

Negotiating the Line Between Masculine and Feminine Rhetoric Within the Academy

Amy Nishimura, Assistant Professor of English, University of Hawai'i West O'ahu

Abstract

Teaching within institutions that prototypically privilege the social order of language is often problematic for both genders, especially because we tend to occupy masculine lines of rhetoric. The “standards” that women adhere to are not always associated in the feminine construction, and when we question “standards,” the language base we utilize is rooted according to a patriarchal construction. When Luce Irigaray and other feminist writers argued that we must find new ways of creating discourse, she called for a complex construct, one that challenges the social order; that is, Irigaray and others asked society to consider shades of discourse that recognize tolerance, empathy, compassion, and ambiguity. This paper will illustrate how the masculine and feminine use language differently—in various forums, in negotiable lines between both sets of discourse.

Some of the central questions this paper will examine include, how does the way we use language in an organized institution, in specific forums, differ based on the amount of perceived power/privilege we have? How do male and female colleagues communicate differently yet along similar lines when it pertains to bureaucratic tasks within a University setting? Women's discourse, often misconstrued, is characterized along lines of pink-collar tasks, We metaphorically clear tables and manage tasks that others are unwilling to attend or wish to ignore. More specifically, we aim to reconcile lines of communication within the institution and use compassionate rhetoric; as a result, those who use such rhetoric are perceived in negative connotations. This work is often rendered invisible or marginalized in most work-place environments, but this paper will argue how these tasks benefit the University setting and how they might function differently in an idealized setting such as Hawai'i.

Introduction

The term pink-collar is prototypically applied to working-class, domestic positions; those who serve (paid and/or unpaid) in kitchens, in offices where paperwork is situated and underscored, spaces where painstaking work is undertaken but not always visible to society—this is a small shading of the identity regarding the pink-collar worker. She or he has distinguishable markers as she/he might work in a traditional diner, clearing dishes for patrons passing through, the person might organize events, often styling a room for a meeting held for others, and this person will spend a great deal of time doing chores that involve attentive listening, counseling, or advising. The latter is not work in the traditional, capitalist sense; that is, how does one qualify or quantify skills like compassion, listening, organizing, and demonstrating empathy in a structure that routinely belittles said skills? After all, this is a generally low-profile task that is extremely difficult to measure and in a University setting, a skill that does not always situate well among faculty. This paper aims to examine how the pink-collar task of gathering, disseminating, and communicating pertinent data in a timely manner and facilitating productive discussions in which all parties are heard and recognized is traditionally conceived as a woman's

role, consistently devalued by both men and women. I begin with a brief overview of the social order of language, contextualize how our primarily western society imposes a restrictive linear mode of communication in the workplace regardless of gender, background, social class and race, and I argue that pink-collar labor in Hawai'i is, at times, destabilized.

The Social Order and the Construction of Patriarchal Language

Twentieth century rhetorician Kenneth Burke (1968) categorized the social order of language as a system pertaining to order and hierarchy; in other words, communication is often established according to who has perceived social or structural power. For example, religion continues to center around an omniscient, authoritative position, dictating social mores, norms, and values. As society accepts these social codes, they become embedded in how we interact and perceive people. In large measures, these codes have remained unquestioned, people accept a social order that places patriarchy in a dominant position and matriarchy in a subordinate or sub-par status. Given the social code enacted because of patriarchal power, a dominant system—one that was primarily singular in how it functioned—was systematically traced into the social consciousness of western culture. We comprehend the world according to how it has already been constructed for us, according to dominant patterns of language and behavior that situate women as subordinate to men. Organically, this impacts the way we utilize language, and given the social order set forth within society, we fall into patterns of communication which construct an “us vs. them” dynamic. That is, we comprehend words according not only to prescribed definitions but by antonyms, or opposites. The word “masculine” is historically associated with positive characteristics: strong, aggressive, virile, and assertive. The word “feminine” is historically associated with negative attributes: emotional, weak, or passive. Thus, our language, especially that of American English, functions by way of opposites, of binarisms that separate instead of constructing a complex organism that is pluralistic in nature. In American society, the idea of assertive strength, of being associated with the masculine, is hyper-produced through all aspects of daily living: the workplace, the media, through various areas of propaganda, and this hyper-production is often perpetuated in one's home, by role models, parents, and/or peers. At times, this translates into a code of control or dominance which extends into day-to-day interactions and dialogue between people. For working professionals, a public patriarchy (Young 1990) prescribes how we engage one another, always mindful of a linear order, social and professional conversation reflect desires to maintain power and control. Though this seems antithetical to post-secondary institutions that encourage academic freedom, feminist studies, and ethnic studies, all destabilizing and evolving patterns of work, we continue to enact a frame that posits an aggressive, competitive atmosphere resembling hyper-masculinity.

In post-secondary institutions, do we, as scholars and educators, exemplify qualities that translate into able, efficient leaders, by treating colleagues with respect and/or common consideration as we engage in professional conversation? Or, do we repeat models of totalitarianism, set forth through the social order, one that privileges a restrictive communication process? As we use words like tolerance to express value for diversity, (a term linked to

equality), have we constructed larger pathways of dialogue that are circular or reflective? As Iris Marion Young points out,

Often, however, norms of speaking that I bring under the label ‘articulateness’ privilege the modes of expression more typical of highly educated people. Spoken expression that follows the structure of well-formed written speech is privileged over other modes. Speech or writing framed as straightforward assertion is privileged over more circuitous, hesitant, or questioning expression. (1990, 38)

Because we privilege speech patterns that signify confidence, those who captivate an audience are considered charming, commanding, or concise. Command, however, as Young points out, is part of a constructed code set in specific cultural contexts; what is not often questioned is why the “circuitous, hesitant, or questioning expression” (Young 1990) is perceived in pink-collar contexts. That is, why do we continue to malign circuitous routes of expression with feminine models contextualized according to definitions associated with “emotional,” or “ambiguous.” Perhaps one of the most problematic claims for this type of privileging is how antithetical it is when teaching in supposedly humanized environments. Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2000) questions how teachers and students become “automatons” playing distinct roles in the larger narrative of education. Continuing to stage our roles of teacher/student, administration/faculty, or senior colleague/junior colleague, illustrates how everyone may feel oppressed within a system that confines people to perform within a hierarchical setting.

Disruption of The Social Order

Starting in the early 1900s and evolving into the present day, a disruption of the social order was challenged by feminists Simone DeBeauvoir, (1989) Betty Friedan, (1964) Adrienne Rich, (1995) Julia Kristeva, (1982) Helene Cixous, (1994) Luce Irigaray, (1985) and others who discuss the confining use of western language and disrupt the binarism of masculine and feminine. The discourse these women constructed did not aim to re-create or reverse the established order; that is, their goal was not to construct an anarchical structure. Luce Irigaray, (1985) in particular, challenged the patriarchal order and questioned why women were being excluded from describing their own narratives and subject positions, along with their own *individual* feminine identities. Arguing for new definitions outside of canonical religious standards, in particular language based in western theology and philosophy, she states that we cannot replace the existing social order by overturning the binarism as this would only create a different yet similar, hierarchical structure. Rather, Irigaray’s (1985) work clarifies why society must re-consider the idea that “man” represents the transcendent nature of God—all things powerful and benevolent. Though general feminist theory provided a pragmatic foundation for women and men to analyze the social order, what was lacking, at the time, was an inclusive model of feminism, one in which various ethnic perspectives would situate a double or triple-bind theory. The double-bind or double-consciousness as noted by Toni Morrison (1993) and bell hooks (2000) situates the African-American woman through subjugated markers where

black women were objectified by white and black male authors; although African-American women are telling their own stories, especially in contemporary society, their hyphenated identities continue to situate them as signifiers, as agents who continue to pave a path toward social justice. (Morrisson 1993) The triple-bind applies to the “third-world” situation, that is, how is one heard and recognized without accessing the master’s tools and when she does, how is she represented in noticeable arenas (such as the United States) place that have social or perceived power? (Spivak 1999)

A text that offers an inclusive turn of recursive process is bell hooks’ *Feminism is for Everybody* (2000); this is a concise and progressive text positing that feminism is an all-encompassing term, not a negative, exclusionary ideology. hooks’ ideology underscores the point that feminists must analyze ways in which white feminism might exclude women of color: “we knew that there could be no real sisterhood between white women and women of color if white women were not able to divest of white supremacy, if feminist movements were not fundamentally anti-racist” (2000, 58). Though some feminists of privileged status accused ethnic women of betraying ideas of “sisterhood,” this argument situates that general feminism must examine structures of power within its own “inclusionary” model. Another claim hooks provides is that sisterhood is only impactful when we “confront the ways women—through sex, class, and race—dominate and exploit other women” (2000, 3) and that we need extensive political forums to address these differences. For those who teach at post-secondary institutions in the United States, there are multiple arenas where politics of gender, class, and race are broached. These forums are utilized in the classroom and in meetings where educators aim to engage students and one another about the social construction of race and gender. Ironically, but not surprisingly, is the difficulty of transferring difficult discussions to forums that involve faculty-only gatherings. In many contexts, these issues become invisible, managed, restrained, or sidelined by those who have perceived power and, at times, these issues are silenced or ignored altogether. In this context, how does one broach a model of sisterhood and/or how do we make others, especially fellow sisters, aware of their institutional abuse of power? How can hooks’ argument hold when various parties (gender, class, and race) fail to reflect on their subjective/privileged authoritative positions? Especially if there is a marked inability to acknowledge how one’s communication style impacts those around them, and when they may unintentionally subjugate those who have no “capital” within an institution? For females who have accumulated “value” within institutions of higher education, do they turn away from a feminist expectation because they are requested to offer models of communication that demonstrate tolerance, compassion, and empathy—words that often undermine authority? Or do we, as Jean Kilbourne (2000) points out merely pay “lip service to words such as empathy, nurturing, and compassion”?

The work of hooks, Kilbourne, and others reproduce what many feminists have stated about those who use patriarchal language: a lack of consciousness regarding linguistic construction continues to support a structure aiding the oppression of both men and women. Responding to this model in terms of race and class are ethnic feminism/s, modalities that

explain or suggest how othered identities are gifted with double-consciousness or second sight. In Nancy Barron's "Dear Saints, Dear Stella: Letters Examining the Messy Lines of Expectations, Stereotypes, and Identity in Higher Education," (2003) she notes the mestiza or self-consciousness her Latino students experience as they begin their academic journeys. She also notes the difficulty that ethnic and white groups have in "talking together." (2003,15)

I want to articulate some of the complications involved when people with a connected past, present, and future come together in "higher" learning. It seems that most of our difficulties working together come from our difficulties talking together. We really don't talk about color and our histories anymore, verdad? Actually, it's unusual to come together and talk together, as it seems we're more comfortable taking turns talking. We seem to accept that we know enough about each other, so, really, the only point in coming together is to be heard but not really to listen. (2003, 15-16)

Citing spaces of oppression whereby people of color have historically been erased, ignored, or silenced, Barron's article contextualizes how oppression works in an insidious manner, and how the seemingly automatic nature of dehumanizing others or the coded systems of "unquestioned norms, habits, and symbols, lay in the assumptions underlying institutional rules and collective consequences of following those rules" (2003, 26). When defined according to "everyday practices" and applied to spaces of higher learning, how does this oppressive station manifest itself within dominant and subordinate roles, among those with perceived power and those who are routinely subjugated, dismissed, or ignored?

Stratification of power and pink-collar injustice is prototypically reinforced along lines of domestication, family values, and heteronormative roles. (Young 1990) However, within the last several decades, gender exploitation in the workplace has become a site of contest where women who engage in pink-collar tasks are defined according to aspects of nurturing or mothering:

In twentieth-century capitalist economies the workplaces that women have been entering in increasing numbers serve as another important site of gender exploitation. David Alexander (1987) argues that typically feminine jobs involve gender-based tasks requiring sexual labor, nurturing, caring for others' bodies, or smoothing over workplace tensions. In these ways women's energies are expended in jobs that enhance the status of, please, or comfort others, usually men; and these gender-based labors of waitresses, clerical workers, nurses, and other caretakers often go unnoticed and undercompensated. (Young 1990)

Visible pink-collar work is attributed to the mundane and may include: setting appointments, making reservations for lunch or dinner, coordinating schedules, planning events, maintaining records/files, and other organizational labor. When Young points out that these tasks go unnoticed, this is true in several layers—as witness to several administrative assistants at my institution who plan and prepare various events, the people who walk into decorated rooms often sweep by these assistants without so much as a hello or thank you. On one occasion, I witnessed

faculty members sweep pre-assigned seats for assistants, leaving our “secretaries” to sit in a corner or off to the side of the room. Another way to view the invisible, what Young maintains as “unnoticed and undercompensated,” (1990) are tasks not easily identifiable because they include exploiting an emotional skill set, qualities such as attentive listening, responsive inquiry, dialectical engagement, and positive reinforcement. In work place settings, these items are not counted in a material sense, their value cannot be documented or written up in a report, the women who engage others in this manner offer their services and are, routinely exploited for their talent. The latter model, the less visible model, especially in a western construct, is not viewed with ideals of power because many patriarchal structures are built on ideas of independence—maintaining a norm of consistently striving for perfection and power without complaint, without need for collaborative support. The norm asserts that paying attention to one’s or another person’s *feelings* is soft work, not demonstrative of worthwhile in most institutional settings. Therefore, those who spend time listening to others, being responsive, or engaging in authentic dialogue are routinely dismissed or perceived as wasting time, energy, and resources. Instead of being valued or receiving compensation and acknowledgement for pink-collar efforts, women are dismissed or maligned for their efforts because there is little to no material worth in these jobs that are self or community assigned.

The Marxist model of labor exploitation focuses on a top down approach where communication is dictated and enforced; communication does not involve engagement and the worker is subsequently exploited due to coercion, pressure, or fear. This “distributive model” (Young 1990) of labor applies to today’s workforce, where women expend time and energy “smoothing over tensions” (Young 1990) and talking with others—*not talking at* but talking with others. Referring back to hooks’ point regarding sisterhood, it seems then that in post-secondary institutions, “bringing about justice where there is exploitation requires re-organization of institutions and practices of decision making, alterations for the division of labor, and similar measures of institutional, structural, and cultural change.” (Young 1990) In terms of gender balance and equality, part of my argument is that situating or changing the patriarchal lens will not occur simply by following lines of the status quo or situating more women into various sectors of the workforce. Change, then, according to Young and others, involves incremental adjustments to change and develops through language, self-reflection, and acute awareness of how we use and wield power. Still, another way of perceiving this point is that “women must re-appropriate femininity” (Minh-ha 1989, 16) and “when armors and defense mechanisms are removed, when new awareness of life is brought into previously deadened areas of the body, women begin to experience writing/the world differently” (Minh-ha 1989, 16) Minh-ha defines women’s subjectivities as shedding confined or limited spaces because traditional modes of discourse lack transmutability or transcultural flexibility. Her work traverses patriarchal limitations so that women and all humans have the ability to write themselves into a knowledge base that is less hierarchical and more humane.

Cultural and gender contextualization is, in large part, measured according to distinct standards set forth for us, we enter the world with social coding handed to us, and Minh-ha

(1989) asks us to consider various interpretations. If this is part of the question/problem, that a constant process for awakening and/or re-awakening is needed, then another necessary aspect, along with gender and cultural coding, is that of linguistic study. Deborah Tannen's texts provide some answers to questions involving confronting gender dynamics, politics, and communication in, *Gender and Discourse* (1994) and *You Just Don't Understand* (1990). As a Professor of Linguistics, Tannen offers various situations in which men and women re-examine patterns of communication and various social habits/constructions that lead to discord. In *Gender and Discourse*, she determines that power is an illusive model as denoted by Brown and Gilman, 'One person may be said to have power over another to the degree that he is able to control the behavior of the other. Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is non-reciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior' (1994, 25). More specifically, when we apply this to an actual situation, the teacher/student dynamic or parent/child dynamic are applicable. The author argues that anyone who has perceived power must re-think their own situational behavior in order to extract a conversation based less in patriarchal order and entrenched more in dialectical engagement. In other social arenas, perhaps at celebratory gatherings, we prototypically portray this alternative suggestion on a consistent basis but Tannen argues how specific modes of communication that are reflected in specific contexts might create an integrated knowledge in terms of how power, powerlessness, and dominant behavior work in tandem:

my purpose is to demonstrate that the "meaning" of any linguistic strategy can vary, depending at least on context, the conversational styles of participants, and the interaction of participants' styles and strategies. Therefore the operation of specific linguistic strategies must be studied more closely to understand how dominance and powerlessness are expressed and created in interaction. (1994, 32)

Citing examples of indirectness, interruption, and silence, the author distinguishes how these points reference a particular gender and highlight particular cultures. Certainly, for the point of indirectness, usually signified in the negative for Western models of communication, in the East, they serve as a noted form of decorum, subtlety, and nuance. For various modes of address, she argues that interruption might be viewed as contributing to a dialogue; whereas, in some cultures speaking out of turn, especially if you are considered "subordinate" is considered rude or disrespectful. In my observations, those who utilize the social order of language are often offended when someone speaks "out of turn" or interrupts when they hold center stage. Finally, various forms of silence elide both passivity and aggression, but silence also holds power in multiple ways. King-Kok Cheung (1993) asserts in that people convey powerful messages through a glance, touch, question, re-direct, or simple nuances of indirectness instead of an aggressive linear method of communication. As an ethnic form of feminism, Cheung's discussion adds that silence, instead of verbosity, demonstrates a negotiated power between speakers—the person in the position of authority listens attentively without commanding orders or even providing suggestions. Instead, through a specific question, re-direct, or by the act of

merely listening, the person sitting in the less authoritative seat is able to contemplate choices and suggestions thereby allowing him/her more active agency. At the same time, in *You Just Don't Understand*, Tannen argues that while women occupy positions of esteemed power, we are not allowed to communicate with the same authority as males (1990, 17). That is, we are punished for assuming the same lines of verbal command or aggression. While this impression is certainly accurate, I would add that we are punished by both male and female peers because of our pink-collar labels; at times, we are requested to carry more—we are expected to demonstrate confidence, linear thinking, and convey a sense of empathy and compassion all within the same conversation. As noted earlier, this requires a source of indispensable energy that is not easily defined, identifiable, or characterized. (Young 1990)

Returning to Tannen's point that when women use methods of communication which are patriarchal in tone and delivery, part of the question is, are they simply doing their job in ways that society expects or are women contributing to a patriarchal and institutional pattern which is destructive and oppressive? Are we conveying that feminism is for everyone or are we displaying an anti-feminism that exhibits Michel Foucault's (1995) sense of panopticon? Do some women trade feminist ideals in order to wield authority over those they deem subordinate and how is this decision made, how does a person perceive that another human being has lesser worth/value in a society? The author also argues that our methods of communication illicit several forms of power and that, at times, people misunderstand or make the wrong assumption about cultural coding or an individual's comprehension of conversation. Depending on the forum, the parties involved, and how power is distributed in various settings, perhaps a common expectation is that a woman who has institutional power should demonstrate a matrilineal persona of understanding and compassionate reasoning. At the same time, given the exploitive lines of nurturing and compassion that go unrecognized, perhaps he/she should not engage in labor that goes unpaid; yet, a failure to recognize how he/she is treating "subordinates," a failure to consider her use of socio-linguistic methods might result in resistance and subversion. Perhaps a fair approach is that men and women who hold positions of perceived power must examine how their use of language impacts those around them but what happens when women wield power in ways that make others, especially ethnic women, uncomfortable or silenced? Even more disturbing is when women and men fail to understand that "well-intentioned liberalism" (Young 1990) often leads to oppressive contact zones. The models of justice become increasingly complex when the well-intentioned migrate toward spaces like Hawai'i, having little to no understanding about the people or place he/she will inhabit.

Hawai'i as Negotiated Site

As a progressively Democratic state, one with a troubling plantation labor history and negotiating issues of postcolonialism and transculturation, Hawaii's image is largely a working-class trope. Propaganda helps to formulate an "aloha spirit," but the underlying motif is Hawaii's problematic labor history and the disenfranchisement of the Native Hawaiian people. Thus, the idyllic sketch of paradise is fraught with problematic issues of gender, race, and class;

however, communication between and among many “insiders” who live in the islands convey a situational and/or self-awareness useful for models of alternative patterns of communication in higher education. This is by no means a pragmatic lens—I merely offer a different, less western-based model of communication. In Hawai`i, the mechanisms for controlling dialogue are utilized but so is a method of “talk story,” and oral literacy as opposed to print or hyperbolic literacy. In many ways, obtaining personal information in an attempt to bridge the social with the professional, in order to release both parties from implied positions of power and to simply become acquainted with one another is part of the cultural dialectic. Generally, questions for “talk story” range from one’s place of birth to mutual acquaintances, but speakers do not move instantly into stratified lines of communication providing a testimony of one’s social status or material wealth. One of the co-founders of a prominent local press in Hawai`i, Bamboo Ridge, notes that “talk story” functions through idioms and a common dialectical speech pattern signifying a fondness for where a person grew up. (Lum 1997) Therefore, getting to know someone takes an informal tone—people engage one another on a personal level, inquiring about details that are integrative and based on intuitive knowledge. When someone does not attempt to comprehend how dialogue structures work slightly differently and continues to follow the social order or evokes an authoritative structure that is condescending, several interpretations are assumed. First, the person might be perceived as wanting to maintain a homogeneous model of power and control; second, the person might be perceived as privileging the heteronormative or social order; third, the person might be perceived as failing to listen attentively to her colleagues. Hawai`i is also a considerably complex site of negotiation when it comes to race relations; on one hand, the idyllic or “melting pot” image comes to mind. On the other hand, the troubling systemic pace of hegemony continues to disenfranchise specific groups of people; rather, those with social, political, and institutional power are often of a specific ethnic group or class. Given these dynamics, social coding, conversation, spaces of communication and power become enmeshed and simplified at the same time—people might demonstrate polite deference, might engage in colloquial/dialectical exchange without acquiescing to standards or hegemonic codes of discourse, might traverse between public patriarchy while negotiating a feminist model of communication, and they might disregard lines of social status, disabling a Marxist structure of power. While some of these points are no different from other states, Hawai`i continues to evoke an “ohana” (family) like stature conveying a paradox when it comes to power and race relations.

For at least the past forty years, the groups who have material, social, and political power have been the Japanese and Chinese, groups who have both suffered and benefitted from hegemony. At most social, political, and educational institutions, those of Asian American descent wield privilege—at times, they embody the prototypical public patriarchal model. However, in some instances, they also demonstrate a social awareness and empathy that disrupt normative models of power. In terms of pink-collar tasks, many Asian American women are supportive and encouraging of those who do not possess social status. Certainly, when considering the place of Nisei women, due to a cultural coding that emphasized responsibility, they were expected to demonstrate harmony, filial piety, and a strong sense of obligation to

family and community. (Hassell 1993) How does this social and familial bind work in an institutional setting where women in general are expected to demonstrate a sense of loyalty, strong work ethic, and a positive or harmonious attitude? Also, how might this function differently from work-place exploitation as Iris Marion Young has pointed out in her work (1990) regarding social justice? One way to describe how some ethnic women communicate, to convey a point is either through attentive, stoic, or rhetorical silence. (Cheung 1993) King-Kok Cheung notes that articulate silences are rooted in a specific cultural context, often valued in Eastern culture yet devalued in Western constructs. While silence does have pervasive power and is, at times, as dangerous as verbal aggression, ethnic women faculty use attentive silence in order to deconstruct their own power. As I have witnessed at my own institution, one faculty member in particular does not assert power in traditional methods; rather, she listens attentively to those who either need to talk through a problem or process a situation. Thus, she continually demonstrates a supportive engagement while simultaneously contributing to the overall well-being of the institution. That is, she supports young colleagues insuring a productive outcome that impacts everyone else in the community.

Certainly, in places of higher education, if part of our goal is to educate students about self-awareness and social justice, then readjusting our own roles seems relevant on multiple levels. As Freire (2000) states, authentic thinking and communication can only take place if everyone is perceived as a human being in which he/she has something valuable to contribute. Extending this into places of higher education and institutions where under-represented or under-privileged groups of people are repeatedly taught to render a submissive attitude toward figures of authority, many of my male and female colleagues work on deconstructing the oppressor/oppressed mentality. In a setting where students have been historically, socially, and politically reminded of their subjugated place, asking them to perceive themselves not as repositories but as active participants in a conversation involving their own education serves as an excellent tool to build cohesive and productive classroom environments. In this sense, various models of humanist feminism are embodied because we do not command a sense of privilege or entitlement due to perceived power; rather, we work with our students to insure that they feel heard and that they are not pushed to the edges or periphery of the classroom. Negotiating the boundary between teacher and student is not a simplistic task.

Pressing upon the importance of “talk story,” of dialectical rhetoric and discourse, instead of authoritative models of conversation provide people with methods to equalize power dynamics in a given situation. The hierarchy at most institutions is clear: senior faculty are expected to mentor junior faculty and junior faculty are usually expected to metaphorically clear the dishes and tend to pink-collar tasks. Inevitable recourse translates into the untenured tending to respective areas of teaching, research, and service in ways that are different from tenured faculty. Whether taking minutes during committee meetings, serving on various committees, or other service-related tasks, junior faculty must demonstrate both an agreeable manner and an ability to manage several tasks/areas at once. The invisible or pink-collar work seems to fall into distinct and fuzzy categories; that is, the senior faculty, especially women, are positioned in

some or all of the following: they serve as negotiator, as listeners, as organizing meetings, and/or serving as counselors/mentors but junior faculty also fall into the pink-collar class. This is not to say that men do not tend to these “chores” but as Tannen, (1994) Young (2000), and others have pointed out, their methods are often different from those of women, and, perhaps ethnic women in particular.

Michel Foucault (1995) has described power as an illusion, a seemingly invisible entity that is manufactured and human beings willingly offer consent; any particular individual can adhere a prescribed sense of control over a given situation. It is in the prescription of power that further aids an individuals’ sense of grandeur as he/she directs people who they believe are their subordinates. In a social/political institution, the hierarchy of who has power is clear due to organized lines of distribution—what is not often clear is who abuses their position of authority. It is probably a universal statement to claim that all workers simply want to be heard and they want their ideas/points validated on the most basic human levels.

Bibliography

- Barron, Nancy G. “Dear Saints, Dear Stella: Letters Examining the Messy lines of Expectations, Stereotypes, and Identity in Higher Education.” *College Composition and Communication*. 55.1 (September, 2003). 11-37.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. California: University of California Press, 1968.
- Cheung, King-Kok. *Articulate Silences*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Cixous, Helene. *Three Steps on the Ladder of Writing*. Translated by Susan Sellers and Sarah Cornell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Chow, Rey. *Ethics after Idealism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- DeBeauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Translated by H.M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Press, 1989.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Press, 1995.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*. Translated by Donald Macedo. London: Continuum International Press, 2000.
- Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell Press, 1964.
- Hassell, Malve von. “Issei” Women: Silences and Fields of Power.” *Feminist Studies*. 19.1 (Autumn, 1993). 549-569.

- hooks, bell. *Feminism is for EVERYBODY: Passionate Politics*. Massachusetts: South End Press, 2000.
- Irigaray, Luce. "And the One Doesn't Stir Without the Other." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 7.1 (Autumn 1981): 56-57.
- Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which is Not One*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Kilbourne, Jean. *Can't Buy My Love: How Advertising Changes the Way We Look and Feel*. Detroit: Free Press, 2000.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Translated by Thomas Gora. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Lum, Darrell H.Y. "Fourscore and Seven Years Ago." *Growing Up Local: An Anthology of Poetry and Prose from Hawaii*. Ed. Eric Chock, James R. Harstad, Darrell H.Y. Lum and Bill Teter. Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1998.
- Lum, Darrell H.Y. *Local Genealogy: "What School You Went?" Stories From a Pidgin Culture*. Dissertation. Hawaii: University of Hawai'i, 1997.
- Minh-ha, Trinh T. *Woman Native Other*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Morrisson, Toni. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. New York: Vintage Press, 1993.
- O'Reilly, Andrea. *Rocking the Cradle: Thoughts on Feminism, Mothering, and the Possibility of Empowered Motherhood*. Ontario: Demeter Press, 2006.
- Rich, Adrienne. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. New York: W Norton and Company, 1995.
- Spivak, Gayatri. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: A Critique of the Vanishing Present*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Tannen, Deborah. *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Tannen, Deborah. *You Just Don't Understand*. New York: Harper Collins, 1990.

Wittig, Monique. *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.

Young, Iris Marion. *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Young, Iris Marion. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Published by the Forum on Public Policy

Copyright © The Forum on Public Policy. All Rights Reserved. 2010.