

In my favorite passage, Busch explains that “the knowledge of prices in a free market is much like the knowledge of geometry.” To paraphrase: if the sum of the interior angles of a three-sided shape is not 180, by definition it is not a triangle. For neoliberals free markets are natural and always produce the desired outcome; however, the state must produce “legal requirements, bureaucratic rules, and audit mechanisms to promote compliance (and sanction non-compliance) with the new market-like rules” (pp. 15–16). Unfortunately, since institutions do not comply with these rules of the free market, they must be reshaped to do so. By definition, they cannot be 179-degree triangles. Higher education is just one of the many institutions that the neoliberals have been seeking to change by introducing commercial activities to public institutions and demanding privatization of institutions—or direct competition from the private sector.

Busch argues that these basic premises have affected administration, education, and research in different ways. By restructuring the administration of universities and research institutions, neoliberals have “undermine[d] collegiality and promote[d] managerial control and hierarchy” in the name of the efficient use of public funds (p. 48). They have promoted bureaucracies at educational institutions and government agencies to which they report. These are not efficient. Rather, college trustees and presidents repeatedly tell us, they must hire more staff to meet the reporting demands that the state has imposed on them. Meanwhile, colleges and universities compete for rankings and ratings, seek lucrative relationships with corporations who donate funds, become partners on research projects, and develop findings into products.

Busch is clear that these practices undermine research and teaching. Since educators increasingly compete in the precarious market for such contingent jobs as adjunct and visiting instructor, they cannot afford to do basic research. Neither can full-time and tenure-track professors, who must pass through the nasty, anxiety-ridden process of obtaining tenure by accumulating citations in orthodox (and prestigious) journals. And knowing that the STEM fields offer higher

salaries, students who are saddled with increasing debt major in the sciences, much as the state once encouraged Russian youth to become engineers. So, too, Busch’s analyses of MOOCs and huge lecture halls were grand. Yes, MOOCs do seem to be the progeny of the correspondence course that the nineteenth century glorified.

Although I very much enjoyed Busch’s analyses of these phenomena and thought hard about his suggestions for combatting neoliberalism in higher education, I loved his chapter on the plight of professors. To be sure, historically, professors have not had academic freedom, much as instructors who choose to write controversial tweets and Facebook posts do not have academic freedom now. But I adored Busch’s analysis of orthodox and heterodox journals, what sort of knowledge gets cited because of the academia-made hierarchy of journals, the sorts of knowledge that young professors therefore seek to produce to keep their jobs—in short, how the infrastructure of knowledge production limits the knowledge that can be produced.

Translated from the report requested by the “Sciences en questions” work group at the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, *Knowledge for Sale* is a great read. It is so well-written and concisely covers so much ground that it would be a terrific book for both undergraduate and graduate courses on the sociology of education.

Masculine Compromise: Migration, Family, and Gender in China, by **Susanne Y. P. Choi** and **Yinni Peng**. Oakland: University of California Press, 2016. 179 pp. \$29.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520288287.

JULIA CHUANG
Boston College
julia.chuang@bc.edu

In 1988, Deniz Kandiyoti wrote of the ways that women strike “patriarchal bargains” with the men in their conjugal lives, traditionally trading away autonomy and labor market participation in exchange for financial security (Kandiyoti 1988). Susanne Yuk-Ping Choi and Yinni Peng’s *Masculine*

Compromise: Migration, Family, and Gender in China continues this conversation. Their study reverses the concept, taking the male standpoint as subject and identifying the compromises that men make in order to preserve symbolic meanings of male responsibility, particularly as their own economic security erodes.

The topic is of special import in China, where cities have become sites of great wealth accumulation, and large numbers of rural migrants—who are still mostly men, despite the well-known imagery of the female factory worker—spend their adult lives eking out livelihoods in the urban informal economy. Choi and Peng carry out an interview-based study of 192 working class men in south China, a region where global outsourcing has brought factories and created a sizeable informal sector. The men work as security guards, construction workers, taxi drivers, and other various other blue-collar professions. Only thirteen of them work in white-collar professions. All are rural in extraction, meaning that they originate from villages where industrial development lags far behind, but a subsistence-oriented farming economy remains. This is an important detail. In cities, migrants live in marginal shantytowns, are excluded from many formal jobs and property ownership, and face exorbitant fees for their children to attend urban schools. But the traditional kinship norms of farming villages continue to exert considerable influence over migrants' lives in cities.

Urbanization has taken migrants far afield of their home villages, but men are still beholden to a set of masculine expectations held over from traditional kinship structures. They face parental pressures to submit to arranged marriages to women in their rural hometowns, unreasonably high requirements of financial stability for marital eligibility, and responsibilities to care for aging parents. These requirements were once reasonable in a rural society where marriages were endogamous and patrilocal and women "flowed," like spilled water, from their fathers' to their husbands' households upon marriage. But today, women often consent to patrilocality only under the expectation that their marriage partners provide a village

house or township apartment. This is a high bar for rural men to meet. In Choi and Peng's study, men received an average monthly salary of less than 3,999 RMB or 600 USD and averaged living expenses of 2771 RMB or 415 USD monthly; many postpone marriage proposals because they must save for nearly a decade before they can purchase village houses and township apartments totaling around 50,000 RMB (9,000 USD).

What Choi and Peng show through these stories is how men shift the symbolic boundary of proper masculine authority as they struggle or fail to meet these expectations. Most of the men in their study continue to espouse traditional ideals of masculinity—for example, they insist on establishing patrilocal residence near their own natal villages rather than their wives'—yet they compromise selectively on smaller household decisions. Most insist on patrilocality for mainly symbolic reasons: one cites his sense of "male dignity," while another fears that others will see only his wife's family's wealth if he establishes residence near them. But one makes a material argument as well, describing the burden he felt after he is left with the full responsibility of caring for his aging parents after his older brother "married out" by relocating to his wife's natal village.

Meanwhile, they cede smaller household decisions to women. These are not insignificant concessions. Most men in the study leave their wives with full authority of household finances. But they are not pure; women control household finances only because they remain back in villages, caring for children rather than joining their husbands working in cities. When women do migrate and work, their husbands feel shame over their inability to earn enough to allow them a lifestyle of urban leisure, their rural approximation of an urban ideal of manhood. This captures an angle that studies of migrant women miss or observe only indirectly: that migration may bring women increased household bargaining power, but it also subjects them to the spillover effects of the class insecurity faced by their husbands in migration.

Finally, it is notable that those men who fail to meet masculine expectations in cities often retreat to the countryside, where arranged

marriages lower the bar they must meet for respectability. In cities, all men grapple with a general culture of hypergamy, in which women seek to trade up, choosing wealthy and powerful men in a kinship culture where men are responsible for providing economic security. One man, "Ng," is moved by a higher-earning but compassionate girlfriend who chooses inexpensive gifts and restaurant meals, but then is crushed when her parents object to their dating on the basis of his precarious finances. When he is deserted by the object of his affections, he returns home, where his parents arrange his marriage to a local village woman, a tepid union to which he has resigned himself. This is a finding that complements observations of women migrants: because women can leverage patriarchal expectations to optimize marriage choices in cities, men fare better in rural communities, where traditional kinship norms yield automatic status and authority.

Masculine Compromise tracks as well the changing division of household labor within migrant families. Choi and Peng offer a spectrum of gender relations: in some families, men exempt themselves from household labor; in others, they strategically avoid it; still others accept household labor selectively; and, finally, some share household responsibilities equally. They organize their analysis as a typology, an approach that calls to mind Arlie Hochschild and Anne Machung's *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. Like Hochschild and Machung, Choi and Peng let their informants describe their own gender ideologies, then point out discrepancies between their claimed views and their actual practices.

One minor quibble must be made. Choi and Peng's study does not address widespread Chinese reforms, including a 2011 "New National Urbanization Plan," that selectively grant rural migrants more substantive access to cities. The validity of the study of course does not require the most up-to-date survey of rural-urban citizenship policies. But discussion of these changes could have allowed the authors to analyze structural foundations for variations in masculine practice. For example, do better rural

pension coverage and higher rural welfare subsidies for aging farmers weaken expectations that men establish patrilocal residence so they may care for aging parents? Likewise, does increased enrollment of migrant children in urban schools reduce men's expectations that women abstain from migration?

Masculine Compromise presents a true-to-life depiction of the experience of rural men living on the margins of urban society. It does so with subtlety and sensitivity, quietly documenting men's private aspirations and personal failures rather than attempting overdetermined structural statements on the character of masculinity under crisis. Smartly, it quickly references then dispenses with categorical terms like hegemonic or failed masculinities (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005), concepts too functionalist to capture symbolic self-definitions of manhood. One hopes Choi and Peng's approach will spur future studies of masculinity in other contexts of rapid economic change.

References

- Connell, Raewyn W., and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19(6):829–859.
- Hochschild, Arlie, with Anne Machung. 1990. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Avon Books.
- Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1988. "Bargaining with Patriarchy." *Gender & Society* 2(3):274–90.

Saving Face: The Emotional Costs of the Asian Immigrant Family Myth, by **Angie Y. Chung**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016. 223 pp. \$28.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813569819.

AMY HSIN
Queens College, CUNY
amy.hsin@qc.cuny.edu

The novelist Chimamanda Adichie observes, "The problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue, but that they are incomplete." Perhaps no other racial stereotype is so perfectly characterized by this observation than the Asian model minority