on a global scale, and seeking international recognition to which university administrators are responding.

These incentives are not simply neoliberal. While global capitalism makes claims on the university as an institution, so does the political liberal project of modernity, expressed as faith in science, progress, and democracy and entangled in national histories and intersectional identities (Colyvas 2012; Timmermans and Epstein 2010). “Modernizing” the university can be a commitment furthered by the neocolonial enlightenment project of liberalism no less than by the newer neoliberal governance project called academic capitalism (Celerant 2009; Garforth and Kerr 2009). Over the whole twentieth century, some feminists have been aligned with the political liberal project of expanding political citizenship and asserting women’s human rights (Berkovitch 1999), yet there have always also been feminist critics of this approach. Sensitive to how white women from the Global North have used their relative privilege to tie their claims about gender equality to neocolonial modernization projects (e.g. Cornwall, Harrison, and Whitehead 2007), Cassandra-like critics of how gender equality movements may exacerbate other inequalities may even suggest “taking a break from feminism” and setting aspirations for gender inclusivity aside (Halley 2008).

Despite justified concerns with how feminist access to decision-making power will be used (Orloff and Schiff 2014), activists who have struggled for decades to achieve an impact on policies affecting women’s lives are cautiously optimistic. Activists point to the “window of opportunity” for substantive change they see opened by texts endorsing gender equality (Prügel

forthcoming). Women's participation in governance is seen as offering a chance to make rather than criticize policy, and mobilization at the grassroots is valued as a way to hold policy-makers accountable for giving more than lip service to intersectional gender equality (Daly 2005; Weldon 2002).

Two of the reform projects about which feminists have been most ambivalent across many specific sites are diversity management and gender/diversity mainstreaming (Prügl 2011). Both are being imported into universities by gender equality advocates in the name of "reform," but without much consideration of what would make them more useful or dangerous in the context of universities as knowledge production and transfer systems.

Diversity Management and Mainstreaming

In considering the ways gender equality advocacy in universities intersects with academic capitalism and globalization, we consider both diversity management premised on the rationale of positive effects on the "bottom line" (the well-known "business case," Elomäki 2015; Risberg and Söderberg 2008) and gender mainstreaming (Daly 2005; Prügl 2014). Both are highly managerial models of dealing with political demands for inclusion of "diversity." As projects legitimating the power of managers over human capital, both have affinities with the academic capitalist reform project (Elomäki 2015); in appealing to "objective knowledge" about gender and diversity, both also intersect with the politically liberal projects of enlightenment and global modernity (Bustelo, Ferguson, and Forest forthcoming; Wotipka and Ramirez 2008). Nonetheless, the two models are different in their relation to race and class as stratification principles and to private and public sector structures of accountability.

The first model, the "business case for diversity," emerged in management in the United States in the 1980s, supplanting a social justice rationale for gender and race inclusivity; in the ensuing decades, it has become globally familiar (Edelman, Fuller, and Mara-Drita 2001; Risberg and Söderberg 2008). It is embraced most fervently in the United Kingdom and United States, being firmly anchored in Anglo-American corporations and management schools (Hankivsky and Christoffersen 2011; Prügl and True 2014). Based on the claim that active diversity management is good for business profitability, the definition of diversity has expanded beyond race and gender to include religion, nationality, sexuality, and even personality "different from the norm" (Woodward 2012).

Although U.S. universities also express commitment to diversity strongly enough to defend it in court, what this means to them, what problems it is intended to solve, and how white women faculty members figure into it remain vague. On the one hand, white women have been the primary beneficiaries of corporate diversity management strategies (Dobbin 2009; Tomaskovic-Devey et al. 2006) and can readily think of ways to apply similar managerial tools to

further the project of gender equality in universities. On the other hand, race has been the controlling discourse in thinking about gender discrimination and exclusion in the United States. So in the U.S. higher education field, the term “inclusive excellence” works outward from the idea of race to encompass gender, disabilities, and other inequalities, challenging a narrowly drawn idea of merit as embodied by white male elites of the previous century (Williams, Berger, and McClendon 2005).

Diversity management is, however, a traveling concept, now widely used outside the United Kingdom and the United States and globally for science and academia. Woodward (2012) analyzes how diversity management has informed EU policy, associating it with identification of individuals as having “differences” of various kinds and with neoliberal versions of social policy that prioritize economic growth (see also Elomäki 2015). As universities are brought into the “diversity management business” (Hankivsky and Christoffersen 2011), they frame it as variety of backgrounds of students and researchers being “good for science,” not just for corporate decision-making (O’Connor 2014). The concept of diversity management has also widened as it traveled to rest on more than the business case of profitability, being applied in Nordic countries as a signal of corporate social responsibility (Meriläinen et al. 2009; Risberg and Söderberg 2008) and legitimating “gender empowerment” programs of transnational corporations like Levi-Strauss and Unilever (Prügl 2014).

The second model, gender mainstreaming, endorsed by the UN in 1995 and by the EU in 1997, has become widely embraced to legitimate change in the management practices of states. Gender mainstreaming frames the problem of inequality as a lack of attention to gender in the routines of policy-making, leading to outcomes that differentially privilege women and men. Like diversity management, mainstreaming is a managerial, top-down model of reforming institutional practices to be more inclusive (Daly 2005). Unlike diversity management, the mainstreaming model begins from gender as the conceptual core and takes the administrative state rather than corporate practices as its target. Although actual mainstreaming policies and projects are frequently critiqued for overly relying on categorical gender, essentializing gender differences, and framing women as deficient, they legitimate active state-led interventions toward a goal of gender equality (Daly 2005; Kunz forthcoming; Walby 2005).

Gender mainstreaming remains such a central strategy for feminists in the state (“femocrats”) in Europe that it has also been expanded to be more intersectional by being redefined—controversially—as “diversity mainstreaming” (Hankivsky and Christoffersen 2011; Prügl 2011). In this extended model, diversity is defined primarily by the specific list of potential discriminations that the EU directed be prohibited by its member states (Kantola and Nousiainen 2009). The potential that feminists see in gender/diversity mainstreaming, however, lies in its proactive engagement in making policy more inclusive of both women and men, responsive to less normative forms of gender and

sexuality, and accountable for producing equality rather than reproducing inequalities (Squires 2005). Rather than reacting to individual level acts of discrimination after the fact, gender/diversity mainstreaming is intended to identify structures and processes that can be changed to generate increases in overall equality of outcomes. Van den Brink and Benschop (2012) call such inequality-producing processes in universities a “seven-headed dragon” that has to be slain, but they consider the mainstreaming mandate as arming feminists in the field of higher education with state-approved weapons.

However, the diversity management/mainstreaming models have little to say about creating space for critical intersectional perspectives in teaching and research, since neither was constructed for academia as an institutional field where knowledge and power relate explicitly. The emphasis in both strategies is more on personnel than on content. As a result, both state and corporate management models emphasize efficient creation and use of human resources that will allow a national “knowledge economy” to maximize its standing in the world system. Interaction among students from diverse backgrounds, including international students, is considered useful, especially for privileged white male students, because these students can learn “cultural competences” that will help them function better in leadership roles in a diverse world (Williams, Berger, and McClendon 2005).

Human resource justifications for inclusivity demonstrate how the critical edge of reform has been blunted: the “outsider-within” challenge to the hierarchies of knowledge institutionalized in higher education systems should not just “add difference” in perspectives, locations, or needs to the required knowledge of managers, but move “away from an understanding of feminist knowledge as expertise towards gender as a critical analytics for disruption and contestation” (Kunz forthcoming). Feminist critics seek to unmake the different illusions of neutrality constructed in both the classical canons of merit and the new models of measurable productivity. The specifics of how gender equality is connected to the managerial discourses used in both models can be seen in universities’ efforts to address merit in terms of accountability and excellence.

Discourses of Accountability and Excellence

By discourses, we mean the logics that connect authority relations, material resources, and social legitimacy and give meaning to how agents interact with each other. Accountability is a principle for organizing power and authority; excellence is a discourse of knowledge and value; both are linked to the material world they help to organize. Our analysis focuses on how they inform each other and the gender equality politics of universities.

Accountability

One transformation strongly associated with academic capitalism is the shift of authority away from politicians and ministries of education, as well as from

self-governing networks of (primarily male) professors, to administrators and the exercise of authority through formalized and increasingly quantified metrics of productivity. The empowerment of a new, more permanent (but highly mobile) and more powerful class of university administrators is consistent with specific neoliberal strategies that delegate state responsibilities downward and spread surveillance and sanctioning authority among competing managers. Framed as freeing universities from the direct supervision and budgetary discipline of the state, academic capitalist reforms place more power in disembodied systems of accountability (“audits”) such as organizational rankings, quantified “assessment exercises” of faculty productivity, and increasing use of standardized tests of student performance to allocate funding. These governance tools shape the consciousness and thus the behavior of participants (Colyvas 2012; Prüg 2011; Subramaniam, Perrucci, and Whitlock 2012).

Weakening the authority of professors to define merit just as women are becoming better represented may be an instance where “women get a ticket to ride when the gray train has left the station” (Carter and Carter 1981). However, formalization of evaluation also creates greater transparency to outsiders for previously mystified ideas of professional merit. Chains of accountability flow upward through the growing layers of administration, each empowered bureaucratically by being entrusted with budgets from which incentives can be distributed. Even as women rise to new heights of formalized power in some university systems, administrators become accountable for their institutions’ success with respect to measures over which they personally have little if any say.

Research on students also suggests that academic capitalist restructuring has mixed implications for specific forms of inclusivity. National systems vary in how they use demands for productivity to improve or restrict access for students, and individual universities also work strategically to target new markets for students and gain market share in a context in which women already count as good students (Teelken and Deem 2013). As expansionist principles, liberal definitions of global progress and modernity overlap with academic capitalist interests in extracting profit transnationally. Together, they hold higher education administrators accountable for producing internationalization on their campuses as a sign of quality (Allemann-Ghionda 2014; Ramirez and Christensen 2013). Competition over credits and attraction of highly mobile, internationally diverse students to particular institutions also increase institutional accountability for teaching quality, even if this form of merit is often measured in superficial or misleading ways (Allemann-Ghionda 2014; Ramirez and Tiplic 2014).

Transparency to those outside the university—citizens, social movements, politicians—created in formalized measures of inclusion can also be used to hold insiders more accountable for counting the diversity of students and faculty and to support challenges to decision-makers’ claims about their relative merits. Discursively, gender equality advocates justify managers’ role in conducting quantified surveillance of research and teaching as steps toward becoming less subjective and less enmeshed in “old boys’ networks” (van den

Brink and Benschop 2012). The effort to acknowledge and remove personal biases and inconsistencies of judgment from evaluations offers at least the promise of more fairness than when professors were granted freedom to set standards on a case-by-case basis.

Excellence

Success in institutionalizing auditing as fair, neutral, and important has shifted the discourse of merit and meritocracy, so that these terms have lost their original critical edge and seem not the opposite but the precondition of equality (Celerant 2009; Ramirez and Tiplic 2014), and struggles are now fought over defining what excellence “really” is. Trust in the value of objective measurement works against the recognition of elite interests in educational systems as structures where power and privilege accumulate over time; today, the discourse of meritocracy is embraced by the privileged to justify their advantages (Khan and Jerolmack 2013). Audits are double-edged swords that are both essential to expose “illegitimate” biases among decision-makers and to more deeply institutionalize these biases’ more “legitimate” forms. Quantified merit helps to identify the presence of “glass ceilings” and “leaky pipelines,” and to promote greater uniformity in how rewards are allocated (Garforth and Kerr 2009; van den Brink and Benschop 2011). But to identify the misuse of an evaluative system is not to offer any critique of the ways universities organize their hierarchies overall.

By aligning their definitions of merit with those of higher level administrators who control organizational sanctions, gender mainstreaming projects and diversity managers use the corporate-like accountability structures emerging in academia to reward decision-makers for including more women or other “diverse” individuals in their departments or research projects (Allan 2012; O’Connor 2014). The institutionalization of auditing also accepts the premise that efficient competition requires structures for comparative evaluations of excellence (O’Connor and O’Hagan 2015). In addition, the quantified comparisons that audit cultures promote are part of the discourse of scientific progress in which “best practices” are identified, shared, and imitated globally. Gender equality advocates aim to increase gender sensitive policy-making by using ranking systems that include measures of how women fare (Garforth and Kerr 2009). The development of global indicators of gender equality has become a field of research in its own right, as knowledge of systematic gender disadvantage is translated into formalized indicators used for policy-making (Bose 2014). Universities both produce and employ such gender expertise as part of their educational mission.

Feminist critics draw attention to how the power to define excellence is political (Garforth and Kerr 2009; Husu and de Cheveigné 2010; Kahlert 2014; van der Vleuten and Verloo 2012). Increased auditing of performance according to quantified standards of productivity is criticized as biased against women, for example, by systematically missing many valuable aspects of work—such as teaching, mentoring, or serving on committees—where women may often

outperform men. Furthermore, these quantified metrics are being produced to an increasing degree by international corporate publication giants like ISI-Pearson and Thompson-Reuters, which are clearly committed to a bottom-line view of what constitutes valuable knowledge (Olds 2012). These for-profit ranking systems define the merit of universities, disciplines, and individual scholars, becoming institutionalized as the common sense of academic evaluation on which scholars are encouraged to rely rather than on the local, contextualized knowledge of their disciplines (Ramirez and Christensen 2013; Subramaniam, Perrucci, and Whitlock 2012).

The hegemonic narrative of merit measured as citation count (“impact”) is accepted by some gender equality advocates who strive to ensure that women’s work and gender scholarship receive their due credit, but it is also challenged in its own terms by research showing that men still control the definitions of what journals are important (Nielsen 2015), and that men’s and women’s citational networks do not overlap as much as the ideal of gender neutral science would suggest (van der Weijden and Calero-Medina 2014). In fact, the routine construction of academic expertise relies on gendered networks, mobilizes masculinity to claim the organizational power to define values, and evaluates competences in gendered terms (Azocar and Ferree 2015; Lamont 2009).

Since the indicators used define the concept being measured, these rankings drive restructuring; as organization scholars say, “what you measure is what you get” (Espeland and Sauder 2007). Measures of academic standing and productivity are not only gendered, but biased toward English-speakers and definitions of modernity and excellence held by politically dominant groups (Connell 2015). In this regard, academic capitalism accepts and strengthens—rather than challenges—the bias toward economic and political elites in the classic liberal global politics of knowledge at work in defining academic norms.

Germany provides two good examples of geopolitics dominating neoliberal norm definitions. In the process of unification, the external evaluators of former East German academics and departments defined ties to United States, United Kingdom, and West German researchers and their standards as those of “universal excellence” (Ferree and Young 1993). The same bite of external evaluation was felt two decades later by academics and universities in unified Germany, when the federal Excellence Initiative offered greatly enhanced funding to those judged to be outstanding “by international standards.” Many German professors and academic administrators were surprised to discover that in the twenty-first century, their inclusion of women and international researchers fell so notably short of these standards that it occasioned an unusual public censure from national leadership (the so-called Winnacker letter; Zippel, Ferree, and Zimmermann in press).

Projects Connecting Accountability and Excellence

The point of these examples is that increases in institutional similarity in higher education systems are not wholly attributable to academic capitalism

and its emphasis on competition and hierarchy. As world polity scholars point out, convergence arises as liberal discourses of modernity, innovation, and progress spread through transnational networks and drive reliance on both rights talk and scientific authority. Pollyanna may applaud the use of traditional/modern and backward/progressive as evaluative criteria for moral as well as economic development of national higher education systems, seeing gender equality advocacy gaining political leverage as a result. In university politics, gender equality advocates take advantage of global modernity as a political project defining excellence as global and diverse. Including more women and more international mobility are diversity-increasing projects that overlap to generate opportunities for some women (Zippel 2012).

But Cassandra notes that when gender equality advocates trust in systems of accountability they have to buy into merit-measuring projects that accumulate advantages for those who are already well positioned by virtue of class, race/ethnicity, nationality, language, age, or sexuality. A belief in science and numbers as fair and impartial correctives to human judgment is not in itself neoliberal, nor is it necessarily progressive; it is a form of governmentality anchored in the technologies of modern life. Academic capitalism uses these discourses of accountability to promote economic competitiveness, conduct market-based evaluations, and measure “productivity,” while gender equality advocacy turns to the same tools and overlapping discourses to measure gender empowerment and social inclusion.

In the past few decades, a multitude of national and international reports have reviewed the scientific knowledge about gender inequalities in academia with the intent of increasing the numbers of women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, collectively called STEM (Garforth and Kerr 2009; Sliwa and Johansson 2013). These reports mix neoliberal and classic liberal justifications. Equality in STEM is advocated in neoliberal terms as it aims to restructure the university to better fit the needs of the knowledge economy and use women’s human resources to the competitive advantage of their own countries or institutions (Berman 2012). But struggles over gender inclusion in STEM also deploy the liberal discourses of progress, science, and democratic governance. Organized advocacy groups have promoted biennial comparative data collection and comparative presentations at the EU level, using the authority of numbers to prioritize active support for women scholars (e.g. European Commission 2013).

Not only academic capitalism but a modernist faith in scientific evidence, including gender knowledge, intertwines with reliance on managerial tools. For example, at presentations, the actual goals and concrete objectives of gender mainstreaming are not openly debated but rather “introduced” to organizational members who need to be trained to be gender aware. Both trainers and those trained are held accountable for their success in making policy more gender-sensitive. Although gender training is often critiqued as too shallow and short term effectively to transform state institutions, it ratifies the existence

of gender expertise and gender experts as legitimate agents of knowledge production and transfer (Bustelo, Ferguson, and Forest forthcoming). Framing gender equality as both politically progressive and economic productive thus harnesses the horsepower of both enlightened modernity and neoliberal efficiency to drive demands for managerial accountability. With no obvious way to calculate their bottom line, university systems combine moral and economic accountability as signals of their own merit in international terms.

As Pollyanna notes, legal demands and directives calling for positive action to increase gender equality—whether or not enforced—offer feminists discursive resources to contest exclusionary definitions of merit. Gender equality advocates promote studies of evaluation biases and encourage awareness of these results among administrators in funding agencies, universities, journals, and disciplinary associations (van den Brink and Benschop 2011). Importantly, the sharing of information essential to create ranking systems is also a mechanism that diffuses feminist strategies across campuses and countries. Globalized systems of accounting for inequalities give activists tools to “name and shame” administrators who have failed to learn from the best practices of their competitors.

But as Cassandra points out, the discourse of accountability also steadily increases expectations for reporting, multiplying the time spent on testing and paperwork requirements by faculty and administrators, as well as escalating demands for productivity (however measured). Since the overall time demands for both productivity and accountability keep rising in this positive feedback loop, disproportionate disadvantages accrue to academics with familial responsibilities or physical limitations on their work time. Gender equality advocates are deeply critical of the impossibility of achieving “work-life” balance that emerges under this system (Ecklund, Lincoln, and Tansey 2012). To the extent that gender equality is discursively limited to meaning “equal opportunities for women” in a system that structurally demands continual production of competitive inequality, however, the solutions will focus on measures offering special accommodations to caregivers, or, as they are called, “family-friendliness” (Lipinsky and Samjeske 2012). As increasingly pointed out, the concept of the family-friendly organization providing “balance” as a benefit has come to dominate the feminist demand for gender inclusive sharing of care (e.g. Jenson 2008).

In sum, gender mainstreaming and diversity management strategies accord with the administratively heavy structure of contemporary universities and make university managers attentive to demonstrating their proactive steps and measurable progress including women and other “others.” For the most part, these equality strategies rely on procedures implemented from the top down, presume accountability upward (whether to university administrators or funding agencies), specify quantifiable metrics of success, and use competition to rise in the rankings as a primary motivator of organizational effort. These strategies widen the definition of excellence to include more diversity of gender and nation, but rarely speak critically about hierarchies of knowers or the place of universities in a global knowledge order.

Feminist challenges to these competitive principles contest both the insatiable demands for productivity by neoliberalized organizations and the modernist construction of academic excellence in terms of hierarchies of knowledge. While gender expertise and gender studies have gained some standing in the field of higher education, their legitimacy is precarious and often tied to their contributions to managerial imperatives for increasing diversity (DeWelde and Stepnick 2015; Garforth and Kerr 2009). Even when some gender equality advocates are reflexively self-critical about their instrumental use of state mainstreaming mandates and the business case to increase pressure on universities, most simply push hard to apply the dominant metrics more evenhandedly. Giving attention to the power relations in the prevailing definitions of excellence and accountability remains a radical position.

Conclusions and Implications for Research

The transformations universities are undergoing in the twenty-first century reflect the growing power of variously neoliberal structures and ideologies. But they are also responding to the continuing global force exerted by classical liberal discourses of pluralism, inclusivity, improved knowledge, and modernization. The terms of argument offered by gender equality activists overlap with liberal claims for equal treatment and scientific enlightenment, even though they also share neoliberalism's stress on competition as promoting efficient use of all human resources and reliance on active management of organizations by means of quantified performance metrics.

We have argued that, at least in higher education reform projects, gender equality advocacy works in conspicuous tension with old and new principles of merit in universities. At one end is the liberal world polity, its infrastructure of transnational NGOs and epistemic networks organized around human rights, scientific progress, and democratic participation. In this classic model, the humanities hold pride of place and creating the enlightened citizen of the world polity is the ideal. At the other end, we find the neoliberal global economy, its infrastructure of corporate power, managerial responsibility for the bottom line, and privatized governance. The emerging neoliberal model of the university is academic capitalism: an expanding managerial class, accelerating demands for quantifiably measured productivity, and instrumental use of research to serve national economic interests. The "useful" sciences have priority, and competition is treated as the universal motivator. The knowledge worker in the global economy is the vision of what universities should produce.

Since these two struggling giants are at best flawed allies, gender equality advocates are constrained to bob and weave in looking to take advantages of the openings either can create. Universities are and have always been places of privilege, and in the contested restructuring of their systems of merit and accountability, opportunities emerge to question the old as well as the new. We do not offer a universal strategy for navigating this tension; we believe such to

be impossible in principle. Instead, we offer specific caveats about feminist thinking about engagement for advancing gender equality in the specific sites where this struggle is being waged.

For a Pollyanna, an analyst inclined to be optimistic about all the progress that has been achieved, transnational successes in making gender mainstreaming a legal mandate and the business case for diversity a corporate norm are applauded as powerful tools for gender equality advocates in universities around the world. Both mainstreaming and diversity management projects are being adapted to higher education systems in order to challenge biases in systems of evaluating merit; devise new standards for inclusion; audit and rank performance in meeting these norms; and name and shame those who fail to embrace “best practices.” The embrace of managerialism shared by these two projects gives them particular leverage in academic systems, where growth in the number and authority of academic administrators facilitates top-down strategies of reform. Getting closer to the seat of authority in the academic system seems to promise gender equality advocates the opportunity to remake decision processes, and thus to transform “how professors think” (Lamont 2009) and what universities consider excellent. While even Pollyanna is not foolish enough to think that this process will be easy, she sees progress as already underway.

For a Cassandra, inclined to see defeat in the offing when feminists confront capitalism of any sort, the current encounters of gender equality advocates with academic governance systems promise more dangers than gains. As Cassandra sees it, by embracing the managerial imperatives of the present era, gender mainstreaming and diversity management advocates can hardly hope to do anything more than collaborate with the cruelties of constant evaluation, accelerating demands for productivity, and measures of performance that are too far removed from the actual practices of academic work to be valid. Cassandra stresses the failings of the mainstreaming model and the business case in practice: top-down rules engender bottom-up evasions, and even real appreciation for difference falls short of addressing structural inequalities. Cassandra not only expects academic struggles for inclusion to fail, she views the demands for inclusion, diversity, and positive action placed on higher education authorities as a smokescreen concealing the deeper structures of power, which she does not expect to yield to rational argument. Rather than biases to be corrected, she sees obdurate interests; the distance traveled is less salient than the shape-shifting obstacles emerging ahead.

Our argument is for more attention to the particularities by which goals are set and specific programs are attempted. As theorists of intersectionality have stressed, “women’s” interests are diverse. Knowing what other agendas are in play when feminist voices are raised can help distinguish who specifically will benefit and who pay the price of particular gender equality strategies.

Contrary to the Cassandras, who see neoliberalism everywhere successfully “seducing” and co-opting feminism for its own ends, we are more confident in

the actual diversity of feminists and feminist knowledge production processes. Feminism has never been limited to the liberal version that is the mainstream in the United States, and self-reflective alliances with other critics of neocolonial modernities and neoliberal economies have enriched the perspectives of many white, Western, privileged feminists. Academia as an institution encourages self-reflection, ongoing critique, and an international orientation, all of which serve to support challenges to the common sense of the status quo. There have also always been self-described feminists for whom individual achievement and women's representation in the corridors of power have been priorities; they are not a new manifestation of neoliberal co-optation. Such "market feminism" may thrive in the relations of governance that off-load authority to civil society, mobilize transnational networks of gender experts, and promote professionalization of political activism (Kantola and Squires 2012), but its origins are as old as capitalism itself.

Unlike Pollyannas, we view both gender mainstreaming mandates and the business case for diversity skeptically as tools for transforming the stratification systems of higher education. Optimism about their ability to bring about longer-term change would have to rest on their offering a fundamental challenge to the universities' ways of assessing merit and effectively holding managers accountable for inclusion, which seems unlikely, as universities have neither the democratic legitimacy needs of states nor the bottom line concerns of corporations to motivate compliance. Universities are instead characterized by ongoing struggles over knowledge and expertise waged among disciplines, formal institutions, and individual researchers. Transforming universities is a project that lays bare the broader contestation over how power-knowledge is to be organized, and feminist successes will demand more than simply adding more women and stirring.

Academic capitalism is fundamentally academic, in that it is about knowledge, discovery, and excellence; it is also capitalist in its evaluations of what kinds of knowledge are valued, what conditions for discovery are created, and what processes are used for identifying and rewarding excellence. The dominance of neoliberalism as an ideology may be replacing classical liberalism as a political justification for how universities operate, but feminism remains precariously positioned as a critic of both.

Thus, if Pollyanna is confident of her ability to co-opt academic capitalist transformations and Cassandra is equally sure of feminist vulnerability to being co-opted by academia, the reality may be more complex and internationally variable. Systems of higher education differ greatly in the specific forms restructuring takes, and pragmatic observers suggest that rather than being dismissed outright, specific partnerships should be examined for how they "bring together the legacies of neoliberalism and feminism, with different results in different contexts, enabling co-optations as much as new openings" (Kunz forthcoming). This to us implies two specific strategic considerations about higher education reform.

First, recognizing that there are multiple discourses being mobilized and paying careful attention to the similarities and differences in the paths universities are taking can offer a better understanding of academic capitalism in general (Ramirez and Christensen 2013). This attention to the specifics of how liberalism, neoliberalism, and feminism become actual reform values and practices will be crucial for understanding what gender equality advocates do accomplish, what new forms of intersectional conflict are emerging, and what roles universities in different parts of the world will play in the new regimes of stratification being formed today.

Second, as Fotaki (2013, 1271) argues, universities are unlike either state bureaucracies or private businesses in that they “are important sites where knowledge is defined and reproduced, and it is also here that the contestation of meanings and significations of the symbolic order comprising knowledge systems is manifest.” Academia is an unusually inward-looking, self-reflexive, and socially powerful site of contestation over the meanings and values of societies’ institutions, and struggles over what kind of knowledge matters are played out especially openly and extensively in its precincts. Thus, it may be most useful for Cassandra and Pollyanna to sit down together and reflect on the different perspectives they bring to gender transformation. This would retrieve gender knowledge from the realm of “expertise” and return it more explicitly to the domain of politics, reducing the effects of technological managerial expectations and reviving feminists’ propensity for disruption and provocation.

Acknowledgements

For their critical and helpful comments and suggestions, the authors wish to thank especially our other TARGET team members Susanne Baer, Paula-Irene Villa, and Karin Zimmermann, as well as participants in the TARGET workshops in Munich (2012) and Madison (2013): Jutta Allmendinger, Shelley Correll, Elizabeth Covington, Suzanne de Cheveigné, Frank Dobbin, Mary Frank Fox, Stefan Fuchs, Sabine Hark, Liisa Husu, Heike Kahlert, Laura Kramer, Inken Lind, Anke Lipinsky, Eva Reichwein, Jennifer Sheridan, Dagmar Simon, Gerhard Sonnert, Abigail Stewart, Gaye Tuchman, Marieke van den Brinck, Maya Widmer, Alison Woodward, and Angela Wroblewski. Many thanks also to Anna van der Vleuten, Mieke Verloo, Laura Frader, Monika Gaughan, Julian Hamann, Katrina Uhly, and the audiences at the Revisioning Gender conference in Stockholm, the Sociological Association Annual Meeting, the Gender and Women’s Studies Program at UW-Madison and the Center for European Studies at Harvard University.

Funding

This work was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation TRANS-COOP grant “TARGET: Transatlantic Applied Research on Gender

Equity Training: Restructuring of Modern Knowledge Economies and Management” (2010–2013); Northeastern University and the Center for German and European Studies; and European Union Center of Excellence at the University of Wisconsin.

Notes

Myra Marx Ferree is the Alice H. Cook Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, where she is also a member of the Gender and Women’s Studies Department. She is the author of *Varieties of Feminism: German Gender Politics in Global Perspective* (Stanford University Press, 2012). Other recent books include: *Gender: Ideas, Interactions and Institutions* (co-authored with Lisa Wade, Norton 2014), *Gender, Violence and Human Security: Feminist Perspectives* (co-edited with Aili Tripp and Christina Ewig, NYU Press, 2013), and *Global Feminisms: Transnational Women’s Organizing, Activism, and Human Rights* (co-edited with Aili Mari Tripp, NYU Press, 2006).

Kathrin Zippel is an associate professor of sociology at Northeastern University in Boston and local Affiliate and Co-organizer of Seminar on Social Exclusion and Inclusion at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies at Harvard University. She is the author of *The Politics of Sexual Harassment: A Comparative Study of the United States, the European Union and Germany* (Cambridge University Press, 2006) that received the APSA Victoria Schuck Award for the best book on women and politics. Her current work explores gender, mobility, and globalization of science. Recent publications include “How Gender Neutral are State Policies on Science and International Mobility of Academics?” in *Sociologica* (2011).

References

- American Association of University Women (AAUW). 2013. *Science, technology, engineering & math (STEM): quick facts*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women.
- Allan, Elizabeth J. 2012. *Policy discourses, gender, and education: Constructing women’s status*. London: Routledge.
- Allemann-Ghionda, Cristina. 2014. Internationalization and diversity in higher education: on the change of discourse and practice. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 60 (5): 668–80.
- Alvarez, Sonia E. 2009. Beyond NGO-ization? Reflections from Latin America. *Development*, 52 (2): 175–84.
- Azocar, Maria J., and Myra Marx Ferree. 2015. Gender expertise. *Gender & Society*, doi:10.1177/0891243215602104.
- Bailyn, Lotte. 2003. Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10 (2): 137–53.
- Berkovitch, Nitza. 1999. *From motherhood to citizenship: Women’s rights and international organizations*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Berman, Elizabeth Popp. 2012. *Creating the market university: How academic science became an economic engine*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Bernstein, Elizabeth. 2010. Militarized humanitarianism meets carceral feminism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 36 (1): 45–71.
- Bose, Christine E. 2014. *Patterns of global gender inequalities*. San Francisco: SWS Feminist Lecture. August 19.
- Brenner, Neil, Jamie Peck, and Nik Theodore. 2010. Variegated neoliberalization: Geographies, modalities, pathways. *Global Networks*, 10 (2): 182–222.
- Bumiller, Kristen. 2008. *In an abusive state: How neoliberalism appropriated the feminist movement against sexual violence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bustelo, María, Lucy Ferguson, and Maxime Forest, eds. Forthcoming. *The politics of feminist knowledge transfer: A critical reflection on gender training and gender expertise*. (Introductory chapter).
- Carter, Michael J., and Susan Boslego Carter. 1981. Women's recent progress in the professions or, women get a ticket to ride after the gravy train has left the station. *Feminist Studies*, 7 (3): 477–504.
- Celerant, Barbara. 2009. Review: *The rise of the meritocracy, 1870–2033* by Michael Young. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115 (1): 322–26.
- Colyvas, Jeannette A. 2012. Performance metrics as formal structures and through the lens of social mechanisms: When do they work and how do they influence? *American Journal of Education*, 118 (2): 167–97.
- Connell, Raewyn. 2015. Meeting at the edge of fear: Theory on a world scale. *Feminist Theory*, 16 (1): 49–66.
- Cornwall, Andrea, Elizabeth Harrison, and Ann Whitehead. 2007. Gender myths and feminist fables: The struggle for interpretive power in gender and development. *Development and Change*, 38 (1): 1–20.
- Currie, Jan, Bev Thiele, and Patricia Harris. 2002. *Gendered universities in globalized economies: Power, careers, and sacrifices*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Daly, Mary. 2005. Gender mainstreaming in theory and practice. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 12 (3): 433–50.
- David, Karen. 1991. The politics of class, race, and gender: Access to higher education in the United States, 1960–1986. *American Journal of Education*, 99 (2): 208–37.
- Deem, Rosemary. 2007. Managing a meritocracy or an equitable organisation? Senior managers' and employees' views about equal opportunities policies in UK universities. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (6): 615–36.
- DeWelde, Kristine, and Andi Stepnick. 2015. *Disrupting the culture of silence: Confronting gender inequality and making change in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Dobbin, Frank. 2009. *Inventing equal opportunity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ecklund, Elaine Howard, Anne E. Lincoln, and Cassandra Tansey. 2012. Gender segregation in elite academic science. *Gender & Society*, 26 (5): 693–717.
- Edelman, Lauren, Sally Riggs Fuller, and Iona Mara-Drita. 2001. Diversity rhetoric and the managerialization of law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106 (6): 1589–641.
- Elomäki, Anna. 2015. The economic case for gender equality in the European Union: Selling gender equality to decision-makers and neoliberalism to women's organizations. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 22 (3): 288–302.
- Espeland, Wendy, and Michael Sauder. 2007. Rankings and reactivity: How public measures recreate social worlds. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113 (1): 1–40.

- European Commission. 2013. *She figures 2012: Gender in research and innovation*. Directorate-General for research and innovation. Brussels: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Evans, Mary. 1997. Negotiating the frontier: Women and resistance in the contemporary academy. In *Knowing feminisms: On academic borders, territories and tribes*, ed. Liz Stanley, 46–57. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Evans, Elizabeth. 2015. *The politics of third wave feminisms: Neoliberalism, intersectionality, and the state in Britain and the US*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Brigitte Young. 1993. Three steps back for women: German unification, gender, and university “reform”. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 26 (2): 199–205.
- Fotaki, Marianna. 2013. No woman is like a man (in Academia): The masculine symbolic order and the unwanted female body. *Organization Studies*, 34 (9): 1251–75.
- Friedman, Thomas L. 2005. *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Garforth, Lisa, and Anne Kerr. 2009. Women and science: What’s the problem? *Social Politics*, 16 (3): 379–403.
- Halley, Janet. 2008. *Split decisions: How and why to take a break from feminism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Halley, Janet, Prabha Kotiswaran, Hila Shamir, and Chantal Thomas. 2006. From the international to the local in feminist legal responses to rape, prostitution/sex work, and sex trafficking: Four studies in contemporary governance feminism. *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender*, 29: 335–509.
- Hankivsky, Olena, and Ashlee Christoffersen. 2011. Gender mainstreaming in the United Kingdom: Current issues and future challenges. *British Politics*, 6 (1): 30–51.
- Husu, Liisa, and Suzanne de Cheveigné. 2010. Gender and gatekeeping of excellence in research funding: European perspectives. In *Gender Change in Academia*, ed. Birgit Rieggraf, Brigitte Aulenbacher, Edit Kirsch-Auwärter, and Ursula Müller, 43–59. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, and National Academy of Engineering. 2007. *Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Jenson, Jane. 2008. Writing women out, folding gender in: The European Union “modernises” social policy. *Social Politics*, 15 (2): 131–53.
- Kahlert, Heike. 2014. Gender (in)equality in academic career promotion of doctoral students. In *Paths to career and success for women in science*, ed. Britta Thege, Silvester Popescu-Willigmann, Roswitha Pioch, and Sabah Badri-Höher. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.
- Kantola, Johanna, and Kevat Nousiainen. 2009. Institutionalizing intersectionality in Europe. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11 (4): 459–77.
- Kantola, Johanna, and Judith Squires. 2012. From state feminism to market feminism? *International Political Science Review*, 33 (4): 382–400.
- Khan, Shamus, and Colin Jerolmack. 2013. Saying meritocracy, doing privilege. *Sociological Quarterly*, 54 (1): 9–19.
- Kunz, Rahel. Forthcoming. Windows of opportunity, Trojan Horses and waves of women on the move: The power of metaphors in the analysis of the circulation of feminist knowledges. In *The politics of feminist knowledge transfer: A critical reflection on gender training and gender expertise*, ed. Maria Bustelo, Lucy Ferguson, and Maxime Forest.

- Lamont, Michèle. 2009. *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lipinsky, Anke, and Kathrin Samjeske. 2012. Consideration of gender aspects in EU-Funded research projects in Germany. Final Report. In *CEWS Project Report*, ed. Center of Excellence Women and Science. Cologne: GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences.
- Luke, Carmen. 2001. *Globalization and women in academia: North/west–south/east, sociocultural, political, and historical studies in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Meriläinen, Susan, Janne Tienari, Saija Katila, and Yvonne Benschop. 2009. Diversity management versus gender equality: The Finnish case. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 26 (3): 230–43.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103 (1): 144–81.
- Newfield, Christopher. 2008. *Unmaking the public university: The forty-year assault on the middle class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nicolette, JoDean, and Michael B. Jacobs. 2000. Integration of women's health into an internal medicine core curriculum for medical students. *Academic Medicine*, 75 (11): 1061–65.
- Nielsen, Mathias Wullum. 2015. Gender inequality and research performance: Moving beyond individual-meritocratic explanations of academic advancement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40: 1–23.
- O'Connor, Pat. 2014. Understanding success: A case study of gendered change in the professoriate. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36 (2): 212–24.
- O'Connor, Pat, and Clare O'Hagan. 2015. Excellence in university academic staff evaluation: A problematic reality? *Studies in Higher Education*, 40: 1–15.
- Olds, Kris. 2012. *The business side of world university rankings*. Inside Higher Ed, April 12.
- Orloff, Ann Shona, and Talia Schiff. 2014. Feminists in power: Rethinking gender equality after the second wave. In *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences: Interdisciplinary directions*, ed. Robert A. Scott, and Stephen M. Kosslyn. New York: John Wiley.
- Outshoorn, Joyce, and Johanna Kantola, eds. 2007. *Changing state feminism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prügl, Elisabeth. Forthcoming. How to wield feminist power. In *The politics of feminist knowledge transfer: A critical reflection on gender training and gender expertise*, ed. Maria Bustelo, Lucy Ferguson, and Maxine Forest.
- . 2011. Diversity management and gender mainstreaming as technologies of government. *Politics & Gender*, 7 (1): 71–89.
- . 2014. Neoliberalising feminism. *New Political Economy*, 20 (4): 614–31.
- Prügl, Elisabeth, and Jacqui True. 2014. Equality means business? Governing gender through transnational public–private partnerships. *Review of International Political Economy*, 21 (6): 1137–69.
- Ramirez, Francisco O., and John Boli. 1987. The political construction of mass schooling: European origins and worldwide institutionalization. *Sociology of Education*, 60 (1): 2–17.
- Ramirez, Francisco O., and Tom Christensen. 2013. The formalization of the university: Rules, roots, and routes. *Higher Education*, 65 (6): 695–708.

- Ramirez, Francisco O., Yasemin Soysal, and Suzanne Shanahan. 1997. The changing logic of political citizenship: Cross-national acquisition of women's suffrage rights, 1890 to 1990. *American Sociological Review*, 62 (5): 735–45.
- Ramirez, Francisco O., and Dijana Tiplic. 2014. In pursuit of excellence? Discursive patterns in European higher education research. *Higher Education*, 67: 439–55.
- Riegraf, Birgit, Brigitte Aulenbacher, Edit Kirsch-Auwärter, and Ursula Müller, eds. 2010. *Gender change in academia: Re-mapping the fields of work, knowledge, and politics from a gender perspective*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Risberg, Annette, and Anne-Marie Søderberg. 2008. Translating a management concept: Diversity management in Denmark. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 23 (6): 426–41.
- Rossi, Alice S., and Ann Calderwood, eds. 1973. *Academic women on the move*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Schofer, Evan, and John W. Meyer. 2005. The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review*, 70 (6): 898–920.
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie. 1999. *Academic capitalism politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sliwa, Martyna, and Marjana Johansson. 2013. The discourse of meritocracy contested/reproduced: Foreign women academics in UK business schools. *Organization*, 21 (6): 821–43.
- Squires, Judith. 2005. Is mainstreaming transformative? Theorizing mainstreaming in the context of diversity and deliberation. *Social Politics*, 12 (3): 366–88.
- Stanley, Liz, ed. 1997. *Knowing feminisms: On academic borders, territories and tribes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stichweh, Rudolf. 2009. Universitäten im Zeitalter der Globalisierung. In *Wissen und Geist. Universitätskulturen*, ed. Manfred Rudersdorf, Wolfgang Höpken, and Martin Schlegel. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Subramaniam, Mangala, Robert Perrucci, and David Whitlock. 2012. Intellectual closure: A theoretical framework linking knowledge, power, and the corporate university. *Critical Sociology*, 40 (3): 411–30.
- Teelken, Christine, and Rosemary Deem. 2013. All are equal, but some are more equal than others: Managerialism and gender equality in higher education in comparative perspective. *Comparative Education*, 49 (4): 520–35.
- Thayer, Millie. 2010. *Making transnational feminism: Rural women, NGO activists, and northern donors in Brazil*. New York: Routledge.
- Timmermans, Stefan, and Steven Epstein. 2010. A world of standards but not a standard world: Toward a sociology of standards and standardization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36 (1): 69–89.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, Kevin Stainback, Tiffany Taylor, Catherine Zimmer, Corre Robinson, and Tricia McTague. 2006. Documenting desegregation: Segregation in American workplaces by race, ethnicity, and sex, 1966–2003. *American Sociological Review*, 71 (4): 565–88.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 2009. *Wannabe U: Inside the corporate university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- van den Brink, Marieke, and Yvonne Benschop. 2011. Gender practices in the construction of academic excellence: Sheep with five legs. *Organization*, 19 (4): 507–24.
- . 2012. Slaying the seven-headed dragon: The quest for gender change in academia. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 19 (1): 71–92.

- van der Vleuten, Anna, and Mieke Verloo. 2012. Ranking and benchmarking: The political logic of new regulatory instruments in the fields of gender equality and anti-corruption. *Policy & Politics*, 40 (1): 71–86.
- van der Weijden, Inge, and Clara Calero Medina. 2014. Gender effects on evaluation indicators. *ACUMEN (Academic careers understood through measurement and norms)*. The Netherlands: CWTS, Leiden University.
- Walby, Sylvia. 2005. Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12 (3): 321–43.
- Weldon, Laurel. 2002. *Protest, policy, and the problem of violence against women: A cross-national comparison*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Wellmon, Chad. 2015. *Organizing enlightenment: Information overload and the invention of the modern research university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Williams, Damon A., Joseph Buryl Berger, and Shederick A. McClendon. 2005. *Toward a model of inclusive excellence and change in postsecondary institutions*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Woodward, Alison E. 2012. From equal treatment to gender mainstreaming and diversity management. In *Gendering the European Union: New approaches to old democratic deficits*, ed. Gabriele Abels, and Joyce Marie Mushaben. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wotipka, Christine Min, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 2008. Women's studies as a global innovation. In *The Worldwide transformation of higher education*, ed. David P. Baker, and Alexander W. Wiseman. International Perspectives on Education, vol. 9. Bingley, UK: JAI, Emerald Group.
- Zippel, Kathrin. 2012. Internationalizing academia: Why do diversity approaches matter? Boston, MA: Council for European Studies. March 22–24.
- Zippel, Kathrin, Myra Marx Ferree, and Karin Zimmermann. In press. Gender equality in German universities: Vernacularizing the battle for the best brains. *Gender and Education*.