Gender and shifts in higher education managerial regimes

Teresa Carvalho & Maria de Lurdes Machado

Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies, Portugal

While Portugal is one of the European countries with a high representation of women in higher education, there is both horizontal and vertical segregation. The way universities and especially managerial positions are culturally embedded by masculinity is one of the obstacles women have traditionally faced. Recently, higher education institutions have been subjected to external pressures to create a new institutional and organisational environment aimed at substituting the traditional collegial model with a managerial one. In this paper, the authors discuss the way these different models reflect traditional notions of femininity and masculinity and the potential impact they have on women in academia. Based on qualitative methodology, they provide an analysis of whether senior academic managers still reproduce the traditional stereotypes of managerial styles of women and men, and the potential impact of this on women in the clash between managerial and collegial models. The authors conclude by analysing perceptions about leadership styles for women and men, and the potential implications for women's participation in top management in HE institutions.

Introduction

Gender, being socially constructed, contributes to the development of a specific social order (Anthias, 2001; Archer & Lloyd, 2002; Butler, 1999; Francis, 2001; Witz, 1992). Social constructions that attribute a closer relationship between masculinity and power have been identified as one of the main obstacles women face in getting into top organisational positions. While the presence of gender in organisations was not recognised historically, studies since the 1970s have acknowledged the importance of these cultural mechanisms (Hearn & Parkin, 1987; Collinson, 1992; Kerfoot & Knights, 1993; Connell, 1993; Collinson & Hearn, 1996; Marshall, 1984).

Assuming that gender is a social construction implies that notions of masculinity and femininity are not static but instead dynamic, changing every day as a result of 'doing gender' (West & Zimmerman, 1991).

This gender (re)construction justifies the increasing institutionalisation of the notion that equality has been achieved, leading to the emergence of a 'feminised' future (Leathwood & Read, 2009; Francis, 2002; Francis & Skelton, 2005).

In higher education and science, a relationship between masculinity and power has also been identified (Acker, 1994; Hearn, 1999; Hearn, 2002; Morley, 1994; Prichard, 1996), emerging as an explanation for the under-representation of women in senior positions (Bagilhole, 2007; Bagilhole & Goode, 2001; Deem, 1999; Husu, 2001). However, recently the intrusion of managerialism and New Public Management (NPM) has raised important questions about the potential 'impact' of the organisational changes it promotes for women in academia.

The political agenda for higher education reform all over the industrialised world includes a retreat from

state regulation, budget cuts, demands for accountability and control, and changes in academic work, which is expected to become useful, effective and to translate into a real contribution to the competitiveness of the state/nation in a knowledge society (Olssen & Peters, 2005). This general context is transforming universities from academic communities to managed organisations (Harley, Muller-Camen & Collin, 2003), and has been translated into an increasing presence of the market in higher education systems.

As 'academic communities', the most important legitimising claim for universities was the 'social good' argument. In this 'traditional' logic one of the main *raisons d'être* of the universities' existence was their ability to improve people's capacities to engage fully as citizens and, in this way, to contribute to the sustainability of a country's democracy. Now, being redefined as 'managed organisations' the main legitimising argument is based on universities' capacity to demonstrate responsiveness and relevance to market forces and therefore to contribute to national competitiveness and economic development (Sagaria & Agans, 2006; Santiago & Carvalho, 2004).

The negative impacts of these general reforms over academic professionals have been well documented in a number of empirical studies (Exworthy & Halford, 1999; Kirkpatrick, Ackroyd, & Walker; 2005). Several authors have stated that market and NPM are leading to a decline in work conditions, making academic work more individual, flexible and precarious, and also creating a more stressful environment in academia (Altbach, 2001; Barry, Berg & Chandler, 2005; Musselin, 2008; Santiago & Carvalho, 2008).

Other studies have introduced gender perspectives into the examination of the new academic working conditions (Harley, 2002; Harley & Lee, 1997; Kerfoot, 1999; Goode, 2000; Davies & Holloway, 1995; DeGroot, 1997; Deem, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2003; White, 2003). However, the conclusions of these studies are ambiguous. Through electing the economic enterprise as an 'ideal-type' to reshape institutions, NPM placed a strong emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness principles, which meet the traditional masculine management style. Thus, this emphasis can represent a threat to gender equality (Davies & Thomas, 2002; Saunderson, 2002; Doherty & Manfredi, 2006). Conversely, as is argued in other studies (Goode & Bagilhole, 1998) that NPM can provide a pathway for more opportunities for women at the universities management level (Deem, 2003). Since the collegial univer-

sity, with its bureaucratic structures, imposed so many obstacles to women's progression in academia, some female academics welcomed the recent changes in higher education that have undermined traditional forms of governance and management (Yeatman, 1995; Prichard, 1996; DeGroot, 1997; Goode & Bagilhole, 1998). The shift from 'collegiality' to managerialism and corporate governance is interpreted as a disruption from the established organisational order, providing women with a hope of seeing changes in their positions.

Women in Portuguese higher education

While Portugal has one of the oldest Higher education systems in Europe, a binary system was created and new universities emerged during the 1970s. With the opening up of the private system in the 1980s, the consequent increase in the number of universities led to the massification of Portuguese higher education, to a large extent resulting from the increase in the participation of women as undergraduates (Amâncio & Ávila, 1995). There was a parallel increase in the participation of women in academic careers. By 2007, women represented 41.3 per cent of the professoriate. While Portugal has one of the highest percentages of women in academia of any Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) country (OECD, 2006), this does not translate into full equality.

Women's participation in the labour market has been historically high. In 2006 the employment rate was 62 per cent for women (superior to the average of the European Union's EU25 of 57.3 per cent) and 73.9 per cent for men (MTSS, 2009). These numbers result from a historical tendency for women to be integrated in the formal economy. At first, they were mainly employed in agriculture as wageworkers and also in subsistence farming. With political, economic and social transformations, they began to be employed increasingly in the service sector.

The cultural and economic context of Portugal's dictatorship regime (1933–1974) had an important role in integrating women into the labour market. At a time when most developed countries were facing social movements for women's rights and improved democracy, Portugal was facing war with its colonies (Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique). This war, along with the cultural backwardness and economic under-development of the country, resulted in a peak of migration to urban areas and in particular to other

European countries. The lack of men for these reasons transformed women into the main labour force that supported the economy (Nogueira, Constâncio & Amâncio, 1995).

At the same time, political initiatives taken to maintain traditional gender roles resulted in the increased feminisation of some service professions, especially nursing (Carvalho, 2009; Escobar, 2004) and teaching (Araújo, 1990; 1991). In this particular case, the number of women employed as teachers meant Portugal was the country with the most pronounced feminisation of teaching in Europe in 1993 (Nogueira *et al.*, 1995).

This high participation of women in the teaching profession has persisted, though this is not consistent across the different levels of education. According to the World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Report (2009) the female proportion in primary, secondary and tertiary education was 82 per cent, 69 per cent and 43 per cent, respectively.

Inside higher education, there are also important differences that must be highlighted. First, it is important to note that women are predominant to a greater extent in polytechnics than in universities. There are several explanations for this difference. The first is that polytechnics have been institutionalised more recently than universities and polytechnics were therefore able to integrate more academic women in accordance with women's increasing participation as students. Another reason is that polytechnics offer many undergraduate programs in areas that are traditionally more 'feminine', such as social sciences, education or, more recently nursing. Polytechnics also have a greater focus on teaching than research, and tend to offer more unstable and insecure employment (Carvalho & Santiago, 2008). At the same time, it is important to note that polytechnics are socially less prestigious than universities, confirming other studies that reveal that women have more difficulties in older, more prestigious and research intensive universities (Leathwood & Read, 2009; White, 2004; Bagilhole & White, 2008).

Furthermore, as in other systems (Machado-Taylor, Özkanli, White & Baghole, 2007; Leathwood & Read, 2009; Morley, 2005) it is also possible to find persistent horizontal and vertical segregation. Women are mainly concentrated in so-called soft areas such as humanities and arts and are least present in the 'sciences and engineering.

In recent years, the Portuguese higher education system has been gradually changing, under the influence of neo-liberal ideologies and NPM devices. Research has been highlighting the presence of NPM rhetoric since the 1990s with political and institutional narratives increasingly emphasising notions of efficiency, efficacy, quality and accountability. At the same time, the system has been shifting from direct control to self-regulation (Neave & van Vught, 1994) with the intrusion of market and quasi-market mechanisms in the system. However, in Portugal, at least until the end of the 1990s, the movement towards self-regulation has never been based on a purely market-driven logic, and the issues of organisational efficiency and effectiveness were never central (Amaral, Magalhães & Santiago, 2003) when compared, for instance, with the Anglo-Saxon world (Reed, 2002; Meek, 2003). In this context, researchers refer the presence of hybridisation process that articulates institutional control and market coordination (Amaral *et al.*, 2003).

> **By 2007, women represented 41.3 per cent of the professoriate. While Portugal has one of the highest percentages of women in academia of any Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) country, this does not translate into full equality.**

More recently, a new legal framework has been passed by the parliament (Portugal: *Law 62/2007* of 10 September) that brings with it a more evident intrusion of market and NPM in Portuguese higher education. Based on some of the main conclusions of an OECD report on the evaluation of the Portuguese higher education sector (OECD, 2007) it can be interpreted as a 'new tool' to legitimate the substitution of the collegial model by a managerial one, namely by imposing the existence of general boards in which external stakeholders are strongly represented.

Methodology

This paper is part of a cross cultural project being undertaken by the Women in Higher Education Management Network (WHEM) in Australia, Ireland, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey and the United Kingdom. The aim of this research project is to analyse gendered organisational cultures and their impact on the representation of women in university senior management.

Senior management was defined as those who were currently at rector (vice-chancellor/president) or vice-rector level. Twenty-two interviews were conducted (nine men and 13 women) with participants from public universities only. In these universities, in the fashion common in many European countries, the academic community (including professors, administrative staff and students) elects rectors, and vice-rectors are subsequently appointed by the rector.

The interviews were based on an interview schedule adopted by the nine countries involved. In this paper the focus is on changes in universities and, more specifically, on the limits and possibilities of NPM and managerialism to improve women's presence in Portuguese top academic positions.

The content analysis is largely based on questions such as: 'How do you define senior management in university?', 'What have been your observations regarding the working styles of female managers?', 'Did you experience any difficulties in becoming a senior manager?'

Interviews varied in length from 30 minutes to 120 minutes. All the interviews were undertaken by the researchers, following earlier contact made by a former rector and president of the National Council of Portuguese Rectors. With one exception, all interviews were tape recorded.

Findings

A) Universities as neutrals and meritocratic

Data drawn from the interviews with both women and men in senior management positions allow us to describe and conceptualise their perceptions about universities, the way they should be organised and underlying meanings of gender meanings.

In general, the first evidence drawn from these actors' narratives presented a perspective view of the University as a 'neutral organisational field' founded according to universal merit and equity principles. Actually, almost all interviewees took the ungenderedness of their organisations as given. Only two interviewees (both women) believed that gender was an issue in academia. One of them believed that gender discrimination was observable only in business enterprises.

> I think there are no differences between men and women. I cannot identify differences nor any kind of discrimination. But maybe it is because I don't have much experience in management. I think you can only find that in more complex organisations, like in private enterprises (Interview No. 16).

This analysis reveals that actors with senior management responsibilities in Portuguese universities interpret their organisations as being neutral, demonstrating an absence of gender consciousness. In this sense, as Hearn (2002) stated in an other context, 'these absences obscure, through degendering, the political process of contestation of identities and culture' (Hearn, 2002:43).

The notion that universities are gender neutral and based only on meritocratic principles is, in fact, a way of occulting gender power relations (Oakley, 2001; Bagilhole & Goode, 2001). Proclaiming a neutral and meritocratic organisation does not recognise the fact that organisational culture has been historically patterned through masculine beliefs, perceptions and judgements. These patterns include accepted social and cultural differences between men and women on the way organisations are structured, power is distributed and the work is segmented and performed. Indeed, several studies suggest that universities are organised according to male standards and norms that, inevitably, interfere in judgement systems (Hearn, 2001; Currie, Thiele & Harris, 2002; Deem, 1998). This means that notions such as merit or career paths are, in fact, based on male life styles and priorities (Brooks, 2001; Currie, Thiele & Harris, 2002; Hearn, 2001; Oakley, 2001; Davies & Thomas, 2002).

NPM, stressing competition, performance and meritocracy cultures, may reinforce the existence of ungenderedness notions in academia (Thomas & Davies, 2002). In this sense, introducing NPM devices in universities can be an important obstacle to making gender power relations more visible in the organisational context, and by ignoring or obscuring its existence, makes them seem more 'natural' and unquestionable. This could have more impact on systems such as the Portuguese one, in which there is a total unawareness of gender dynamics in academia, with the dominant assumption that gender is not an issue.

The assumed neutral principles of meritocracy sustain the dominant attitude against any institutional policies that attempt to eliminate gender barriers. The individualist and competitive nature of managerial principles reinforce this. Portuguese senior managers reject affirmative action based on the idea that women are able to get there by themselves, and on the perseverance of meritocratic principles. Achieving a senior management position is interpreted as being the finish line in academic competition. Introducing other mech-

anisms could mean that selection would not be based on meritocratic principles:

> Ascending to the top is like the evolution of species – only the best can get there, and this [affirmative action] could interfere with this principle (Interview No.14).

In conclusion, one can say that NPM can be seen as a threat to women's progression in academia. The social 'hard' vision of needing academic merit to reach the top and to get into senior management positions contrasts with the 'soft' version of perceptions about women and managerial work.

B) Different managerial styles

When asked about the way women and men develop their work in senior management, those interviewed acknowledged the existence of different styles that can be identified with the dominant notions of femininity and masculinity.

Women, as opposed to men, were recognised as being more pragmatic, organised and persevering but, more importantly, as developing managerial styles based on team-work, negotiation, dialogue and humanism. These general characteristics are usually referred to as conforming to a transformational leadership style (Davies & Thomas, 2002; Doherty & Manfredi, 2006).

> It seems to me that the way women manage and participate in management is different. I feel that they are more persistent and I think this is fundamental to being able to work in team (Interview No. 22).

> In a general way, women are more pragmatic. They give more attention to personal and human aspects and they are more attentive than men to day-to-day reality (Interview No.17).

> (…) I think one needs to have the capacity to listen, and to work with others. Of course, it is also necessary to take the right decision at the right time but the right decisions take time. If we take a decision that has consequences for the others and they do not feel committed, the risk is that no one will accomplish the decision taken. We need time and work to consolidate, to discuss, to talk, to make people talk with each other and to gather consensus (Interview No.18).

The clear identification of different managerial styles in women and men is relevant to this analysis. Emphasising gender differences in senior management recognises the need to have more women in senior management teams as a way to complement different competencies and skills. In fact, female presence is almost inexorable in this context:

> Women are more pragmatic and give more attention to detail. Men have a macro vision and, as such, they complement each other. That is why I like to work in mixed teams (Interview No.2).

Nevertheless, advocating the need to reinforce the traditional gender differences might also be interpreted as a strategy women develop to maintain their identity when in senior positions. Actually, one woman stated clearly this argument:

> Men do not give us value because they think we are similar to them. It is in our difference that we can find our value. In this sense, we should be women and not attempt to be men. In this way, we can impose things by other than force, masculinity and leadership. No. We should affirm ourselves by our femininity (Interview No.1).

Some studies have highlighted the fact that if women adapt to dominant masculine cultures in organisational contexts, it is not without personal costs (Thomas & Davies, 2002; Sheppard, 1996). This adaptation is often made at the cost of redefining their self. By reinforcing gender differences in managerial styles, Portuguese women may be consciously or unconsciously defining a strategy to avoid these personal costs. In this sense, these discourses reveal that gender is neither a static nor homogeneous reality, instead, gender notions and gender relations are continually (re)defined in the organisational context both by men and women (Butler, 1990; Anthias, 2001; Archer *et al.*, 2001; Francis, 2001). In maintaining the need to be different, women are actively 'doing gender' (West & Zimmerman, 1991) and reinforcing the traditional stereotypes about masculinity and femininity.

However, the reinforcement of gender differences can also translate into a threat to women in academia. NPM, being based mainly on hard management notions (Trowler, 2001) reinforces the masculine organisational culture (Davies & Thomas, 2002). Studies since the 1970s (Bem, 1974; Deaux & Kite, 1993; Eagly, Wood & Dickman, 2000) address the way gender stereotypes keep women far from management positions, since management is associated with the dominant masculinity. In this sense, in reinforcing differences, women are also exposing their distance from this dominant culture and putting themselves in less favourable positions for being identified as 'leaders'. It is relevant, in this context, to try to analyse how NPM has been able to permeate top management in Portuguese public universities.

C) A new culture in place?

Changing higher education institutions from collegial communities to managerial enterprises (Harley, Muller-Camen & Collin, 2003) means these institutions are no longer conceived as traditional professional bureaucracies or even as organised anarchies (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972), mainly structured by bottom-up academic dynamics (Clark, 1983). Universities are now (re)conceptualised as unique entities (Carvalho & Santiago, 2010), or reengineered as complete organisations (Enders, de Boer & Leisyte, 2008), which must act as a kind of collective entity being able to make the best rational choices in a new market, or market-like, environment.

Steaming from the managerialistic principles that managers should have the 'right to manage' in order to make organisations more efficient and accountable (Hood, 1991), the traditional collegial ways of decision making are being replaced by individual ones, resulting in more power concentration in the organisations' top.

Those interviewed recognised these tendencies to (re)configure Portuguese higher education institutions and also senior management roles. The majority interpreted changes as attempts to replace collegial communities with managerial enterprises and demonstrated actively against it. As an example, the discourse of one (male) rector noted:

> I am totally against managerialism in universities and I am totally against the notion of students as clients. ….Universities are spaces for academic reflection because they are related to knowledge creation and diffusion (…)Other countries have already had experiences that reveal to us how managerialism in universities can strongly affect some areas of knowledge that are not marketable, and for me the universities should be fostering all types of knowledge (Interview No.14).

In line with this substitution, there are also attempts to induce changes in rectors' traditional roles. Interviewees' discourses allow us to classify this transformation as the substitution of the 'politician' by the 'manager' with rectors proclaiming the dominance/persistence of the first. Rectors see themselves as having, mainly, a symbolic power in their organisations. They interpret their role from the visionary's perspective. They have an idea or a project for the university and try to accomplish it through micro organisational and political negotiations, which require them to gather consensus to implement it in practice.

> I think the real power a rector has is only symbolic. I think a rector has a strong symbolic power and has a strong power to be the voice of several elements from the academic community (Interview No.18).

> Rectors exercise the power of influence that is almost virtual. (…) S/he has to act with intelligence and political influence in the institutional environment. In this way, rectors have been able to accomplish the institution's objectives, within the organisational structure, with all the bodies and all the people and different voices, based on the political route s/he has previously defined and for which she was elected. S/he has to engage in dialogue with all the people, from all perspectives. This is why I say that his power is almost virtual (Interview No.21).

In defining their roles in this way, rectors move themselves away from the 'manager' role and seem to reject the neo-liberal notion of an autonomous rational actor governed by competitive individualism (Grummell, Lynch & Devine, 2009).

> (…) I do not think I am a manager. I think it is a serious mistake that we make in Portugal because for me rectors are not managers. Rectors govern universities which is a completely different thing (Interview No.14).

Based on these responses, one can surmise that NPM has not been able to change the institutionalised notions of rectors' roles, so that Portuguese universities still are more closely linked to notions of the collegial community than they are with managerial organisations (Harley *et al.*, 2003). The continuous emphasis on the 'political roles' and in dialogue and gathering consensus as the dominant managerial style can be seen as important in keeping the 'female managerial styles' as proper and necessary.

Even more than with rectors' roles, there was a general and homogeneous consensus between interviewees concerning their power legitimacy. Both women and men acknowledge the importance of being a prestigious academic, meaning that they have a solid research career, before ascending to the top positions.

> I think that training is not enough. A rector should be someone that has demonstrated high quality as a researcher. If the rector is not a good researcher s/he has no moral authority to impose things such as demands for high research productivity which is fundamental (Interview No.15).

To defend this argument interviewees used 'managerial language' following what Trowler (2001) referred

to as bilingualism –meaning the simultaneous use of professional and managerial language. Some illustration can be seen in the following responses:

I think institutions should be managed by someone who really understands reality. I think there is an academic culture that should be maintained and I think there is something that is very important – accountability – that can only come from the shop floor – the faculties (Interview No.16).

Things are changing but just as someone who wants to compete at the Olympic Games has to meet the standard, so too should rectors. There are a number of characteristics that a rector should have when they propose themselves to the vocation of rector. These include their scientific and intellectual quality as someone who is prestigious in their academic and scientific career and someone who has good management qualities and negotiation skills too because to manage implies the capacity to negotiate (Interview No.15).

Insisting on academic prestige or merit is, once again, obscuring the gender differences. As others have emphasised in the past, defining background as a prestigious researcher and having held a professorship as a pre-condition to ascend to the top means that many women in academia are kept away from it (Machado-Taylor et al., 2007).

The glass ceiling phenomenon is known worldwide and the difficulties of women gaining professorships are based on a myriad of institutional barriers that the merit principle obscures. They include the dominant masculine notions of knowledge production (Bagilhole & Goode, 2001; Doherty & Manfredi, 2006), the exclusion from privileged networks and from 'access to resources, influence, career opportunities and academic authority' (Morley, 1999, p.4) and from recruitment and selection committees dominated by men (Winchster, Lorenzo, Browing & Chesterman, 2006; van der Brink, Brown & Weslander, 2006).

These known obstacles are reinforced by managerialism and NPM. Several studies have revealed distinct ways managerialism and NPM weaken women's position in academia. Deem (1998) highlights the way it increases administrative workload mainly developed by women, keeping them away from research. This

> **Insisting on academic prestige or merit is, once again, obscuring the gender differences. As others have emphasised in the past, defining background as a prestigious researcher and having held a professorship as a pre-condition to ascend to the top means that many women in academia are kept away from it**

increasing workload is not only due to 'formal processes' resulting from an increase in bureaucratic control, but also 'informal' ones, resulting from supporting roles women have been developing to their colleagues and to students in the new uncertain and insecure environment (Barry et al., 2005), translating into more stressful situations for them. In addition, the way research and knowledge production are socially conceived and evaluated (Harley et al., 2003) contribute to women's work being undervalued and becoming more difficult to get tenured positions, a pre condition to reaching the top.

As a final note, it is important to note that market competitiveness was present in some Portuguese senior managers' responses and, in this context, gender assumed an important role in institutional competitiveness. Equal opportunity is recognised as being an institutionalised value in Portuguese universities and in society, and this is used consciously by senior managers to obtain 'competitive advantage'. Gender is used in both internal and external competitiveness strategies.

In the first, senior managers noticing the increasing number of women in academic staff, invite women onto their teams as a way to win more votes from women. Appointing women to senior positions does not mean that senior managers are aware of gender differences or that they are willing to define policies to promote gender equality. It is more likely that women are being used as tokens.

As you know, when someone competes in an election, they want to win. It is evident and I cannot hide that the gender effects are also considered when I organise my team. I do not invite anyone only because they are a woman or a man, I invite them because of their qualities. But your question is important. I must confess that when I was organising my team I also thought about having a woman in my team because I would like to win the elections also with the votes from women… (Interview No.15).

In the second, gender is used as a marketing strategy to help to define and consolidate an institutional image of a university that is innovative and modern.

In the type of decision women take I think there are no differences. However, in what concerns the university public image I think it is important. It

gives a different image of our university, of innovation, of being ahead of their time, and it gives those outside, the notion that also in this area the university is Number One (Interview No. 4).

Traditionally gender equality was a value universities would promote to endorse a more equitable society; in a market driven system, gender equality is now conceived as a competitive advantage universities use to obtain a better market position. Gender equality is confined to instrumental and not social purposes as it was dominant in the welfare state.

Conclusions

This paper is based on the conviction that gender is a socially constructed concept that is defined and (re) defined in everyday life both by women and by men. Universities are not different from other organisations, meaning that they are also permeated by the dominant social notions of femininity and masculinity.

In recent decades, changes in higher education systems have followed the path of NPM and managerialism all over the developed countries. The concern in this paper was less with the conventional implications of NPM for organisational and individual performance and more on the way it can reproduce the traditional stereotypes concerning women's and men's managerial styles and the potential impact of this over women in the present confrontation of the managerial and collegial models.

There are myriad non-convergent directions in the way NPM exerts an influence over gender organisation. First, it is important to remember that the dominant notion about the university is one that keeps reflecting the idea of the 'ivory tower'. Both men and women have an image of their organisations as being ungendered. In this context, one can expect gender to be kept off agendas in Portuguese higher education. This is even more reinforced by the consensus rejecting actions that look for gender equality in more proactive ways. NPM can reinforce this neutrality turning increasingly invisible gender discrimination in higher education institutions.

Even if senior managers did not consider gender to be an issue in their organisations, they identified different managerial styles, with women more identified with transformational leadership styles and men with transactional. The women interviewed identified these different styles, but they were also defended as a way to make women more visible and 'needed' in top positions. In assuming this position, women are 'doing gender' and reinforcing the traditional gender stereotypes. However, in the new context, the managerial styles more identified with women also seem to be less valuable.

NPM has not been able to change the institutionalised notions of rectors' roles in maintaining the Portuguese universities as being linked more with collegial communities than with managerial organisations. However, all insist on the need for academic prestige or merit before ascending to positions at the top, which once again, obscures gender differences in academia. In conclusion, one can say that NPM represents simultaneously a threat and an opportunity for women in higher education management. The result will depend mainly from internal micro political dynamics.

Teresa Carvalho and Maria de Lurdes Machado are researchers at the Centre For Research In Higher Education Policies (CIPES), Portugal.

References

Acker, S 1994, *Gendered Education: Sociological Reflections on Women, Teaching and Feminism*. Buckingham; Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Altbach, P 2001, 'Academic freedom: International realities and challenges'. *Higher Education* 41, 205–219.

Amâncio, L & Ávila, P 1995. 'O género na ciência'. in Jesuino, J. (ed), *A Comunidade científica Portuguesa nos finais do Séc. XIX.,* Celta Editora, Oeiras, pp. 47-71.

Amaral, A, Magalhães, A & Santiago, R 2003, 'The rise of academic managerialism in Portugal', in Amaral, A, Meek, L & Larsen, IM (eds.), *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 101-123.

Anthias, F 2001, 'The material and the symbolic in theorizing social stratification: issues of gender, ethnicity and class', *British Journal of Sociology,* 52(3), pp. 367-390.

Araújo, H 1990. 'As mulheres professoras e o ensino estatal'. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 29, 81-103.

Araújo, H 1991. 'As professoras primárias na viragem do século: Uma contribuição para a história da sua emergência no estado'. *Organizações & Trabalho,* 5(6), 127-146.

Archer, J & Lloyd, B 2002, *Sex and Gender,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bagilhole, B 2007, 'Challenging Women in the Male Academy: Thinking about draining the swamp', in Cotterill, P, Jackson, S & Wetherby, G (eds) *Challenges and Negotiations for Women in Higher Education*, Kluwer.

Bagilhole, B & Goode, J 2001, 'The Contradiction of the Myth of Individual Merit, and the Reality of a Patriarchal Support System in Academic Careers', *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 8(2):161-180

Bagilhole, B & White, K (2008). 'Towards a gendered skills analysis of senior management positions in UK and Australian Universities', *Tertiary Education and Management,* 14(1), pp. 1-12.

Barry, J, Berg, E & Chandler, J 2005, 'The neglected middle: Gender, managerial-

ism and change in academe in Sweden and England', in *Gender, Work and Organisation 4th International Interdisciplinary Conference*, Keele University.

Bem, B, 1974, 'The measurement of psychological androgyny', *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, pp.155-62.

Brooks, A, 2001, 'Restructuring bodies of knowledge', in Brooks, A & Mackinnon, A (eds), *Gender and the Restructured University Changing Management and Culture in Higher Education*, Buckingham, SRHE and Open University Press, pp. 15-44.

Butler, J, 1999, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity,* London, Routledge.

Carvalho, T & Santiago, R, 2008. 'Gender differences on research: Perceptions and use of academic Time', *Tertiary Education and Management,* 14(4): 317-330

Carvalho, T & Santiago, R 2010, 'Still Academics After All', *Higher Education Policy,* Forthcoming.

Carvalho, T 2009. *Nova gestão pública e reformas da saúde. O profissional-ismo numa encruzilhada*. Edições Sílabo, Lisboa.

Clark, B 1983. *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, M, March, J & Olsen, J 1972, 'A Garbage can model of organisational choice', *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 17(1), 1-25.

Collinson, D 1992, *Managing the shopfloor: subjectivity, masculinity, and workplace culture*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.

Collinson, D & Hearn, J (ed.), 1996, *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*, Sage, London.

Connell, R 1993. 'The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history', *Theory and Society*. 22(5), pp. 597-623.

Currie, J Thiele, B & Harris, P 2002, *Gendered universities in globalized economies: power, careers, and sacrifices*, Lexington Books.

Davies, A & Thomas, R 2002, 'Managerialism and Accountability in Higher Education: the Gendered Nature of Restructuring and the Costs to Academic Service', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 13(2), pp. 179-193.

Davies, C & Holloway, P 1995, 'Troubling transformations: Gender regimes and organizational culture in the academy', in Morley, L & Walsh, V (eds) *Feminist Academics. Creative Agents for Change,* Taylor & Francis, London, pp. 7-21.

Deaux, K & Kite, M 1993, 'Gender stereotypes' in Denmark, F & Paludi, M (eds.) *Handbook on the psychology of women*. Greenwood, Westport, CT. Press, pp. 107-139.

Deem, R 1998, 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom', *International Studies in Sociology of Education,* 8(1), pp. 47-70.

Deem, R 1999, Power and resistance in academia: The case of women academic managers, in Whitehead, S & Moodley, R (eds). *Transforming managers, Gendering Change in the Public Sector,* Routledge, London, pp. 66-83.

Deem, R 2001, 'Globalisation, New managerialismo, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important?', *Comparative Education,* 37(1), pp. 7-20.

Deem, R 2003, 'Gender, organizational cultures and the practices of manager-academics in UK universities', *Gender, Work and Organization,* 10(2), pp. 239-259.

DeGroot, J 1997, 'After the Ivory Tower: Gender, commodification and the 'Academic'', *Feminist Review,* 55, pp. 130-142.

Doherty, L & Manfredi, S 2006, 'Women's progression to senior positions in English universities', *Employee Relations*, 28(6), pp. 553-572.

Eagly, A, Wood, W & Dickman, A 2000, 'Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal', in Eckers, T & Trautner, H (eds.) *The develop-*

mental social psychology of gender, Eribaunm, Mahwah, pp. 123-174.

Enders, J, de Boer, H & Leisyte, L 2008, 'On striking the right notes: shifts in governance and the organisational transformation of universities', in Amaral, A, Bleiklie, I & Musselin, C (eds) *From Governance to Identity, a Festschrift for Mary Henkel*. London: Springer, pp. 113-130.

Escobar, L 2004. *O sexo das profissões. Género e identidade socioprofissional em enfermagem*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.

Exworthy, M & Halford, S 1999, 'Professionals and managers in a changing public sector: Conflict, compromise and collaboration', in Exworthy, M & Halford, S (eds) *Professionals and the new managerialism in the public sector.* Open University Press, Philadelphia.

Francis, B 2001, 'Relativism, realism and feminism: an analysis of some theoretical tensions in research on gender identity', *Journal of Gender Studies,* 11, pp. 39-53.

Francis, B 2002, 'Is the future really female? The impact and implications of gender for 14-16 year olds' career choices', *Journal of Education and Work,* 15, pp. 75-87.

Francis, B & Skelton, C 2005, *Reassessing Gender and Achievement: Questioning Contemporary Key Debates,* London and New York, Routledge.

Goode, J 2000, 'Is the position of women in higher education changing?', in Tight, M (ed.), *Academic Work and Life: What it is to be an Academic, and How this is Changing* (International Perspectives on Higher Education Research, Volume 1), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.243-284

Goode, J & Bagilhole, B 1998, 'Gendering the management of change in Higher Education: A case study', *Gender, Work & Organization,* 5(3), pp. 148-164.

Grummell, B, Lynch, K & Devine, D 2009, 'Appointing Senior Managers in Education: Homosociability, Local Logics and Authenticity in the Selection Process', *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* 37(3): 329-349

Harley, S & Lee, F 1997, 'Research Selectivity, Managerialism, and the Academic Labor Process: The Future of Nonmainstream Economics in U.K. Universities', *Human Relations,* 50(11), 1427-1460.

Harley, S 2002, 'The Impact of research selectivity on academic work and Identity on UK Universities', *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(2), pp. 187-205.

Harley, S, Muller-Camen, M & Collin, A 2003, 'From academic communities to managed organisations: The implications for academic careers in UK and German universities', *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 64(2), pp. 329-345.

Hearn, J 1999, 'Men, managers and management: the case of Higher Education', in Whitehead, S & Moodley, R (eds), *Transforming Managers: Gendering Change in the Public Sector,* UCL Press, London.

Hearn, J 2001, 'Academia, Management and Men: Making the Connections, Exploring the Implications' in Brooks, A & Mackinnon, A (eds) *Gender and the Restructured University.* Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University.

Hearn, J 2002, 'Alternative conceptualizations and theoretical perspectives on identities and organisational culture' in Iiris Aaltio-Marjosola, I, Aaltio, I & Mills, A (eds), *Gender, identity and the culture of organizations,* Routledge, London.

Hearn, J & Parkin, W 1987, *'Sex' at 'work': The power and paradox of organisation sexuality.* Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St. Martin's.

Hood, C 1991, 'A public management for all seasons?' *Public Administration,* 69(Spring), pp. 3-19.

Husu, L 2001, *Sexism, Support and Survival in Academia: Academic Women and Hidden Discrimination in Finland.* University of Helsinki, Helsinki.

Kerfoot, D 1999, 'The organisation of intimacy: managerialism, masculinity and the masculine subject' in Whithead, S & Moodley, R (eds) *Transforming Management: Gendering Change in the Public Sector*, UCL Press, London, pp. 230-46.

Kerfoot, D & Knights, D 2007. 'Management, masculinity and manipulation: From paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain', *Journal of Management Studies.* 30(4), 659-677.

Kirkpatrick, I, Ackroyd, S & Walker, R 2005, *The new managerialism and public service professions.* Palgrave-MacMillan, London.

Leathwood, C & Read, B 2009, *Gender and the Changing face of higher education. A feminized future?* The Society for Research into Higher Education, London.

Machado-Taylor, M, Özkanlı, Ö, White, K & Bagilhole, B 2007, 'Breaking the Barriers to women achieving seniority in Universities', paper presented to EAIR Forum, Innsbruck.

Marshall, J 1984, *Women managers travellers in a male world,* John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

Meek, L 2003, 'Governance and management of Australian higher education: enemies within and without', in Amaral, A, Meek, L & Larsen, I (eds.) *The higher education managerial revolution?* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Morley, L 1994, 'Glass Ceiling or Iron Cage: Women in UK Academia', *Gender, Work and Organization,* 1(4): 194-204

Morley, L 1999, *Organising Feminisms: The micropolitics of the academy,* Macmillan, London.

Morley, L 2005, *Gender equity in Commonwealth higher education,* Women's Studies International Forum, 28(2-3), pp. 209-221.

MTSS 2009, Statistics indicators of women and men in labour market. Retrieved from <http://www.mtss.gov.pt>.

Musselin, C 2008, 'Towards a sociology of academic work' in Amaral, A, Musselin, C & Bleikie, I (eds.), *From governance to identity. A festschrift for Mary Henkel*, Springer, 47-56.

Neave, G & van Vught, F 1994. *Changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe.* Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Nogueira, C, Constança, P & Amâncio, L 1995. 'Women in management in Portugal. A demographic overview'. *Gender, Management and Science*. pp. 207-218.

Oakley, A 2001, 'Foreword' in Brooks, A and Mackinnon, A (eds) *Gender and the Restructured University,* Buckingham: Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press

OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) 2006, *Women in Scientific Careers: Understanding the Potential.* OECD, Paris.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) 2007, *Education at a glance 2007.* OECD. Paris.

Olssen, M & Peters, M 2005, 'Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism'. *Journal of Education Policy,* 20(3), 313-345.

Portugal. *Law, 62/07* of 10 Setember 2007.

Prichard, C 1996, 'Managing universities: is it men's work?', in Collinson, D, & Hearn, J (eds), *Men as managers, managers as men: Critical perspectives on men, masculinities and managements,* Sage, London, pp. 227-238.

Reed, M 2002, 'New managerialism, professional power and organisational governance in UK universities: A review and assessment', in Amaral, A, Jones, G & Karseth, B (eds), *Governing higher education: National perspectives on institutional governance*, Kluwer University Publishers, Dordrecht, pp. 163-185

Sagaria, M & Agans, L 2006, *Gender Equality in US Higher Education: International Framing and Institutional Realities.* Research Institute for Higher Education. Japan: Hiroshima University.

Santiago, R & Carvalho, T 2004, 'Effects of Managerialism on the perceptions of Higher Education in Portugal', *Higher Education Policy*, 17(4): 427-444.

Santiago, R & Carvalho, T 2008, 'Academics in a new work environment: The impact of New Public Management on work conditions'. *Higher Education Quarterly,* 62(3), pp.204-223.

Saunderson, W 2002, 'Women, academia and identity: Constructions of equal opportunities in the 'New Managerialism' – A case of lipstick on the gorilla?' *Higher Education Quarterly,* 56(4), pp. 376-406.

Sheppard, D1996, 'Organisations, power and sexuality: The image and self-image of women managers', in Hearn, J, Sheppard, D, Tancred-Sheriffe, P & Burrel, G (eds), *The sexuality of organisations*, Sage, London, pp. 139-157.

Thomas R & Davies A 2002, 'Gender and New Public Management: Reconstituting Academic Subjectivities', *Gender, Work and Organization,* 9(4), pp.372-397.

Trowler, P 2001, 'Captured by the discourse? The socially constitutive power of new higher education discourse in the UK', *Organization*, 8(2), pp. 183-201.

van der Brink, M, Browns, M & Waslander, S 2006, 'Does excellence have a gender? A national research study on recruitment and selection procedures for professoriat appointments in The Netherlands', *Employee Relations* 28(6), pp. 523-539.

West, C & Zimmerman, D 1991, 'Doing gender', in Lorber, J & Farrell, S (eds), *The Social Construction of Gender,* Newbury Park, Sage.

White, K 2003, 'Women and Leadership in Higher Education in Australia', *Tertiary Education and Management,* 9(1), pp. 45-60.

White, K 2004, 'The Leaking Pipeline: Women Postgraduate and Early Career Researchers in Australia', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(4), pp. 227-241.

Winchester, H, Lorenzo, S, Browning & Chesterman, C (2006). 'Academic women's promotions in Australian universities', *Employee Relations* 28(6), 505-522.

Witz, A 1992, *Professions and patriarchy,* Routledge, London.

Yeatman, A 1995, 'The gendered management of equity-oriented change in higher education', in Smyth, J (ed.) *Academic Work,* Buckingham: Open University Press, pp. 194-205.