

**“There Is Something We Haven’t Talked About Yet”.  
Neapolitan Ice Cream as Gendered Academic  
Organization in Chilean Universities**

**“Hay un tema que no hemos conversado”.  
La cassata como organización académica generizada  
en las universidades chilenas**

**Marcela Mandiola<sup>1</sup>, Nicolás Ríos<sup>2</sup> y Alejandro Varas<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile

<sup>2</sup> Universidad de Barcelona, España

<sup>3</sup> Universidad de Playa Ancha, Chile

### **Abstract**

This work offers an analysis of the practices that articulate Chilean academia using a gender performative approach, a discursive perspective and an organizational scope. Following the Logics of Critical Explanation, we discursively analyze interviews of academics, studying Neapolitan ice cream as a metaphor for the gendered organization of academic practices. The results reveal the social and political logics that constitute a gendered and genderized stratification of academic organizations, where masculinized research and feminized teaching are shaped as nodal points, while polymorphous extension operates from its ambiguity. Finally, from a fantasmatic logic, it is discussed how academic practices are constituted by management, which challenges the visibilization of resistances within contemporary Chilean academia.

**Keywords:** academic organizations, academic practices, Chilean universities, discourse, gender

---

**Post to:**

Marcela Mandiola

Universidad Alberto Hurtado. Erasmo Escala 1835, Santiago, Chile.

academiaygenero@gmail.com

Agradecimientos a FONDECYT 11121353 y a CONICYT PIA SOCH180025.

---

© 2019 PEL, <http://www.pensamientoeducativo.org> - <http://www.pel.cl>

ISSN: 0719-0409      DDI: 203.262, Santiago, Chile  
doi: 10.7764/PEL.56.1.2019.10

---

## Resumen

Este trabajo ofrece un análisis de las prácticas que articulan la academia chilena acudiendo a un enfoque performativo de género, una perspectiva discursiva y una mirada organizacional. Siguiendo las Lógicas de Explicación Crítica (LEC), se analizan discursivamente entrevistas a académicxs, indagando en la cassata como metáfora de la organización generizada de las prácticas académicas. Los resultados permiten develar las lógicas sociales y políticas que constituyen una estratificación generizada y generizante de las organizaciones académicas, donde la investigación masculinizada y la docencia feminizada se conforman como puntos nodales, mientras la extensión polimorfa opera desde su ambigüedad. Finalmente, desde una lógica fantasmática, se discute cómo las prácticas académicas son constituidas por la gestión, lo cual genera desafíos para visibilizar las resistencias dentro del contexto contemporáneo de la academia chilena.

**Palabras clave:** discurso, género, organizaciones académicas, prácticas académicas, universidades chilenas

## Introduction

In recent years we have witnessed a series of international debates regarding the transformation of gender relations in economic, political, and social structures. With the broadening of their scope and contexts of relevance, these discussions have contributed to emphasize the masculine and heterosexual order that sustains the most diverse situations of discrimination, harassment, and sexual and gender violence. Education—and particularly academia—has not been exempt from these processes. In the case of Chile, they have manifested themselves in the emergence of the feminist movement by Latinx<sup>1</sup> students and the new alliances between feminism and academia in light of demands for a non-sexist education and the battle against sexual violence at universities.

Since this is a practice that represents organized working life and which exerts a reflective role of social existence through the production of knowledge, this context has been placing academia among the new “objects” that require critical understanding of their processes. It is also a point in time that draws critical views of feminism regarding the organizational transformations in academia, considering the trajectory of Chilean universities subsequent to 1980. This trajectory refers to a process of privatization, commodification (35 private and 18 public university institutions), increasing international integration, and massification and feminization of enrollment—in 2017 enrollment reached 52.1% women in undergraduate studies and 51.7% in graduate studies (Conicyt, 2018), which coexists with persistent inequalities between men and women in research (40% of projects awarded were led by women versus 60% led by men, Conicyt, 2018), job protection, teaching commitment, and segregation by subjects and areas of knowledge, which in 2016 could be observed in female doctorate graduation rates reaching 58.9% in health and social services, 53.1% in education, 30.9% in engineering, and 38.1% in sciences (Conicyt, 2018).

In this effort to investigate the relationships between academia and gender within a community of practice, this paper provides an analysis of Chilean academia and the way in which its organization compromises social and political logics. At the same time, it shows the manner of articulation of these processes of generalization and hierarchization of research, teaching, and outreach practices—the components of the so-called the Neapolitan ice cream<sup>2</sup>—as well as their relationship with a hegemonic heterocentric and masculine order. In order to do that, we analyze the contextualized self-interpretations of various Latinx academics regarding their practice, through interviews conducted over four years of research, questioning the neutrality of Neapolitan ice cream as a metaphor for the generalized organization of academic practices in Chilean universities.

---

<sup>1</sup> In feminist literature various proposals have been made to challenge sexism in language. In an effort to overcome the presumed scope of the masculine article dictated by the norms of the Real Academia Española (RAE), the authority on the Spanish language, one of these proposals has been the simultaneous use of feminine and masculine articles. However, this strategy is often questioned as it introduces a binary language formula. Because of this, the use of the “x” instead of gendered terms has emerged as an alternative to sexism and binarism. [Translator’s note: The relevant articles and pronouns for groups in English are already gender-neutral (they, the students, the teachers, etc.), and thus there is no direct translation of the term *lx*, used in place of the gendered Spanish article *los/las*. Principally in the United States the term *Latinx* (a gender-neutral version of the plural terms *latinos/latinas*) has recently emerged, which shall be used in this article in place of *lx* where appropriate. Otherwise, the usual, gender-neutral articles shall be used.

<sup>2</sup> A multi-layered Italian ice cream of chocolate, strawberry and vanilla flavors.

### Placing Research in Gender and Academia in Latin America and Chile

The relationship between academia and gender has become a field of research and intervention that is characterized by a theoretical-methodological breadth and variety that has enabled them to be discussed in different contexts and historical periods of the university. Within this diversity, one of the problems that emerge is the invisibilization and exclusion of women, from which epistemological and political interest is revealed by analyzing and intervening in university spaces.

From an international perspective, the studies conducted in this area can be distinguished and grouped depending on how they understand and apply the concept of gender. On the one hand, there are papers that view it as an “identitary” issue, a perspective that is well exemplified by research whose emphasis is on the discrimination experienced by women in academia (De Armas & Venegas, 2016; Diaz & Dema, 2013; Hart, 2014; Maurer, 2010; Moncayo & Pinzón, 2013). On the other hand, some studies can be classed as viewing gender in a “relational” manner, emphasizing the influence of organizational structures and dynamics in the construction of gender in academia (Bird, 2011; Cortez & Hersant, 2016; Fisher & Kinsey, 2014; Fotaki, 2013; Mandiola & Varas, 2018; Van der Brink & Stobbe, 2009). In this vein, we should mention studies that have adopted approaches to gender in conjunction with other inequalities from an “intersectional” perspective (Johansson & Sliwa, 2014; Misiaszek, 2015; Sang, Al-Dajani, & Özbilgin, 2013). And finally, it is possible to point to other initiatives that have made feminist methodologies the subject of study because of their impact in addressing a traditionally masculine environment (Jenkins, 2014; Martínez-Alemán, 2014; Ríos, Mandiola, & Varas, 2017).

However, studies in this field can alternatively be distinguished by their territories of geopolitical deployment (Anh Nguyet, 2012; Erden-Aki, Ozcelik-Eroglu & Uslu, 2015; Gálvez, 2015; Ogbogu & Bisiriyu, 2012; Wullum Nielsen, 2014), considering that the analysis of the university from the perspective of gender, as an organizational and work scenario, is emerging in Chile and Latin America, with a greater orientation toward its analysis based on its educational function (Rodrigou, Burijovich, Blanes, & Domínguez, 2010).

In Chile, a large part of the research that links academia and gender comes from a particular concern of Latinx academics, either in relation to feminist activism or its trajectory within gender studies. It is also possible to identify research promoted by universities or state agencies that have conducted institutional assessments of gender inequalities in academic life and scientific production (Andrade, 2013, Montecino & Obach, 1999). However, there is a growing volume of studies that focus on the labor or organizational dimension of academia, which have not necessarily adopted a gender perspective, but which have been more centered on reforms relating on academic capitalism (Ibarra, 2003; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) and the commodification of higher education, as well as its effects on the reorganization of work and academic identities (Fardella, Sisto, & Jiménez, 2016; Guzmán & Barnett, 2013). In the cases where there has been convergence between the examination of work, academic organization, and gender perspective, precedence has been given to analyzing horizontal or vertical segregation, oriented toward the counting of men and women from a viewpoint centered on the sexual division of labor (Saracostti, 2006; Venegas, 2017).

In this context, exploring the experiences of emerging research into academia and gender in the region is particularly useful. Something common to these studies is that they challenge the idea that the university only reproduces gender inequalities that come from outside, questioning how it actually produces them (Andrade, 2013; Buquet, Cooper, Mingo, & Moreno, 2003; Marrero & Mallada, 2009; Rodrigou et al., 2010). At the same time, they have contributed to question the widespread idea that gender analysis is equivalent to investigating issues of women as opposed to men, demonstrating how problematic it is to standardize women’s experiences, as well as their intersection with ethno-racial, class, and sexuality issues (Pérez & García, 2013).

This research falls within guidelines that bring together the aforementioned studies, although it contributes a gender and discursive perspective in the analysis of the practices of the academic organization, namely, teaching, research, and outreach. This is particularly relevant when it comes to overcoming perspectives that have operated according to a comprehension of gender as a binary identity, avoiding the question of how gender is produced in academia and how it becomes something that exists beyond the subjects that are part of it.

### Gender in Academic Organizations: Performativity, Practices, and Discourses

The organizational perspective offers an approach that allows us to pay attention to the ways in which gender is produced and reproduced in academia (Calás & Smircich, 2014). Seen as an organization, academia allows us to open up the *black box* of universities, investigating the multiplicity of practices that constitute it, the way in which these practices are organized, and, ultimately, how this organization articulates social relations. In this regard, it is possible to consider academia as an area constituted from a set of practices whose organization is not neutral, because it has real consequences for those who work in it. This perspective is distanced from the question of academic or gender identities (what they *are*), instead being more interested in the constitutive contingency of both categories (how they are *made*). In other words: how gender is made when academia is made. It is thus currently possible to find organizational studies that go beyond the male-female dichotomy, adopting perspectives focused on undoing gender rather than reifying its binary nature (Butler, 2004; Keli, 2009; Mandiola & Varas, et al., 2017). From these viewpoints, gender is something that is made and is not an identity, with meanings that are fluid and non-essential (Jeanes, Knights, & Martin, 2011).

Following Butler (2004), gender can be understood as the discursive effect of a series of practices that regulate the intelligibility of the subjects within a binary heterosexual matrix, this being a discursive practice on which social norms are based regarding the feminine and masculine. However, although gender is a mechanism by which the dichotomous feminine/masculine notion is produced and naturalized, it can also be “the apparatus by which such terms are deconstructed and denaturalized” (Butler, 2004: 42). Stating this implies adhering to a performative concept of gender, the effects of which can only be understood based on its productive reiteration (Butler, 2004).

Applied to the university field and to the study of academic practices, a performative perspective of gender is particularly productive when revealing the way in which it is reproduced in regulations, but also regarding the different ways in which it is subverted through practices which disrupt binarism and dichotomy. This perspective invites one to observe the effects of gender that entail the organization of academic practices based on their genderized and genderizing nature (Acker, 1990). This involves looking at how the advantages and disadvantages, exploitation and control, action and emotion, as well as the identities, have been conceptualized through and in terms of a distinction between the feminine and the masculine (Alvesson & Due Billing, 2007).

Insofar as both gender and academic organizations are constituted through discursive practices, the latter are connected to each other in specific ways, depending on the social and political conditions that mobilize certain forms of organization. In that regard, we will pay attention to the way in which the discursive practices of Chilean academia are articulated, constituting “nodal points”. According to Laclau, “any discourse is constituted as an attempt to dominate the field of discursivity, to arrest the flow of differences, to constitute a centre. The privileged discursive points of this partial fixation will be called *nodal points*” (Laclau & Mouffe, 2011, p. 152). Similarly, as Žižek argues, a nodal point is “a kind of knot of meanings... the word which, as a word, on the level of the signifier itself unifies a given field, constitutes its identity” (Žižek in Laclau, 2009, p. 134). By establishing nodal points it makes it possible for the hegemony of certain articulatory practices over others. From this perspective, it is argued that academic organizations in Chile are structured by establishing certain academic practices as nodal points where the discourses invoked by such practices will have a hegemonic role in universities, since they represent the universality of the academic field, dominating and delimiting the possible actions within them.

Although there is debate addressing the differences and similarities between Laclau and Butler (Butler & Laclau, 1999; Butler, Laclau, & Žižek, 2000), for the purposes of this study, what allows us to connect the two authors are their contributions to the political theory of discourse, their understanding of the processes of hegemony, and their position within post-structuralism (Barros, 2008; Kelan, 2010). Both Butler and Laclau offer clues to understand the manner in which contingent and reiterated practices of academic organization shape the means by which gender and academia are materially and symbolically constituted, as well as potentially subverted and contested. The methodological design of this study and the choice of the analysis process are based on this perspective, due to the centrality occupied by the political analysis of discourse.

## Methodological Approach

### Logics of Critical Explanation (LCE)

The study was conducted in three regions of Chile that concentrate the largest number of universities in the country (V Valparaíso, VIII Biobío, and Metropolitana). By means of theoretical sampling (Glasser & Strauss, 1967) 12 universities were selected (private, traditional, and state-run). In this context, 26 interviews were conducted with academics<sup>3</sup>, considering a diverse group in terms of gender, academic trajectory, and disciplinary affiliation. These interviews were active and semi-structured (Gubrium & Holstein, 1995), being carried out as an open interaction guided thematically by flexible guidelines. In each of these meetings, the interviewer examined the interviewee's academic trajectory and their academic practices. This involved describing both the way in which these practices were organized and the interpretations that the interviewees made of that organization (contextualized self-interpretations).

When transcribing the interviews, we followed some of the conventions of the Jefferson system (Potter, 1998), which allow us to highlight interactions in the narratives that are relevant from a discursive perspective in the analysis. Using the transcript of the content, we carried out theoretical sampling (Valles, 1997) of interviews and extracts according to their analytical richness, based on the objectives of this study. The extracts used in this article were coded using a different letter for each academic (e.g. "academic a").

In order to analyze the information produced, we followed the proposal of Logics of Critical Explanation (LCE) (Glynos & Howarth, 2007), which focuses on the processes of institution and reproduction of practices, as well as on the methods of response by antagonistic projects, processes that explain the formation of new subjectivities and, in this case, of organizations as such. In this regard, LCEs constitute a method of political discourse analysis, in which processes of explanation are deployed that contribute to the questioning of a study phenomenon, conducting "a back and forth between the problem investigated and the varied explanations offered to make it more intelligible" (Barros, 2008). That is to say, it is not a deductive or inductive method, but is instead retroductive, which in this case implies considering (and respecting) the interpretations of the academics themselves, without reducing them to mere subjective points of view, offering a kind of explanation that permits a certain generality (or transferability), providing spaces for criticism and respecting the specificity of the case being researched (Glynos & Howarth, 2007).

Therefore, according to Glynos & Howarth (2007), a science of social explanation involves the mobilization of logics, which must be related to the empirical circumstances in which they are expressed, in order to construct a descriptive, explanatory, and critical narrative. Following Laclau, the authors propose that the logic of a practice "comprises the rules or grammar of a practice, as well as the conditions that make the practice both possible and vulnerable" (Barros, 2008). In other words, logics make certain modes of articulation of practices possible and others are excluded or impossible.

Three types of logics are thus proposed: social, political, and fantasmatic (Glynos & Howarth, 2007). Social logics allow us to historically and culturally characterize the practices in a particular domain by identifying the rules that govern them and give them meaning and function. On the other hand, political logics permit us to explore how social practices are instituted, contested, or sustained through the identification of the hegemonic and antagonistic practices present in the discursive fields. And finally, fantasmatic logics invite us to understand how the subjects contribute to the invisibilization and naturalization of the socio-historical and political character of every practice, underscoring the role of ideology or fantasy by closing down the radical contingency of social relations. As Barros (2008) explains, it is through this type of logics that we seek to "capture 'what' characterizes a practice or regime, 'how' it was constituted, and 'why' it is indeed possible, thus answering the three basic questions of all social research" (p. 174).

The results presented in this paper are focused on social and political logics and their articulation with genderized and genderizing academic practices, leaving the final discussion as a space to develop the invisibilized or naturalized elements in the area of study.

<sup>3</sup> The fieldwork also involved carrying out classroom observations and analyzing official documents from the universities selected for the study. This clarification is relevant since these complementary techniques contributed to familiarization of the researchers with the work and organizational formality of university life, the daily academic life of the interviewees, and, thus, contributing to the interview guidelines.

### Neapolitan Ice Cream: The Three Flavors of Chilean Academia

The metaphor of Neapolitan ice cream, the traditional three-flavored dessert, comes from the compulsory nature of academic performance, since those who try it do not all like it equally: “The academic requirement is that one is the teacher and they say that we have to comply with the Neapolitan ice cream, that is, I have to do teaching, research, and outreach” (academic a).

Traditionally, the main functions of the university have been considered to be research, teaching, & outreach (Castro, 2004). The process of professionalization of academics, which in Latin America can still be considered to be in progress (Bernasconi, 2008), has been articulated around research and ignoring teaching, since academic productivity is defined primarily on the basis of publications and the acquisition of competitive funds for scientific activity (Theurillat & Gareca, 2015). Teaching is not the focus of doctoral education, peers rarely evaluate it, and there are no universal standards that allow anyone to judge who is who in this university practice (Bernasconi, 2008). Similarly, teaching at Chilean universities has, for several years, been characterized by logics of job instability or flexibility (Cerba, 2012; Guzmán & Barnett, 2013; Simbuerger & Neary, 2016; Sisto, 2005). As a consequence of this, mention is made of “taxi teachers” or *boletariado*, referring to independent teachers who are paid fees (Da Cidade, 2011; Jarpa, 2015; Reyes & Santos, 2011; Sáez, 2015), metaphors that highlight the insecure nature of teaching, with multiple employers; individualized and mechanized, in constant search of “clients”. The practice of outreach is seen in third place, considering the power relations in which it is placed with respect to research and teaching practices. It is spoken of as a subordinate practice: “Outreach is the responsibility of the faculties and their academics, since what is ‘outreached’ is their previous work” (Donoso, 2001, p. 185). This is, therefore, the outreach of the service of research and teaching.

In our study, the academics interviewed tended to describe their work in relation to research, teaching, and outreach, with a naturalized categorization of those tasks emerging, which makes the former practices two nodal points of academic activities. Outreach appears as a significant practice, but with a relatively minor level of importance. It was also possible to recognize management as a practice, but given its high degree of naturalization, the interviewees did not identify it as such.

One academic in a management position said at the end of an interview: “*There’s a topic that we haven’t discussed*<sup>4</sup> that has to do with gender, ok? And I, at least personally, believe in meritocracy... and therefore, removed from the gender status” (academic g). This quote reflects well how, for this interviewee, the organization of the practices that make up the Neapolitan ice cream is perceived as neutral in terms of gender. This organization, which is supposed to be pre-discursive or non-political, is tied to a faith in the meritocratic management of the university, which allows the interviewee to talk about gender to marginalize this concept from the academic field, reducing what happens there to individual capabilities, to personal effort, or human talent. However, the Neapolitan ice cream imposes demands and entails privileges; it is interlaced with administration and planning, which ultimately leads to a complex articulation of practices. What we will examine next is how the Neapolitan ice cream is articulated in the order of Chilean academia.

#### Chocolate: Male-oriented research

The practice of research is one of the main criteria for the assignation of incentives and assessment of performance, in a context where productivity is a requirement for academics and, in some cases, a determining factor for their economic income and their permanence in educational institutions. As one of the interviewees states:

When I started in academia I was younger, I got right into the thing, you know? Which essentially is the competitive thing, right? The issue of having ISI, having SciELO, having Scopus, going for a Fondecyt... I got into that, I got into that logic... which effectively lets you take on positions now... um, in the field, um, good, solid positions, let’s say, where you exercise a certain... you accumulate capital (academic b).

<sup>4</sup> Italics added by the authors.

The above quotation enables us to see the impact of a specific way of organizing research in academia in subjective and relational terms. The primacy of publications tells us about the central importance of productivity, understood in a context where accumulation of production is rewarded, ensuring advantageous positions in academic competition and guaranteeing public recognition by allowing the authors to rise in rankings. Indeed, the practice that defines excellence within Chilean academic institutions is research (Theurillat & Gareca, 2015), which, when oriented successfully and productively, reveals the male orientation throughout its organization (Carvalho & Machado 2010; Martínez-Alemán, 2014).

The quotation also informs us about the processes of immersion in academia and the experiences of socialization involved in entering this field. This immersion employs accepted and assimilated rules that mark out the trajectory of academics in relation to the production of papers and obtaining research funds. In organizational terms, competition lies at the heart of these rules, marginalizing other possibilities for academic organization, such as collaboration, solidarity, and collectivity. As has been investigated in other studies, social relationships of competition are an articulating element of organizational practices in the male-oriented order (Carvalho & Machado, 2010; Kerfoot & Knights, 1999; Morley, 1999; Prichard, 1996; Thomas, 2002). The same interviewee states:

We don't read each other... I published in ISI and I don't really care if they read my paper or not; it's in ISI, that's the indicator, you know? Um, I used, let's say, um, I accumulated greater prestige and symbolic capital with ISI or with *Fondecyt*... whether or not they read my paper is irrelevant (academic b).

This quotation shows how the contemporary organization of research seems to challenge academic subjectivities based not only on productive and competitive logics, but also on individualistic logics. In this context and by articulating itself as an individualized practice with little peer collaboration, the use of successful research is related to a competitive evaluation that designates winners and losers. This equation that links productivity, competitiveness, and individualism—as part of the principles that organize the rules of the game of research—is deployed in a scenario of inequalities that can be expressed numerically. When reviewing research figures in Chile and the distribution between men and women, it is clear that the modes in which they compete are not the same, and these rules are accepted, since the allocation of research funds is concentrated among men (Benavente, Dides, & Morán, 2008; Conicyt, 2010; López-Bassols, Grazi, Guillard, & Salazar, 2018; Rebolledo & Espinoza, 2016; Santos-Herceg, 2012). In this sense, the individualistic logic is tied to the male-dominated order in the organizational regime of the research practice, as has been noted in other contexts (Carvalho & Machado, 2010; Martínez-Alemán, 2014; Morley, 1999).

Along with the numerical findings regarding the gender inequalities in academia, it should be stressed how expert knowledge, constituted based on this organizational logic, is established as the privilege of a few individuals with an evident hierarchical superiority, which reveals the elitist logic of productivity, competitiveness, and individualism as organizational principles promoted in research. This genderized logic places interpersonal relationships, collaboration, and care of others in a feminine-dominated and insecure second place. This is mediated by formal elements of recruitment policies and the demands that arise from them in universities, as well as their incentive and performance bonus policies, aspects that have become decisive and that traverse the institutions beyond gender binarism. As one academic states:

If someone says 'ok, but what does a man need for this?' Damn, I don't know, because it's not like I work from eight to eight, it's not like I travel all year round... I don't know what it is, but luckily I found it and that allows me to have a relatively strong and successful career (academic c).

Since research is the preferred practice by which academic recognition is defined, examining it from a gender perspective is therefore central to analyze the supposed neutrality of its rules, as well as the gender policies in which it operates (Connell, 2009). And the fact is that the logic that prevails when organizing research can be familiarized with constitutive elements of hegemonic and managerial masculinity in the context of academic capitalism (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Connell & Wood, 2005; Knights & Tullberg, 2011). Describing research as a male-dominated practice implies that masculinity is not an attribute of sexed bodies, but a process of configuration of historical and political practices (Connell, 2009), which in the academic field are articulated in the practice of research, favoring rationality, objectivity, and efficiency in the standards of academic performance (Burris, 1996; Barry, Berg, & Chandler, 2006;

Carvalho & Machado, 2010; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Martínez-Alemán, 2014; Mandiola & Varas, 2018; Thomas, 2002).

Therefore, the relationships between research, masculinity, and hegemony can be understood based on the rules that organize this practice, which when met allow access to the regulation of the meaning of academic, status, and organizational control (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985; Donaldson, 1993). To say that productivity, competitiveness, individualism, and elitism constitute male organizational logics in research is to reveal their connection to the patriarchal dividend (Connell, 1995), which is accessed by those who meet the conditions to conduct research, acting in complicity with the exclusions of what does not coincide with the genderized rules of its practice and constituting a scientific elite marked by homosociability (Burriss, 1996; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Martínez-Alemán, 2014; Prichard, 1996).

Productivity, competitiveness, individualism, and elitism emerge as logics that constitute the organization of research, articulating with one other to create strategies that naturalize and invisibilize other types of non-commercial, free, mutually supportive, collaborative, fairer, and more democratic organizational practices. But they also put the practice of research in a privileged position compared to others such as teaching and outreach, which we will examine below.

### **Strawberry: Feminized teaching**

As an insecure practice, teaching is in a different position. Compared to research, it appears to be a subordinate practice: while research concentrates the ideas of what it means to be a proper academic, teaching is displaced from that hegemonic position. This subordination is expressed in various ways.

One of them is obviously job insecurity, where one of the most significant elements lies in low salaries (Cepa, 2012; Jarpa, 2015; Theurillat & Gareca, 2015), that is, in economic subordination. The practice of teaching is also largely marginalized from decision-making spaces (Theurillat & Gareca, 2015), that is to say, there is also a political marginalization. Lastly, while in research knowledge is produced through studies, teaching is traditionally constituted as the transmission of knowledge that is crystallized (Theurillat & Gareca, 2015), which results in an epistemic subordination.

However, these forms of subordination should be explained from a gender perspective, and in order to do this we will talk about a feminization of teaching as a genderized and genderizing process, as a way of understanding the subordinate position it occupies, as opposed to the male hegemony of research. Below we review what this process consists of.

One of the characteristics of teaching is that it is always carried out with another, in this case, the students:

We teachers make theatrical representations to the students on a relatively daily basis, right? There in front... kids that look at you, sometimes with rejection, sometimes with amazement, and I believe that that's where corporality is expressed a lot, isn't it? I think that in that kind of theatricality [is] where the body plays a fundamental role (academic b).

Teaching therefore requires that academics establish a personal series of corporal movements and postures. There is an emphasis on corporality, which is accompanied by the voice of teachers and their correlating gestures. While research conceals the body, but shows products such as papers or research, teaching exposes faces, hands, mouths; it is a body for others. This "teaching body", required to perform an exercise in front of others, makes teaching a performance, constituted from a "theatrical logic" (Bravo, Castillo, & Rubiño, 2012).

In the same vein, teaching is established as a practice where clothing acquires relevance: "I've been letting myself go, from something strict to something increasingly loose... I'm allowed not to wear a tie, wear sneakers if I want, jeans" (academic b). Insofar as the body is visible and it is in movement, clothing has an expressive, communicative role of a hidden curriculum. Clothing allows for identity changes that reconfigure the practice of teaching, games that shed light on didactics that are mediated and constituted by a body that seeks to be visible or invisible, that is, we are seeing a "body logic" (Hooks, 1994).



That said, this theatrical and aesthetic scenario is conjugated with questions made to the teachers that lead them to make much more traditional performances in terms of the gender norm:

The youngsters have lots of... they have a bad background, and well, that has a bad side and a good side, and that makes you become more involved... I do worry, among the things that we talk about and we see, well, now, what do we do with these? ... there's a lot of contact, yes, I... there are youngsters there, every day, sometimes very, very much contact (academic f).

Teaching seems to be a practice characterized by 'contact', where the body not only gives affection, but also allows an encounter to be established that stimulates other types of feelings and attitudes: concern and involvement, in this case. In the above quote, the contact is not only physical but also empathic: the teacher transcends their position to project their own desires in the students. Then the students become care subjects: they are no longer "kids" who "reject" you, but "youngsters", placed in a relationship of adult-centric subordination. Affection and care then constitute teaching from a "motherly logic" (Apple, 1997).

Feminization and maternalization relate to the progressive incorporation of the female labor force into the teaching profession in the last century (Apple, 1997; Skelton, 2002). The emergence of this process is related to the strategic change in the curriculum that required maternal subjectivity to compensate for the deficient upbringing of children in contexts of poverty. It is the logic of the teacher as a "good mother", caregiver, and repairer of the damaged childhood in the suburbs (Apple, 1997). This same phenomenon has been noted in Chilean academia by Berríos (2007), who states that "the position of the female academics is that of the educating mother who subordinates herself to the researching father" (p. 119). However, maternity is different here, since it does not refer to the role of women, but to the set of practices and discourses that constitute a maternal position, whether of men or women, in the academic teaching space.

Whether through theatrical, corporal, or maternal logic, teaching emphasizes corporeality, affection, and the kinesthetic. In light of these aspects we talk about a "feminization of teaching", understanding that, in Chile, this practice is associated with traditional traits that heteronormative standards have designated for women: the feminine becomes the nodal point of the practice of teaching.

We can thus state then, that in the academic organization, research and teaching follow a generalized division of work: the classroom can be equated to the home, to the private sphere, where teachers take responsibility for the educational work with students, similar to what happens with the reproductive tasks of parenting, care, and affection; while research, in the public sphere, either through papers or presentations, produces the academic knowledge valued in national and international rankings. From this perspective, the metaphor of the "house of studies", as higher education institutions are often known in Spanish, reveals its genderized nature. We will now review a third polymorphic practice with respect to the binary genderization of research and teaching: outreach.

### **Vanilla: Outreach, a polymorphous limit**

Based on the self-interpretations of Latinx academics, outreach is "conspicuous by its absence" in terms of the fact that very few mentions are made of it. Those who are involved in outreach do so in ways that reproduce the pattern of power and the questioning of its status stated previously. Outreach is not a nodal point of the narratives and is not commonly mentioned based on significant outreach or links to the surroundings, but in heterogeneous ways, appealing instead to very specific and individual practices:

It's the only way I have at the moment to relate to the surroundings, because I don't do other tasks that aren't for the U[niversity], so I get on board with projects with companies, but projects shed light on a relationship with the surroundings (academic d).

While research and teaching are jobs, the so-called "relationship with the surroundings" is defined as a series of projects. The former two are defined as productive practices carried out exclusively in the academic space; while outreach, by contrast, is defined as a projective practice: as something that has still not come to pass, something that may or may not be in the future. Its character is put into doubt and detached from the academic-work area, and this effect is also demonstrated by omission:

Ah, I forgot to tell you, something that might be very important [laughs]; I'm the director of the Social Relations Center (academic b).

The importance of outreach is invoked with laughter to counteract its oversight. However, even its importance is called into question by a "might be". Although there is a position of power in this practice (being director), outreach has a borderline or marginal character in the academic sphere, so it is not necessary to invoke such a position or status. This establishes outreach as a practice whose ambiguity puts it at the edges of the academic arena and whose organizational logics fluctuate between different variants.

One of them refers to the transformation of outreach into a practice of "publicity" or "marketing": insofar as research and teaching provide resources, outreach should promote such work by encouraging the loyalty of their clients: families and the state. Outreach, therefore, becomes the "sale of a product", of the practices of research and teaching as the products of an academy-enterprise (Samaniego, 2001). But from a gender perspective, this academic outreach becomes the shop window of this educational institution, that is, a way in which the university's heterosexual matrix reveals an "exhibitionist logic".

In other variations, outreach also takes charge of the cultural aspect and for offering a service to the community. The cultural aspect emerges as what can be delivered freely to society without the risk of losing value. In this sense, outreach builds an academia-museum, an academia-theater, or even, an academia-circus. That being said, this tells us about pleasurable outreach, where academia not only satisfies the appetite of the "surroundings," but also does so through a parody of culture, which uses music, painting, theater, dance, and cinema as apparel for an academia that resorts to the logic of "transvestism". Offering services, outreach sheds light on a welfare or charitable logic that often involves the use of the relationship primarily for research purposes.

From a gender perspective, we can clearly see how welfare refers to an affective outreach, a practice of fraternal and condescending love, from a protective mother or father to their children: reproduction of affection typical to a heteronormative family setting. However, in light of that logic, there are other coexisting logics of exhibitionism and transvestism. All of this as a whole constitutes outreach as a polymorphic practice in terms of gender. Therefore, the subordinate and marginal character of outreach, which puts it at the limit of the academic sphere, coexists with its projective, variable, and nonproductive character.

This allows us to restate that research and teaching constitute the nodal points of the symbolic field of academia, while outreach remains an ambiguous practice, which seems ambivalent and marginal in relation to the heterosexual matrix that generically segments and hierarchizes research and teaching. Outreach maintains a subordinate position considering the logics that organize these practices and, although it is detached from static categorization in this matrix, it neither manages to challenge nor breach the binarism of gender.

### **Beyond Neapolitan ice cream: The invisible and the resistant**

So far we have characterized the social and political logics that articulate academic practice, demonstrating how teaching and research are established as nodal points in relationships of subordination, while outreach occupies an ambiguous and polymorphous place. Likewise, we have questioned the articulation of these practices based on a gender perspective, a discursive viewpoint, and an organizational standpoint, which allows us to reveal the logics that operate in each practice and its genderized and genderizing nature. Male-dominated research, female-dominated teaching, and polymorphous outreach occupy a hierarchy in the academic field, in that order, corresponding to a hegemonic heterocentric and masculine order. Thus, the "Neapolitan ice cream" has been questioned regarding its apparent neutrality, revealing its contingent character based on the analysis of its constitutive practices and the social and political logics that are articulated in its organization.

The gender perspective, oriented toward the organizations and not solely toward those who integrate them, reveals how practices, standards, awards, and sanctions, the division of labor, and status, among others, make organizations genderized entities (Acker, 1990); that is, constructors and disseminators of a sex/gender system that not only regulates what happens in each organization, but also collaborates in the

construction/maintenance of the prevailing hegemonic sex/gender system in the social sphere. To say that the “Neapolitan ice cream” has been questioned regarding its apparent neutrality means contributing to debunk the presumed neutrality of its precepts and thus the expectation of abstract workers, without body, without emotionality, and without sexuality (Acker, 1990). The genderized articulation of Neapolitan ice cream presupposes and privileges certain types of subjectivities, while excluding and marginalizing others. Thus, the differences and discriminations that end up constituting an academic body have to do more with the way in which the work is organized than with the individual characteristics of those who put it into practice.

Based on a gender perspective, the study has allowed us to outline a series of questions that can be condensed into two questions: what would be the fantasmatic logics behind the social and political logics analyzed in academia? And what would be the practices of resistance in this national scenario?

Looking at the first question, we should dwell on what we understand by the academic sphere. In our research, we have identified this “object” as a discursive field constituted by teaching, research, and outreach practices, where the former two constitute the two nodal points that structure the field, and outreach delimits the borders. It should be underlined that, as a discursive field, formed by the differential relationships between the three practices (teaching, research, and outreach), the academic sphere is not a full totality, but is instead threatened by an invisible exterior. We have identified that exterior, located beyond the limits of outreach, as the practice of management, which is not explicitly recognized by the interviewees as a practice as such, but which intrudes on each of the three practices addressed in a covert manner.

The intrusion of management sheds light on its unavoidable presence as the fantasmatic logic that articulates the other practices. It can be observed in research through the uncomfortable tasks of applying for competitive funds and seeking acceptance for papers in indexed journals. In teaching it can be seen through planning and evaluation work. In outreach, the marketing element more clearly expresses aspects that are strongly linked to business management. But in addition, management functions as an extra-academic practice in terms of areas that are not described as such, including officials, managers, and those who are involved in university governance.

As for the second question, we see that it is related to what we have suggested regarding management. The intrusion of management, operating from a fantasmatic logic, hides the power relations in Chilean academia, and this makes the difficulty of finding strategies of resistance that dispute the power within it understandable. But also, the possibilities of resistance—particularly from a gender perspective—falter in the face of the academization of feminism, since this movement is seen to have become curricular content, a research topic, an institutional policy, or a committee or administrative unit. This academization, as an absorption and neutralization of political demands, runs the risk of subjecting university feminism to the management that governs invisibly. Feminism is placed on tracks parallel to those of the institutionalization of gender and the neoliberalization of universities in Chile (Rebolledo, 2014).

This is why the possibility of resisting and transforming Chilean academia implies raising the visibility of management as a kind of invisible nodal point with respect to the three practices described, revealing the political aspect in the organization of the academic field. In this sense, what *we have not talked about* is precisely what feeds and influences our practices as academics in the neoliberal, male and heteronormative university. Gender is thus postulated as a promising approach for this, since rejecting the quantitative and identity trap contributes to deconstructing the organizational complicity and its fantasmatic logic.

The original article was received on October 5th, 2018

The revised article was received on March 20th, 2019

The article was accepted on March 22nd, 2019

## References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and society*, 4(29), 139-158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002>
- Alemán, A. M. M. (2014). Managerialism as the “New” Discursive Masculinity in the University. *Feminist Formations* 26(2), 107-134. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2014.0017>
- Alvesson, M., & Due Billing, Y. (2007). *Understanding gender and organizations*. London: Sage.
- Andrade, C. (2013). *Del biombo a la cátedra: igualdad de oportunidades de género en la Universidad de Chile*. Santiago de Chile: Universidad de Chile.
- Anh Nguyet, D. (2012). Gendered academia in a market-oriented Vietnam. *ISEA* 40(2), 85-97.
- Apple, M. (1997). *Maestros y textos. Una economía política de las relaciones de clase y de sexo en educación*. Barcelona: Paidós Ibérica.
- Barros, M. (2008). Articulación de lógicas y conceptos: el análisis político desde la teoría del discurso post-estructuralista. *Pensamiento Plural*, 3, 167-178. Retrieved from <http://pensamentoplural.ufpel.edu.br/edicoes/03/08.pdf>
- Barry, J., Berg, E., & Chandler, J. (2006). Academic shape shifting: Gender, management and identities in Sweden and England. *Organization*, 13(2), 275-298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084060061673>
- Benavente, M., Dides, C., & Morán, J. (2008). *Estudio sobre las percepciones de investigadores/las sobre brechas de género en algunos productos estratégicos de programas Conicyt. Informe final*. Recuperado de <http://www.conicyt.cl/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Estudio-de-Percepcion-de-Investigadores-as-Productos-Estrategicos-CONICYT-2008.pdf>
- Bernasconi, A. (2008). La profesionalización de la academia en Chile. *Calidad en la Educación*, 28, 15-27. <https://doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n28.199>
- Berrios, P. (2007). Análisis sobre las profesoras universitarias y desafíos para la profesión académica en Chile. *Calidad en la Educación*, 26, 39-53. <https://doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n26.232>
- Bird, S. (2011). Unsettling universities' incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures: A case-study approach. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 18(2), 202-230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00510.x>
- Bravo, B., Castillo, J., & Rubiño, A. (2012). *Memorias de la experiencia de evaluación docente: la evaluación como representación teatral*. Valparaíso: Universidad Católica de Valparaíso.
- Buquet, A., Cooper, J., Mingo, A., & Moreno, H. (2003). *Intrusas en la universidad*. México, D.F.: Universidad Autónoma de México.
- Burris, H. (1996). “Technocracy, Patriarchy and Management”. In D. L. Collinson & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*, 61-77. London: Sage Publications Ltd. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446280102.n4>
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from [https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/butler-undoing\\_gender.pdf](https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/butler-undoing_gender.pdf)
- Butler, J., & Laclau, E. (1999). Los usos de la igualdad. *Debate Feminista*, 19(10), 115-139. Retrieved from [http://www.debatefeminista.cieg.unam.mx/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/articulos/019\\_06.pdf](http://www.debatefeminista.cieg.unam.mx/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/articulos/019_06.pdf)
- Butler, J., Laclau, E., & Žižek, S. (2000). *Contingencia, hegemonía, universalidad. Diálogos contemporáneos en la izquierda*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Calás, M., & Smircich, L. (2014). *Engendering the organizational: Organization studies and feminist theorizing*. In P. S. Adler, P. du Gay, G. Morgan, & M. Reed (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of sociology, social theory and organization studies: Contemporary currents*, 605-659. London: Oxford University Press.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R. W., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551-604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00160017>
- Carvalho, T., & Machado, M. (2010). Gender and shifts in higher education managerial regimes. *Australian Universities Review*, 52(2), 33-42. Retrieved from <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=573971028251613;res=IELAPA>
- Castro, A. (2004). La universidad como institución de conocimiento. ¿Una discusión pendiente en Chile? *Calidad en la Educación*, 20, 19-36. <https://doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n20.342>
- Cerpa, V. (2012). *Profesores taxi. El eslabón más débil de la educación superior* (Tesis de magister inédita). Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago de Chile.
- Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica, Conicyt. (2010). *Mujeres protagonistas de la ciencia*. Retrieved from <http://www.conicyt.cl/documentos/GENERO20agosto.pdf>

- Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica, Conicyt. (2018). *Participación femenina en programas Conicyt 2017*. Retrieved from <https://www.conicyt.cl/mujeres-en-ciencia-y-tecnologia/documentos/estadisticas-y-analisis/>
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. California: University of California Press.
- Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity. Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829-859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Connell, R., & Wood, J. (2005). Globalization and business masculinities. *Men and Masculinities, 7*(4), 347-364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184x03260969>
- Connell, R. (2009). *Gender: In world perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Cortez, M., & Hersant, J. (2016). Femmes et mathématiques au Chili. *Synergies Chili, 12*, 59-71. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313064216\\_Femmes\\_et\\_mathematiques\\_au\\_Chili](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313064216_Femmes_et_mathematiques_au_Chili)
- Da Cidade, A. (31 de agosto de 2011). El profesor taxi. *The Clinic*. Retrieved from [https://issuu.com/theclinic/docs/the\\_clinic\\_402](https://issuu.com/theclinic/docs/the_clinic_402)
- De Armas, T., & Venegas, C. (2016). Patriarcado y capitalismo académico. In Red Chilena Contra la Violencia Hacia las Mujeres (Ed.), *Educación no sexista. Hacia una real transformación*, 57-66. Santiago: Silvana Del Valle Bustos.
- Díaz, C. & Dema, S. (2013). Las mujeres y la ciencia. La escasez de mujeres en la academia, un caso de histeresis social. *100cias@uned, 6*, 149-156.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity. *Theory and Society, 22*(5), 643-657. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00993540>
- Donoso, P. (2001). Breve historia y sentido de la extensión universitaria. *Calidad de la Educación, 15*, 177-188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n15.454>
- Erden-Aki, O., Ozcelik-Eroglu, E., & Uslu, E. (2015). Longitudinal analysis of female authorship of psychiatry articles in Turkey. *Noro Psikiyatri Arsivi, 52*(1), 95-8. <https://doi.org/10.5152/npa.2015.7265>
- Fardella, C., Sisto, V., & Jiménez, F. (2016). Nosotros los académicos. Narrativas identitarias y autodefinición en la universidad actual. *Universitas Psychologica, 14*(5), 1625-1636. <https://doi.org/10.11144/javeriana.upsy14-5.nani>
- Fisher, V., & Kinsey, S. (2014). Behind closed doors! Homosocial desire and the academic boys club. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 29*(1), 44-64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/gm-10-2012-0080>
- Fotaki, M. (2013). No woman is like a man (in academia): The masculine symbolic order and the unwanted female body. *Organization Studies 34*(9), 1251-1275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613483658>
- Gálvez, V. (2016). The absence of remembrance on feminism in academy: A debate on human rights. *Femeris. Revista Multidisciplinar en Estudios de Género, 1*(1-2), 74-94. <https://doi.org/10.20318/femeris.2016.3228>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Glynos, J., & Howarth, D. (2007). *Logics of critical explanation in social and political theory*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (1995). *La entrevista activa*. Londres: Sage.
- Guzmán, C., & Barnett, R. (2013). Academic fragilities in a marketised age: The case of Chile. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 61*(2), 203-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.776006>
- Hart, M. (2014). Missing the forest of the trees: Gender pay discrimination in academia. *Denver University Law Review, 91*(4), 873-892. Retrieved from [http://www.tsulaw.edu/assets/title\\_IX/MISSING%20THE%20FOREST.pdf](http://www.tsulaw.edu/assets/title_IX/MISSING%20THE%20FOREST.pdf)
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress. Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Ibarra, E. (2003). Capitalismo académico y globalización. La universidad reinventada. *Educação & Sociedade, 24*(84), 1059-1067. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0101-73302003000300017>
- Jarpa, M. (15 de septiembre de 2015.). La ruta de un profesor "taxi". *La Tercera*. Retrieved from <http://www.latercera.com/noticia/nacional/2015/09/680-646039-9-la-ruta-de-un-profesor-taxi.shtml>
- Jeanes, E., Knights, D., & Martin, P. (Eds.) (2011). *Handbook of gender, work and organization*. Sussex: Wiley.
- Jenkins, K. (2014). 'That's not philosophy': Feminism, academia and the double bind. *Journal of Gender Studies, 23*(3), 262-274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2014.909720>
- Johansson, M., & Sliwa, M. (2014). Gender, foreignness and academia: An intersectional analysis of the experiences of foreign women academics in UK business schools. *Gender Work and Organizations, 21*(1), 18-36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12009>

- Kelan, E. (2009). *Performing gender at work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kelan, E. (2010). Gender logic and (un)doing gender at work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 17(2), 174-194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00459.x>
- Kerfoot, D., & Knights, D. (1999). *Man management: Ironies of modern management in an "old" university*. In S. Whitehead & R. Moodley (Comp.), *Transforming managers: Gendering change in the public sector*, 200-213. Oxon: Routledge.
- Knights, D., & Tullberg, M. (2011). Managing masculinity/mismanaging the corporation. *Organization*, 19(4), 385-404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508411408170>
- Laclau, E. (2009). *La razón populista*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, Ch. (2011). *Hegemonía y estrategia socialista. Hacia una radicalización de la democracia*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- López, V., Grazi, M., Guillard, C., & Salazar, M. (2018). *Las brechas de género en ciencia, tecnología e innovación en América Latina y el Caribe. Resultados de una recolección piloto y propuesta metodológica para la medición* (Nota Técnica nº IDB-TN-1408). Washington, DC: BID.
- Mandiola, M., & Varas, A. (2018). Educar es gobernar: explorando los inicios del managerialismo masculino en la academia chilena. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 43, 57-78. <https://doi.org/10.26489/rvs.v31i43.3>
- Martínez-Alemán, A. (2014). Managerialism as the 'new' discursive masculinity in the university, *Feminist Formations*, 26(2), 107-134. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2014.0017>
- Marrero, A., & Mallada, N. (2009). *La universidad transformadora. Elementos para una teoría sobre educación y género*. Montevideo: Universidad de la República.
- Maurer, E. (2010). *Reflecting on practical experience and a case study within the field of gender equality politic*. In B. Riegraf, B. Aulenbacher, E. Kirsch-Auwärter, & U. Müller (Eds.), *Gender change in academia*, 353-363. Germany: VS Verlag.
- Misiaszek, L. (2015). 'You're not able to breathe': Conceptualizing the intersectionality of early career, gender and crisis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(1), 64-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.957267>
- Moncayo, B., & Pinzón, N. (2013). Women leaders in academia, gender and stereotypes. *Panorama*, 7(13), 75-94. <https://doi.org/10.15765/pnrm.v7i13.433>
- Montecino, S., & Obach, A. (1999). *Género y epistemología. Mujeres y disciplinas*. Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones.
- Morley, L. (1999). *Organizing feminisms: The micro-politics of the academy*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ogbogu, C., & Bisiriyu, L. (2012). Gender issues in the recruitment and selection of academic staff in a Nigerian university. *Gender & Behaviour*, 10(2), 4751-4766. Retrieved from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/gab/article/view/83675>
- Pérez, T., & García, A. (2013). Situating women scientists with non-normative gender positions in the Colombian national system of science and technology. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*, 16(2), 47-54. <https://doi.org/10.14718/acp.2013.16.2.4>
- Potter, J. (1998). *La representación de la realidad. Discurso, retórica y construcción social*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Prichard, C. (1996). *Managing universities: is it men's work?* In D. Collinson & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as managers, managers as men: Critical perspectives on men, masculinities and managements*, 227-238. London: Sage.
- Rebollo, L. (2014). Aportes de los estudios de género a las ciencias sociales. *Revista Antropologías del Sur*, 1, 65-80. Retrieved from <http://revistas.academia.cl/index.php/ads/article/download/771/876>
- Rebollo, L., & Espinoza, M. P. (2016). Género, universidad e investigación. Una triada compleja. *Revista Anales*, 7(11), 155-171. Retrieved from <https://revistas.uchile.cl/index.php/ANUC/article/download/45234/47288/>
- Reyes, D., & Santos, M. (8 de noviembre de 2011). Los profesores taxis. El hedor de lo heredado: la desprofesionalización académica y su parque humano. *El Mostrador*. Retrieved from <http://www.elmostrador.cl/noticias/opinion/2011/11/08/el-hedor-de-lo-heredado-los-profesores-taxi-y-la-desprofesionalizacion-academica/>
- Ríos, N., Mandiola, M., & Varas Alvarado, A. (2017). Haciendo género, haciendo academia: un análisis feminista de la organización del trabajo académico en Chile. *Psicoperspectivas*, 16(2), 114-124. <https://doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-vol16-issue2-fulltext-1041>
- Rodrigou, M., Buriyovich, P., Blanes, P., & Domínguez, A. (2010). *Trayectorias laborales y académicas de docentes en la UNC. Brechas de género*. Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba - Unifem.
- Sáez, B. (8 de abril de 2015). Boletariado: platas frescas para las AFP. *El Desconcierto*. Retrieved from <http://www.eldesconcierto.cl/paisdesconcertado/politica/2015/04/08/boletariado-platas-frescas-para-las-afp/>

- Samaniego, A. (2001). *Las universidades públicas: equidad en la educación superior chilena?* Santiago: LOM Ediciones.
- Sang, K., Al-Dajani, H., & Özbilgin, M. (2013). Frayed careers of migrant female professors in British academia: An intersectional perspective. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20(2), 158-171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12014>
- Saracostti, M. (2006). Mujeres en la alta dirección de educación superior: posibilidades, tensiones y nuevas interrogantes. *Calidad en la Educación*, 25, 243-259. <https://doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n25.261>
- Santos Herceg, J. (2012). Tiranía del paper. Imposición institucional de un tipo discursivo. *Revista Chilena de Literatura*, 82, 197-217. Retrieved from <https://revistaliteratura.uchile.cl/index.php/RCL/article/view/24871/45032>
- Simbuerger, E., & Neary, M. (2015). Free education! A 'live' report from the Chilean student movement, 2011-2014 - reform or revolution? [A political sociology for action]. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 13(2), 150-196. Retrieved from <http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/5-13-2-5.pdf>
- Sisto, V. (2005). Docencia universitaria y la gest(ac)ión de la universidad sin órganos: un análisis desde la subjetividad laboral del docente en condiciones de precariedad. In B. Levy & P. Gentili (Comp.), *Espacio público y privatización del conocimiento: estudios sobre políticas universitarias en América Latina*, 523-574. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- Skelton, C. (2002). The feminization of schooling or 're-masculinising' primary education? *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 12(1), 77-95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210200200084>
- Slaughter, Sh., & Leslie, E. (1997) *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies & the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Theurillat, D., & Gareca, B. (2015). Organización de docencia e investigación en universidades: una exploración al caso chileno. *Calidad de la Educación*, 42, 123-160. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-45652015000100005>
- Thomas, R., & Davies, A. (2002), "Gender and New Public Management: reconstituting academic subjectivities". *Gender, Work and Organization*, 9(4), 372-397. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00165>
- Valles, M. (1997). *Técnicas cualitativas de investigación social: reflexión metodológica y práctica profesional*. Madrid: Editorial Síntesis.
- Van den Brink, M., & Stobbe, L. (2009). Doing gender in academic education: The paradox of visibility. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 16(4), 451-470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00428.x>
- Venegas, J. (2017). *Participación femenina en cargos directivos en instituciones de educación superior chilena*. Nota técnica Aequalis 251. Retrieved from <http://www.aequalis.cl/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Participaci%C3%B3n-femenina-en-cargos-directivos-IES4.pdf>
- Wullum Nielsen, M. (2014). Justifications of gender equality in academia: Comparing gender equality policies of six Scandinavian universities. *NORA—Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 22(3), 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2014.905490>

