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ABSTRACT

In this thesis, a folio comprising a major dissertation and three elective tasks, issues including masculinity(ies), identities, leadership and academics’ work practices are considered against a backdrop of change in the higher education sector. Narrative research methods are applied throughout the folio.

The first elective, a discussion and commentary arising from an interview with an experienced practitioner in gender education, amounts to a feasibility study for the dissertation, whereas the second elective experiments with the use of computer mediated communication as a means of interviewing a small number of male academics about their inclusive teaching practices. Primarily curiosity-driven research, the conclusion is drawn that computer mediated communication, if used at all, ought provide a complementary, not primary means of data collection. The third elective conveys the life story of an Asian-Australian academic who expresses different masculinities according to the social settings in which he finds himself. The conclusion is made that there is neither a single colored masculinity nor a single working class masculinity. The milieux of race and class need to be considered together.

The research described in the major dissertation was undertaken with a group of eleven male academics from a number of rural and metropolitan universities -- men who were thought by their colleagues and peers to practise collaborative approaches to leadership. Whereas the majority of the men practised what could be described as transformational approaches to leadership, a small
number exploited the process of collaboration mainly for their own protection. Very few of the men engaged in discourses of gender. One of the principal conclusions reached in the paper is that there are ramifications for future leadership training that universities offer so that it becomes more relevant and socially inclusive. Another main conclusion relates to the intimidation reported by some of the men in the study, and that there are implications for universities in the way they protect their employees from such incidents. A third significant conclusion is that there is some way to go before gender is integrated into the discourses of male academics. Until this can occur, limited opportunities exist for alliances to be formed between most male academics and feminist academics for the advancement of socially just workplaces.
PREFACE TO THE THESIS (FOLIO)

INTRODUCTION
Masculinities, identities and narratives. The constantly changing terrain in Australia’s higher education system and new challenges for leadership. These are the core issues identified in this thesis.

Australia’s higher education system continues to undergo substantial changes and the core activities for academics who are employed within Australia’s universities continue to expand, whilst at the same time, the level of government funding and support steadily diminishes. Australia’s higher education system is, as it has been since the mid 1980s, in a state of constant change and is subject to the influences of new managerialist approaches that have been more typical in the business, rather than the education sectors. Against this backdrop, life within Australia’s universities is far from “business as usual”. The impact that these changes have had upon academics and their non-academic colleagues provides the background against which academe in Australia now functions.

This Professional Doctorate of Education folio, or thesis, traces some of the modes in which male academics continue to attempt to provide quality education, with the emphasis being on their varied expressions of masculinity. The emphasis throughout the thesis is on men who are leaders in Australian universities, whether that be through their scholarly pursuits, and/or through the leadership positions they occupy (or have previously occupied). The thesis, made up of a major dissertation and three related but smaller
research electives, also considers the use of narrative as a research methodology and as a means of representing the lives of these men.

**RATIONALE**

Feminists have rightly named, critiqued and challenged dominant male hierarchies that exist in Western society. Higher education institutions in Australia have not been immune from this gaze and quite properly, and although the notion of the existence of hegemonic masculinity is somewhat arbitrary and artificial, the concept has helped focus attention on the role that men play in the university system. And the men hitherto written out of the script and rendered largely invisible because they do not “fit” the expectations of hegemonic leadership include men of colour, and men of different ethnicities and sexualities. The way ahead for them, however, is not necessarily straightforward, for despite the gains that can be attributed to feminism, “Other” remains “Other”—men who are different from the mainstream (sometimes referred to as “malestream”) are considered suspect and run the risk of marginalisation.

Academics in Australian universities are expected to teach, research and to provide service to the community. Their tasks are being made more complex and therefore it becomes increasingly difficult for them to demonstrate leadership that ensures that all aspects of the job get done. Male academic leaders who are collaborative in the way they teach, and in the way in which they work with others in general, find themselves swimming against the tide—perhaps even several tides. Even though the concept of these men ‘performing’—as employed in the title of this folio—could be
considered in its more generic sense, the way in which the term is used in this folio is to signal the challenge that profeminist men extend to the majority of men who practise dominant versions of masculinity in their institutions. ‘Performing masculinity’ therefore, is a term that I am using in this folio to argue that men such as the male academics who pursue a collaborative approach are cognisant of the way they express their masculinity in their workplaces, or as Pease (2000, p. 15) states ‘men have choices [original emphasis] as to whether they accept patriarchy or work collectively against it’.

This folio has as a common theme, which is the variable expression of masculinity(ies) and how it is that male academics create and sustain their scholarly identities. The following commentary provides an overview of each of the components of the thesis.

**COMMENTARY**

The initial part of the thesis, Part A, provides selected aspects of my life story that help to contextualise and provide a backdrop to the research folio. In so doing, I feel that I am able to provide a sense of my own evolving academic identity — of how it has been shaped and how it has built upon my inner values and beliefs.

The life story approach that I have adopted in Part A resonates as well with the research methodology used in the main dissertation project and each of the electives, for I consider the life stories of groups of male academics from a small number of Australian universities to garner information about some of their work practices.
I conclude Part A of the thesis by providing a rationale for the research projects represented in the thesis. Later, in Part F, I reflect upon the learnings that I have consciously made as a result of my engagement within the Professional Doctorate of Education (EdD).

As an extended piece of writing and as the major research that comprises the thesis, the dissertation that comprises Part B of the thesis, considers the life stories of eleven male academics who are considered by their peers or professional colleagues to practise collaborative styles of leadership. Written as a narrative, the dissertation explores the way in which the men tell the ‘truths’ of their working lives in higher education; their leadership practices and how they cope with the specific demands of their roles in the midst of a constantly changing milieu. Scholarly identity-formation, of which gender is part, responds to, and has its own impact upon, the way the men demonstrate leadership within their universities.

The dissertation identifies several high points of transformational practice, but also areas of concern, which include the intimidation that several of the men report; the dissatisfaction that almost all of them have for the calibre of leadership training that is offered within their institutions, and the inability for most of the men to consider the role of gender upon their identities and leadership.

Amongst the principal conclusions of the dissertation are the need for increased awareness by senior management of universities of the health costs associated with bullying and intimidatory practices; the need for an invigorated approach to leadership training such as an approach that utilises learnings gained from the Productive Pedagogies movement, and the need to encourage ways in which
gender becomes part of the scholarly discourse so that alliances that already exist between transformational leaders—both male and female—can be encouraged. A specific suggestion relates to the establishment of Leadership Colloquia in and across universities that could be co-sponsored by two of the major stakeholders in Australian universities: the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee and the National Tertiary Education Union.

The first research elective was undertaken relatively early during my candidature in an effort to stabilise, challenge and extend some of the issues—very broad and not particularly focussed—that I had gleaned previously from literature on gender and educational leadership. These issues, contained in Part C of the thesis, were evolving as being at the core of the dissertation component of the doctorate.

Jeffrey, who is the subject of this elective task and who is a secondary school principal with a background in gender education, provided me with insights about his own experiences as a man who challenged hegemonic masculinity in an educational bureaucracy and who had also been involved in gender-in-education projects in a university. He provided insights into the various networks that exist in Australia in relation to gender in education and alluded to various groups, such as profeminist men, who are interested in challenging the way in which gender is conceptualised in the Victorian State School System. And although Jeffrey’s focus was principally on men as educational leaders, he also spoke of the implication for boys’ education. He also emphasised that although educational workplaces may well be the arenas for contestation, they can also be nurturing places.
The refereed conference paper in Part D of the thesis is the representation of a project in which the use of e-mail communication as a medium for having repeated conversations with a number of male academics about their inclusive teaching practices was trialled.

The study met with mixed results: on one hand, it provided an opportunity for the respondents to express how they teach inclusively; on the other, the study made it apparent that the use of e-mails alone did not facilitate communication with the respondents. The implication for research is to ensure that the communication is primarily of a personal, face-to-face nature with the use of e-mails providing a complementary, rather than a primary means of data gathering.

The final research elective in Part E, another refereed conference paper, again uses a narrative genre to convey the complex connectedness that exists between class, ethnicity(ies) and masculinity(ies). The story is of Ian, a successful academic who describes himself as Eurasian, and traces his development through parts of his childhood and into his professional career, using what Gough (1994, p. 17) describes as a ‘realistic fiction’. Relevant literature on masculinities and ethnicity is considered. There is some evidence to suggest that Ian has developed a fluid version of masculinity as a result of his Asian-Australian upbringing, and that he expresses different masculinities according to the social settings in which he finds himself. The paper concludes that masculinity interacts in a complex manner, along with class and ethnicity. This accords with Connell’s (1995) caution that it is dangerous to think
that there is a single coloured masculinity or a single working class masculinity. The milieux of class and race need to be considered as well.

In the closing section of the thesis, Part F, I take time to reflect on two main areas. The first is upon the research projects that I have undertaken, and the second is in relation to the implications of the EdD on my work practices and my realisation that it is not enough for me to find my “voice”; it is necessary to turn “voice” into action.
PART A:

PROLOGUE:

MY STORY
A FAMILY STORYLINE

One of my family storylines relates to my father returning to Cobram in northern Victoria in the 1930s after some years of schooling at South Melbourne Technical School, only to find himself unable to gain a job despite his qualifications. The reason for this, it was concluded, was because local employers did not want to hire the Australian-born son of the area’s first Lebanese family, despite the very appropriate qualifications he held. The story was never told to convey a sense of bitterness, but more as an explanation as to why my father felt forced to become an orchardist like his own father, rather than to pursue a career in engineering. I’m left wondering—but certainly not troubled, maybe even thankful—how it is that my father’s experience has influenced my own view of the world and the passion that I now have around issues affecting people from minority groups, particularly those whom I teach.

From very early in my teaching career, a career that began in 1973, I have taught in a wide variety of teaching contexts in addition to primary teaching, which included being a kindergarten teacher in a special school, my teaching career includes time as a physical education teacher, drama teacher, teaching in prisons, teaching Aboriginal students at a TAFE institute, teaching in industry as well as teaching in universities.
BECOMING AN ACADEMIC

Appointed initially to the Wodonga Institute of Tertiary Education in 1990, my role was to provide academic support for students enrolled in the few courses on offer and to develop a bridging program so that students from government-targeted equity groups could access higher education. The institution was a young one—there was little history of research in WITE and the emphasis was on teaching. The relatively small number of staff—our names could all easily be assembled together on a single A4 page—came to the Institute with much enthusiasm but with little academic experience. Very few of the staff had more than a bachelors degree in their respective disciplines, and upon incorporation into La Trobe University in 1991, there was pressure to not only gain higher degrees, but to also pursue research initiatives. Eventually, primarily with the help of my colleagues, whilst completing a Masters degree (by coursework and major research project), I became partially literate in research methodologies and conducted a research project with a group of environmental volunteers. Even though I wrote about the project with much enthusiasm and using a multi-layered genre, I concluded the research project feeling much less confident than when I started it. The absence of instruction, direction and supervision for the conduct of research meant that I felt largely self-taught—and I was not at all sure that I had got it at all right. Up until I left the University in 1995, I felt that I was beginning to know what life as an academic could be. And I liked it.
IMMERSION IN ENTREPRENEURISM

The company to which I moved early in 1995 after leaving the University, was The Uncle Tobys Company, a large food processing company, which at that stage at least, had a reputation for its commitment to training. I was appointed within the Human Resources Department with a principal responsibility for developing and conducting team-based training via the Company’s training centre. In this environment, I learnt much about many entrepreneurial aspects of private business, including customer satisfaction, quality assurance, business promotion and the competitive nature of private enterprise. This was initially challenging and it took me several months to find a niche for myself in this environment. It was an enlightening experience and for two and a half years, not only was I involved in all aspects of training, but also in initiating programs, writing submissions and developing company-wide policy on matters such as anti-sexual harassment and critical incident stress management.

The period away from academia saw me working not only with The Uncle Tobys Company, but after I left the Company, with a palliative care agency where I was employed as a loss and grief educator, a relatively short stint with another university working in a staff development role, a few private consultancies and the on-going and successful running by my partner and I of two small businesses—one an art-based business; the other a guest accommodation business. I had become immersed in a very different way of being and, as a result, had developed a much broader perspective not only about different cultures of learning, but also about how business is done. My view of the world was changing.
RETURN TO ACADEMIA

My ‘second life’ at the University that began in 1999 was quite different to the first. The particular area of expertise that I found I was able to bring to the University was in the area of vocational education and training (VET). My role is as lecturer and co-ordinator of the University’s post-graduate, fee-paying vocational education and training and other adult education programs on the Albury-Wodonga Campus. In essence, I am employed with enterprise funds, and am expected, in turn, to generate more of the same.

By the time I returned to the University, both it, and I, had changed. It was interesting to encounter the attitudes that many of my former academic colleagues seemed to be developing as a response to the movement towards enterprise-driven development. For me, corporate-style thinking with its concerns about quality assurance, measurement and self-promotion had become a part of my life—I cannot say that I necessarily embraced it or found comfort in it, but I did understand it.

I understood, in particular, that in the post-Dawkins era, it was important and essential for universities to be able to find funds themselves, as subsequent governments steadily withdrew their levels of financial support. The university environment had become competitive and some of the lessons I had learnt even after my relatively short stint in private industry came to the fore.

---

1 A more thorough explanation of the changes that beset Australia’s higher education sector is included in Chapter 1, Part B. My concern at this point is to convey a sense of my own reactions to the noticeable changes since my first university experiences.
Since my return to the University, I think I have become much more aware just how privileged the life of an academic can be. Certainly, there are numerous workplace issues about workloads, interpersonal relationships and the like, but without wanting to romanticise it, the life of an academic provides so many opportunities for self-growth—to be able to explore new and different bodies of knowledge and to apply new ideas. And, importantly, I am coming to realise that my conceptual view of the world is not all that “different” after all.

**Finding My Professional Voice**

By the time I had assumed my first university teaching position in 1990 I can now see that I had well and truly started trying out my voice. Nowadays I would look to the work of Covey, Merrill and Merrill (1994) to find a language to describe my vision that was beginning to emerge then. They—in this instance at least—provide a way of thinking in which individuals need to connect with their own visions of what is important and what gives their lives meaning and that this way of thinking, in turn affects everything else—the goals that are set, the decisions that are made and the way that time is spent. In a few words, I see my vision, or the legacy I would like to leave, as being committed to working towards increasing the visibility of otherwise invisible groups in society. This is something akin to being a cultural learner, that is, someone who ‘... does not speak for others, but works so that they, too, can speak’ (Tierney 1993a, p. 145). A result of feeling the power of one's voice, argues Brookfield (1995, p. 46), 'is fundamentally connected with developing one's sense of agency.'
Indeed, in addition to—or perhaps, because of—the academic role I had taken on, I felt that I was in a position to challenge not only homophobic statements and actions, but also those that smacked of racism and other forms of oppression that exist(ed) on our university campus, and occasionally, in our local community. I’m reminded here of the contrast with the stance articulated by Robert Sunchild, the pseudonym given to a gay, Native American academic living with HIV/AIDS interviewed by Tierney (1993c) who said, ‘I wouldn’t say in one of my classes that I’m gay, although I realise that gay students need role models, that straight students need to have stereotypes changed. But I’m not the one to do it’ (pp. 124-125).

**BACKGROUND TO THE THESIS**

One of the reasons that I chose to look at leadership and its relationship to masculinity—masculinities, as I came to eventually discover—as the focus of the Professional Doctorate of Education degree, arose as a confluence of different events and realisations on my part. One of the strong memories I have of my ‘first life’ (1990-1995) at La Trobe University were the comments that some of my female academic colleagues would make. In discussions about feminist literature with female academic colleagues when I was compiling a bibliography for a ‘Women in Science’ project as part of my Masters degree, my colleagues would ask me how I felt when I read these types of texts. I can recall responding that on one hand it felt like going to the tennis as a fan of whoever was the hero of the moment, only to be 'rewarded' by him at the end of each match.
with a clout across the head from his tennis racquet. On the other hand, my way of coping with this feeling was to consider that I was an exception; that the feminist authors were talking about other men, not me! And this was reinforced by my colleagues who would sometimes add the words, ‘Not you, Kim’ to statements that they might have been making that bemoaned the actions of some men. For me, I accepted the comments naively, not really wondering until much later about either their meaning or their significance.

Many years later, I came to realise that what I had was the focus for a study. I knew from thinking about many of my male friends—non-gay friends in particular—that I was not the only one who thought as I did. I decided that it would help my understanding of how to be a better leader in a university setting if I could get a sense of how other male academics practised an inclusive version of leadership. I may not have held formal leadership positions within the University, but I empathised and identified with the concept of the teacher as a leader. I know that I exercise leadership not only in the influence I exert in my teaching, but also in my daily interactions with colleagues. My approach is collegial, driven by a respect for each person’s contribution and their sense of self. Understanding how I can make a contribution to the academic community, and by ensuring my own well-being in the process, has become the driving force behind the various elements in this folio.

---

2 Over time, I have come to realise that I was reacting to my understandings of radical feminist theory, which I had interpreted as assuming that the experiences and/or interests of women are radically different to those of men—men who often appear as ‘the enemy’ or ‘evil-doers’, primarily engaged in the domination of women.
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE THESIS

I gradually became increasingly curious about other men like me, not necessarily gay men, but men who are sensitive to others in their workplaces, committed to social justice and who also have an emancipatory perspective, for it is a strong ethos of social justice, equity and advocacy that resonates with my own values.

Some of the feminist literature that I have consulted frequently refers to the invisibility of women in organisational structures (Blackmore & Sachs 1997; Oakley 1981; Porter 1994; Radford-Hill 1986; Sinclair 1998). A political imperative to social research projects that focus on women's' experiences exists in many instances and has arisen in an attempt to challenge the hegemonic masculinity, but also to give voice to women in society.

When authors such as Connell (1995) and Buchbinder (1994) began to propose a discourse of multiple masculinities, this broadened and re-focussed the discussion about a hegemonic masculinity in a significant manner. They made it clear that it is not only women who are disenfranchised by a hegemonic masculinity, but also many men. These men who actively conduct collaborative and socially-just work practices—as opposed to merely engaging in the rhetoric—are seen by some as men with whom feminists could form alliances (Blackmore 1995a; Connell 1995; Douglas 1995; Grundy 1993; Ward 1996). Increasingly, there have been calls for the experiences of such men to be acknowledged and for them to find their voice (Grundy 1993; Ward 1996).

The political imperative behind this research folio parallels the situation experienced by many female educational administrators.
It cannot be considered an equivalent situation, however, for clearly, the male academic leaders who will be considered in this study are men. Although they might be marginalised and perhaps even considered ‘traitors’ by the dominant social group, they have still been exposed to masculinist socialisation practices and have profited from being male, even if they do not now accept all the values implicit in being male.

The literature review sections of this dissertation and of the research electives accompanying it present a view that increasingly, some feminist and profeminist writers are looking towards forming alliances with men who demonstrate a commitment to social justice, equity and transformational practice. Some have also expressed a desire to hear these men's stories, though according to the literature consulted, these stories have not yet been heard. I believe that this research is a logical extension of the call for male allies that some writers have been making (Blackmore 1995a; Carrigan, Connell & Lee 1987; Connell 1989; Ward 1996). It will provide evidence that some men, and perhaps even the organisations they work for, are venturing down Sinclair's (1994) ‘second path’ by peeling back some of the cultural layers associated with traditional masculinity. More importantly, however, the study will give visibility and a voice to groups of men who may be swimming against the tide—perhaps against several tides—and it may also have the effect of supporting the efforts of others who might be considered minority or ‘Other’. I see the findings of this study as contributing to a number of fields: studies of identities, leadership and management studies; gender studies; social justice; studies of the Australian higher education sector as well as being a voice at a significant moment in Australian universities.
The research projects that comprise this folio will not only provide an opportunity for a number of male academic leaders to be heard and their practices to become visible, but will also provide insight into the difficulties that they encounter in their workplaces. Some of these men have been, and may continue to be, at odds with other groups such as the majority of other men, some feminists, and possibly other male academic leaders with differing ideologies, different personalities or simply, different ways of doing things. Even the initially seductive notion of seeking out men who work collaboratively and collegially became problematic once I realised that the outward perspective of participatory decision-making had the potential to mask prescribed guidelines for professional practice (Smyth 2001). Moving as I did towards a better understanding of transformational leadership\(^3\), this seemed to better address the genuine expression of participatory ways of leading.

Without wanting to appear paranoid, it is worth noting that I am also likely to experience resistance from some quarters. The very act of raising masculinity(ies) as an issue is likely to be seen as challenging and problematising it. The on-going doubts that men have about their own masculinity(ies) as they compare themselves with others (Kimmel 2000) is likely to be brought to the fore by some of the pieces of research in this folio. The respective research outcomes may be seen as a challenge, not only because they question masculinity(ies), but also because they question the way things are done in some universities.

\(^3\) Transformational leadership, as it was described by its founder, James MacGregor Burns in 1978, aims to draw upon the inner motivation of followers by tapping their enthusiasm and energising their emotional resources. Leaders with charisma, within this framework, inspire followers to achieve change not only in the organisation, but in themselves as well.
Whereas the studies will satisfy some of my personal curiosities just by hearing the men’s life stories—and perhaps even help me feel that I am not alone in the way I treat and work with other people—I want to better understand what is behind their, and my own, practices. My relatively recent exposition to the consideration of gender, as I have indicated in my own narrative, is something that I wish to better comprehend. Interpreting the men’s life stories against current literature—what they say, as well as what remains unsaid—will assist me in this pursuit.

**Beneficiaries of the Studies**

My personal aim in the studies is to reassure myself that I am not alone. Put into the terminology of leaving a legacy as mentioned previously, I would hope that the practices of an otherwise invisible group—a group of male academics who have a reputation for practising a different version of leadership and different expressions of masculinities—are able to be made visible. In the first instance, therefore, the beneficiary of these research projects will be me: in the way I exercise leadership; the way I approach my

---

4 There were two common responses from some people with whom I discussed my research in its formative stages—either that I was wanting the men in the studies to be gay men, or that they gave me the names of gay men who seemed to ‘fit the bill’. To the former: the answer is a clear ‘no’. I was not concerned at all about the sexuality(ies) of any of the men I was seeking for the study. To the second assumption: I found it an interesting commentary on the stereotyping of gay men, that is, that the only leaders who could exhibit collaborative, ‘feminine’ styles of leadership would be gay men. Whereas the marginalising experiences of many gay men may sensitise more of us to the effects of hegemonic masculinity and have probably caused more of us to reflect on what it means to be male, this study is not about trying to establish a relationship between homosexuality and collaborative approaches to leadership.
teaching seeing it, as I do, in terms of the teacher as leader (Andrews, Crowther, Hann & McMaster 2002).

Other beneficiaries of the studies, I would imagine, would be the men who participate in the studies themselves, for although they may not be voicing a desire to be part of a group, knowing that others who practise leadership either in a similar way or with a similar set of ideals, may be reassuring. It might also mean that when they are asked to think of someone else who leads as they do, that they will not immediately think only of women, which was one of the recurring responses from the major study’s participants.

The rationale for these research projects is that they will provide a 'voice' for a particular group of male academic leaders. I see leadership principally as a process of interaction, rather than as necessarily being an end-point. The research projects will hopefully help me, and others, to understand the kind of contribution to tertiary institutions that some male academic leaders are making.

The studies also have the potential to offer insights which are politically crucial if tertiary institutions are to move beyond hegemonic masculinity in their administrative and leadership arrangements. They may provide, for example, some of the grounds for negotiating alliances between feminists and at least some male leaders. Finally, the studies may also provide models for others who might wish to act differently in tertiary institutions but who currently feel constrained inside various hegemonic arrangements.

For me, the difference that I would like to make as a result of undertaking these research projects is that of being able to explain
to my own students and myself how it is that some men practise leadership, how they construct and maintain their scholarly identities (including how they express their masculinity(ies)), and to better understand how they function in increasingly managerialist environments.
PART B:

DISSERTATION:

PERFORMING MASCULINITY AND LEADERSHIP DIFFERENTLY: MALE ACADEMICS, THEIR WORK PRACTICES AND COPING STRATEGIES
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO AUSTRALIA’S HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

Recently, the 2003 Federal Government Budget represented the culmination of a consultative process that included the publication of a number of discussion papers referred to as Crossroads (Nelson 2002). Significant changes to the higher education sector are now mooted and reactions to the package of changes have been mixed, although the ultimate test of acceptance will be played out in the Senate.

The Australian Vic-Chancellors’ Committee (AV-CC) was generally supportive and keen to claim credit for influencing the Federal Education Minister (Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee 2003a). Several weeks later, however, the AV-CC indicated its belief that the reform package provides a base for the future development of the university sector from 2005, but spelt out some specific concerns, such as the proposal to tie education changes in governance to workplace relations, and what it sees as insufficient support for ensuring quality (Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee 2003b).

The National Tertiary Education Union, also keen to claim some credit for its influence on the earlier review, has particular difficulties with the proposed changes, in particular, the likely impact upon the costs for students participating in higher education and the major changes that the package would mean for the Workplace Relations Act (National Tertiary Education Union 2003a; 2003b). The NTEU, reacting to the AV-CC’s (2003b) detailed response to the Federal Budget proposals, makes it clear that whilst
it supports the AV-CC’s request for the government to drop the funding link between governance and workplace relations, it remains critical of the AV-CC’s support for components of the package, such as the opportunities for universities to charge up to 30% more on top of the current Higher Education Contribution Scheme (National Tertiary Education Union 2003c).

The following sections trace the shifts that pre-date the ramifications of the current Budget—changes that occurred in Australian universities since the then Minister for Education in the Labor Hawke Government, John Dawkins, restructured the existing teachers colleges, technical institutes and small universities into higher education institutions, and provide a sense of the responses that have been made to this restructuring, which is sometimes also referred to as the ‘Dawkinisation’ of Australian universities.

**The Advent of the Enterprise University**

In addition to the amalgamations that occurred in the development of the Unified National System (UNS), there are also changes in the way universities are financed, governed and managed (McCollow & Lingard 1996). Academics are living in rapidly changing environments and, as Currie (1998) observes, are adopting practices more commonly found in business, with the balance of power and autonomy being moved away from academics in favour of a centralised core of senior managers (Currie & Vidovich 1998). This is at least partly due to the perceived demands by successive governments for Australian universities to become corporatised, entrepreneurial and innovative.
'The universities of the world,' writes Clark (1998, p. xiii), 'have entered a time of disquieting turmoil that has no end in sight’ (p. xiii). The turmoil of which Clark writes, is brought about by the interaction of several forces, amongst them the increasing numbers and types of students; an expectation that universities will prepare graduates for highly specialised occupations; an expectation that universities will do more for a lower cost, and an expansion and specialisation of knowledge that outruns the resources available. Changes in governmental policies that simultaneously reduce funding whilst setting quotas on teaching, regimens on research and the imposition of accountability measures on student outcomes, provide a background for the expression of these forces. And although governments can portray an illusion of autonomy and self-regulation for universities, they are able to successfully ‘steer at a distance’ by setting performance indicators and performance-related rewards (Kickert 1991 in Vidovich & Currie 1998).

In Australia, funds are currently allocated to the higher education sector via several key elements: resource allocation in the context of a rolling triennium; the provision of educational profiles that act as accountability measures; operating grants; a Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS) for students, and a competitive allocation of research funding (Commonwealth Department of Education Science and Training 2003). For the current triennium, the Government’s objectives are to ‘expand opportunity; assure quality; improve universities’ responsiveness to varying student needs and industry requirements; advance the knowledge base and university contributions to national innovation, and [to] ensure

Universities, in order to function on a commercial footing, have had to become entrepreneurial, complete with the ‘managerial buzzwords and their acronyms’ (Tierney 1998). The consequences of the resultant turmoil include

… a sense of anxiety and loss of direction for individuals, and fragmentation, inconsistency, and a mix of organizational structures, policies and procedures for organizations. Organizational boundaries are failing, while managers face increasing difficulties in concentrating resources, distributing space, establishing and achieving timeframes, achieving productivity (Taylor 1999, p. 72.).

Clark (1998) contends that it is only those universities that are able to demonstrate innovation—a word he uses synonymously with 'entrepreneurial'—that will be able to expand their response capability. Clark suggests five interacting elements that he argues will enable universities to transform themselves into entrepreneurial agencies, namely: a strengthened steering core; an expanded development periphery; a diversified funding base; a stimulated academic heartland, and an integrated entrepreneurial culture.

Whereas Marginson and Considine (2000) acknowledge these elements, they argue that only the first three exist strongly in the Australian higher education sector, the other two being weak or non-existent. They state that in the post-1987 institutions in Australia, academic cultures are too weak to generate either a stimulated academic heartland or an integrated entrepreneurial
culture. A similar malaise has hit universities and colleges in America:

We are told we can "do more with less" or, at least, "cut out the fat"
... No elixir, alas, has proven to be the magic potion for curing academe's ills (Tierney 1998, p. 2).

Clark (1998) acknowledges that the change process in universities is not necessarily the same as in other business organisations. For an idea to take hold in a university, he says, it has to spread among many participants and link up with other ideas, and be constantly tested and reformulated before it ultimately makes its way into the culture of the organisation. The implication for leadership, Clark writes, is that it needs to be context-sensitive, which may mean involving people at every level of the enterprise as well as the adoption of collective leadership.

Clark acknowledges the negative connotation that the word 'entrepreneurial' may have in the minds of traditional academics, who may equate it with hard-nosed management that acts against the collective good. Survival and growth in this current environment, suggests Taylor (1997), may be made possible by several things, including academics learning to live in a 'web of rules', whether they be tacit rules, assumptions or based on new social interactions.

Managing to avoid using the word 'entrepreneurial', Keith (1998) instead draws on the notion of responsiveness—itself a term that is likely to be considered by many as a catch-cry of new managerialism, along with others like 'quality' and 'outcomes' that are evident in the following quotation:

To survive and thrive, colleges and universities will have to be
responsive. Responsiveness is in the eyes of those being served: students, parent, governments, businesses, non-profit organizations. Each of these publics will judge the university in terms of the quality of their relationships with the university, and the quality of the outcomes of those relationships (p. 163).

Formerly perceived as communities of scholars with management being provided by academic leaders, universities in the United Kingdom, as in Australia, are required to ensure that value and quality are provided in teaching and research and that efficiency gains are made. What is becoming more common as a result, Deem (1998) observes, is that academic managers and career administrators are increasingly becoming explicitly responsible for academic staff and their work.

In order to be responsive in an era of new managerialism, Keith (1998) says, there are several things that universities need to become. First, they need to be service oriented (though one might wonder when and why universities are being seen as a service); second, they need new internal relationships, including those that support planning and evaluation processes and an ability for academic and administrative university members to think laterally together; third, they need new external relationships, that will include social partnerships with the communities, government policy makers and other institutions; fourth, they need to focus on outcomes, ensuring that those produced must be relevant to the needs of those beyond the university, and finally, they need to develop extensive communications networks, dispersed teaching sites and to take advantage of alternative instructional methods.
But for Professor Osborne (2002), Vice-Chancellor at La Trobe University, entrepreneurial discourse is a side issue to the broader directions being taken by the Australian Federal Government:

... in many countries, Australia included, the government, despite sporadic protestations in favour of a knowledge-based society, appears to espouse the view that higher education, even in its most functional form, represents a cost, and it spends much time and effort in attempting to devise schemes to reduce that cost. In such a context, where a decreasing contribution to an increasingly training-oriented sector is regarded as inappropriately expensive, the prospects of investment to maintain a presence in pure scholarship seem remarkably remote (p. 9).

Performativity

Within the changes in universities, Ball (1999) considers the notion of performativity as the expression of the new discourse of power, a discourse that takes in accountability, commodification and competition, all being expressions for the deployment of the market into education. He describes performativity as being

... a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation ... that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition and change. The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of 'quality', or 'moments' of promotion ... or inspection (Ball 1999, p. 2).

McCollow and Lingard (1996, p. 15) make the point that a concentration by universities on performativity is a vehicle for changing the nature of academic work. 'Most academics' lives', they say, 'have at least been "touched" by the forces of the market',
although the impact of these forces is somewhat unevenly
distributed across individuals and organisations. Demands are
placed upon the time academics have and these demands are
typically represented by concerns with quality assurance,
performance management, productivity agreements and other
devices that ensure accountability upwards within their
institutions. Ball (1999) describes some of the reactions from
individuals. On the one hand he see things such as culture-
building, pride and a belief in the quality of a product; on the other,
he sees the competition between individuals and groups, guilt,
shame and envy. Another effect is that individuals become valued
for their productivity alone, rather than for the social relationships
they are able to engender.

An additional concern expressed by Marginson and Considine
(2000) is in relation to the centralisation of universities' powers,
with many academic boards, formerly representative of academics’
integrity, being pushed aside. Working conditions in universities
have deteriorated along with a sense that the marketplace is
infiltrating our universities: the language used by accountants;
competition for funds, and performance indicators used to assess
individuals and departments (Currie 1998). For academics to
survive performativity, Ball suggests that they tell themselves
'necessary fictions' to deal with the fabrications that institutions
produce. These fabrications are manufactured within the rigours of
performativity, such that ‘The fabrication becomes something to be
sustained, lived up to. Something to measure individual practices
against’ (Ball 1999, p. 11). Authenticity, says Ball, is replaced by
plasticity, and this plasticity becomes part of the new corporate
identity (Casey 1995a). New, and sometimes perverse, behaviours
are expected as part of the job, a situation that is ripe for the onset of a condition referred to as ‘modern madness’\(^5\) (LaBier 1986).

As well as organisational fabrications, Ball contends that academics are also required to fabricate themselves for procedures such as appraisal interviews, in students' assessments of their lecturers and in promotion and job applications. Blackmore and Sachs (1999 in Ball 1999) refer to this as 'self-management', whereby individuals are seen to be doing things rather than substantially doing things; adding value to themselves as enterprising individuals being ... increasingly caught up in the logic of our own representations. (Ball 1999, p. 21), with the new regimes ...

\[\ldots\text{[jostling] uncomfortably against old understandings of recognised expertise in research, the intrinsic value of learning, and community service and old mythologies about academic freedom and collegiality (Blackmore & Sachs 2000, p. 10).}\]

**Evolving Understandings of Professionalism**

Academics responding differently to the changes in their workplaces have meant that the notion of professionalism is itself changing. It is argued that a number of cultures shape the values and behaviours of academics (Austin 1990), and the way that these cultures evolve helps to explain the differences not only between universities, but also between different campuses of the same university. Austin describes four primary cultures that shape academics: the culture of the academic profession—the sense of what it means to be an academic; the cultures of the disciplines; the

---

\(^5\) LaBier’s concept of ‘modern madness’, whilst mentioned here, will be explored further in Chapter 2.
culture of the academy as an organisation, and the cultures of institutional types—where some institutions place great value on strong discipline-based kinship and research, whereas others have a heavy emphasis on teaching, with little time for research and writing.

Professionalism in universities was once expressed in terms of the ideals of freedom of expression melded with disciplinary expertise, but now, as Blackmore and Sachs (2000) have identified, a range of performativities are required: ‘teaching, research, consultancy, development and community service, measured largely in dollar terms’ (p. 10). They go on to say how the new work environments combined with the new measures of academic performance require new social practices and relationships. By way of comparison, in America, due to the uncertainties of the changing mission of higher education and the consequent uncertainties of academics’ roles, academics are left feeling confused (Goodlad 1990 in Fullan 1993).

Within Australian universities, Technical and Further Education (TAFE) institutes and schools, Blackmore and Sachs (2000) describe a transition that they argue is occurring in our understandings of professionalism. The transition has been occurring since 1987 when national goals introduced policies and practices that valued efficiency (the measurement of knowledge production) and relevance (what is taught and researched). In a general sense, they consider that there is a growing feeling of professional insecurity that is a function of a lessening of control over the professional knowledge base brought about by a lack of governmental consultation in policy development, new notions of employment and the re-exertion of executive management within organisations.
They write that the orthodoxies of management and markets have permeated all aspects of organisational life and are expressed in aspects such as performance management, quality assurance, accountability, and technological literacy (Blackmore & Sachs 2000).

At an academic level as well, the ‘Dawkinisation’ of Australian universities means that vocational teachers from colleges of advanced education are fused with academic teacher-researchers of the traditional universities. 'The former were meant to be encouraged into research but the decline in research funding meant simultaneously the latter were being pushed out of research' (Polya in Radio National 2001).

Blackmore and Sachs point to additional tension—a tension that exists for teachers' professionalism. On the one hand there is democratic professionalism; on the other, a managerial professionalism that has as its priority, the need to meet corporate goals according to a set of standardised criteria. Women leaders, they argue, are positioned 'particularly dangerously' in this context, in that 'they are caught into the web of surveillance, juggling the competing discourses of democratic professionalism from below and management professionalism from above' (Blackmore & Sachs 2000, p. 9).

The implications for the professionalism of teaching staff is not only limited to notions of corporatisation and managerialism, for there is a view that learning has replaced teaching as the dominant paradigm in education (Chappell 2000; Commonwealth Department of Education Science and Training 2002). As Chappell
astutely observes, this will ‘involve quite different combinations of professional skills’. Even though he was referring to the future of Australia’s vocational education and training professionals, a similar expectation seems to be underpinning the recent review into higher education. Smyth (2001) too, when writing about Australia’s schoolteachers, contends that views about the professionalism of teachers is ‘long on rhetoric about teacher autonomy and short on reality’ (p. 6). Because teaching is a labour process, he says, this inhibits the autonomy of teachers, and this is expressed in the prescription of what it is that constitutes teachers’ work; the demand of ‘value for money’; prescribed curriculum frameworks, and adherence to state and federal guidelines and policies. The review into Australia’s higher education system, with its concerns about performance, quality and standards (CDEST 2002), for instance, is an example of how prescriptions experienced by teachers in Australia’s state school systems are being expanded to enfold Australia’s universities—hitherto sites of substantial autonomy (Nelson 2002).

In addition to these Commonwealth-initiated discussions, state governments have been pro-active as well. In June 2002, the Victorian Minister for Education and Training, Ms Lynne Kosky, released a Ministerial Statement entitled Knowledge and Skills for the Innovation Economy (Kosky 2002), a statement on the future directions of the Victorian vocational education and training system. In this statement, she makes it clear that it is necessary to reinvigorate the TAFE workforce so that it is highly skilled and able to provide innovative and relevant training for students preparing
for active citizenship in the innovation economy\(^6\). The skills required of teachers need to be both generic and specific, and additional to learning management and facilitation skills, partnership and relationship skills and technology-related skills, and will be expected to ‘… develop innovativeness and entrepreneurship in others and to engage in team-based, networked entrepreneurial activity themselves’ (Institute Workforce Working Party 2002, p. 6). The significance of both of these initiatives is that, in Victoria, TAFE institutes are autonomous organisations, yet they are expected to conform to public policy. This is not dissimilar to how Australian universities are positioned. The current socio-political milieu is clearly having an impact on all levels of education in Australia.

Prior to the 2003 Federal Budget proposals for higher education reforms, there was disquiet about the inadequate levels of government funding, which, in part, forces universities to adopt different ways of operating. Says Professor Michael Osborne, Vice-Chancellor and President of La Trobe University:

> But, perhaps most destructively, the link with the workforce has strengthened the view that universities themselves should act like businesses and be treated as such—in other words, as if they were training factories. This has led to tensions within universities, as staff are constrained to accept all sorts of aspects of corporate lore, despite their inappropriateness to higher education … This functional view of universities, which is stealthily becoming prevalent, and which perniciously is causing higher education to

\(^6\) Kosky (2002) refers to an innovation economy as being ‘… an economy that can apply its rapidly increasing knowledge effectively in work and social situations to increase productivity and general well-being, and to create and apply new knowledge. It values cross-cultural skills—for global trade and other cross-cultural exchange’.  
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be treated as a commodity, represents a major change in western ideas of such institutions (Osborne 2001).

**Academics’ Responses**

Elected deans and academic councils are being replaced by corporate managerialism and line management, leading, says Currie (1998), to ‘insularity among academics, greater closed individualism, and a loss of a sense of community’ (p. 4). In the United Kingdom, responses to the changes in universities have seen situations in which academic managers report they are struggling to adapt to change (Goode & Bagilhole 1998). The authors report that there were three stances that managers took: resistance—where a common view about the destructiveness and what might be done to deal with it was held; collaboration—an acceptance of the changed rules of the game, and transformation—a movement to create completely new patterns, practices and rules. Goode and Bagilhole noted that the many years of resisting change in the first place had 'left little energy ... for creating new forms of progressive activity' (p. 156). Noteworthy as well, was their observation that those who were adopting the transformation stance were all women and that ‘... they were finding the going hard' (Goode & Bagilhole 1998, p. 159).

Importantly, despite the rush into corporatisation by our universities, there are differences between the functioning of business organisations and that of universities. It has always been beholden upon universities to encourage critical thinking in society, though Currie (1998) (amongst others in her text) finds it necessary to remind academics of this responsibility, for unless academics
resist these changes,

… the result will be a shift from scholar to entrepreneur.

Academics are in a position to examine these globalization practices in depth within their own workplaces and to begin to understand the way in which many workplaces are being restructured and downsized. They are moving in a similar way to assimilate globalization practices, almost through unconscious osmosis (p. 6).

McCollow and Lingard (1996) make the point, however, that there are a variety of models that describe the academic and that these incorporate various ways of seeing academics in the current environment. Academics in various guises—as the corporate, market or state professionals—are relatively recent newcomers to academia, and join the more traditional academic *sui generis* version that long epitomised the unique position held by academics, one of curiosity-driven research and disinterest. Whereas there is great diversity in the work of academics, McCollow and Lingard conclude that the academic *sui generis* model has the capacity to endure changing conditions and that it is likely to morph itself to colonise changing work patterns and differing configurations of teaching, research and publication.

This section has provided a backdrop of the changes that have been, and continue to be, instigated within the Australian higher education sector. Against this backdrop, the interrelated issues of “self”, leadership and coping are explored in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 2: LEADERSHIP, “SELF” AND COPING

As indicated in the Prologue, a combination of personal and professional experiences, previous academic studies and work requirements made me curious about links between leadership and gender, and this, in turn, directed me to writings on masculinity(ies) and ‘Otherness’. Education studies, sociology and social psychology were to be my initial pathways into considering studies on leadership. The few accounts that I read that specifically considered the experiences from men who might be considered as 'Other' included research conducted by Connell (1989), Mac an Ghaill (1994) and Plummer (1999). Sinclair (1998) also considered accounts from Australian female and male chief executive officers and provided insights into gender issues in leadership.

Understandings of gender have changed over time and the significance of gender in organisations is a relatively recently studied phenomena (see for instance Alvesson & Billing 1997; Hearn 1992b). In this chapter, I begin with a brief consideration of different theories of leadership and a consideration of “self” before attending to the issue of coping.

THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

According to Waldo (1984), the Scientific Management Movement of the 19th Century sought to use science as a means, ‘... to place man's [sic] economic life, particularly production, upon a scientific base' (Waldo 1984, p. 49). The Scientific Management Movement had many features, including the segmentation of the labour process according to discrete skills; the control of work from above, and a depersonalisation of the work effort.
By the time of the Second World War, Scientific Management was an international 'given' in large organisations. Management was seen as a science and managers were trained in the so-called scientific methods of ascertaining and working from facts. Because facts, research and measurement lay at the heart of science they were also at the heart of administration. Related practices included planning, which claimed to link objectives or purposes to 'the facts' and the development of principles, which emerged from research. The notion of 'one best man' also emerged, such that '... for any given task there is, theoretically, one person, or at least a type of person, better suited by measurable qualities than all others' (Waldo 1984, p. 58). Expectations of this Modern Period, an epoch in which the dominant feature was large-scale, hierarchical bureaucracy complete with rationality and planning (Thompson & McHugh 1995), were that leadership methods should be objective and supported by scientific proof.

The social dimension of organisations became the focus of the 1930s and the human relations school, thus marking the end of seeing organisations as machine-like phenomena (Alvesson & Billing 1997). Relational aspects of leadership were ignored, with the effect that by the 1950s and 1960s, a workforce had developed that was ill-equipped to take initiative, envision problems or opportunities and was unable to act upon them (Owens 1995). Contingency theory, during the 1960s, challenged the notion of one superior form of organisation, taking into account how differences in size, technologies and the environment influence the management of organisations. By the late 1970s, as a result of an emerging analysis of sociology of knowledge, power and the self-interests of particular groups in organisations became the focus of critical
perspectives on organisational theory. This then led to a consideration of the cultural underpinnings of different groups and how they act in organisations during the 1980s—a reflection of the democratic discourse of workplaces that preceded the strong, top-down leadership discourse in organisations in the 1990s (Blackmore 1999). Alvesson and Billing argue (1997) that we now tend to take things such as group norms, organisational environments and organisational politics for granted and that it is only relatively recently that gender has featured in considerations of organisational theory.

Attempts to define leadership demonstrate how difficult—and perhaps even inappropriate—the task is (Beare, Caldwell & Millikan 1989). Beare et al. trace various definitions of leadership that include those that focus on the exercise of formal authority of an individual to direct and coordinate others; those that acknowledge that it is possible to influence others without being the authorised leader; those that envision the leader as one who provides a sense of understanding of what they are doing for others without changing the behaviour of followers, and those which attempt to construct the social world for others by persuading them to adopt a leader’s values. Other authors, such as Brady and Kennedy (1999) tend not to limit themselves to specific definitions of leadership and provide a smattering of theories of leadership along with various skills, styles and principles of leadership.

For me, leadership is concerned not only with achieving outcomes—whether or not this is achieved through the actions of the designated leader—but also with an ability to link the values and abilities of both the leader and his or her followers in such a
way that both are given a sense of agency. This view of leadership is consistent with the concept of transformational leadership, whereby

The transforming leader, while still responding to needs among followers, looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and leaders into moral agents (Beare et al. 1989).

**Theorising Leadership**

Sergiovanni (1984) differentiates between what he sees as tactical leadership – analytic and administrative action, typically employing learnt skills such as conflict resolution – and strategic leadership, which harnesses the deeper, underlying principles and perspectives that inform the tactical. The mental image I have of Sergiovanni’s model is of an iceberg, a not-too-uncommon metaphor, as it happens, in the leadership literature. The tip that is evident is representative of the tactical elements of leadership exemplified in popular leaders, however it is the majority of the iceberg below the water that relates to the deeper and more inspirational aspects of leadership. Many can enact leadership skills, but fewer possess the principles or understand the meanings or cultural expressions of their actions.

It is true to say that there is confusion about the differences (or not) between managers and leaders and it is therefore difficult to collate or compare findings from research on leadership because different
studies mean different things by the terms (Collard 1997b): some authors see the terms as meaning very different things (Blount 1998; Bennis & Nanus 1985 in Carlopio et al. 1997); some see them as being the same thing (Carlopio et al. 1997) some, such as Bennis and Nanus (1985 in Carlopio et al. 1997, p. xix) see that leadership is concerned with ‘doing the right things’, whilst management is concerned with ‘doing things right’. Other authors, seemingly in recognition of the artificiality of the discussion, opt to treat managers and leaders as being different in some settings, but for the sake of other discussions, treat them as being equivalent terms (for instance Schon 1984; Weiner 1995).

Notwithstanding this, I feel that a mention of some of the more popular theories of leadership is necessary and these include trait theories that have already been mentioned, and influence theory. Trait Theory, Brady and Kennedy (1999) say, is ‘[when] one exerts more influence on others than they do in return’ (p. 209) and that this is dependant upon the traits an individual has in order to exert influence. Leadership always involves a degree of reciprocity; leaders influence, but they too are influenced; leaders encourage rather than dominate. In Distributed Functions/Actions Theory of leadership, leadership is seen in two dimensions: a task function (contributing, coordinating, informing) and a maintenance function (maintaining friendly relationships) (after Johnson & Johnson 1994 in Brady & Kennedy 1999; Owens 1995). The appeal to the authors of this theory of what leadership ought to be is that it builds on the assumption that anyone can be a leader and therefore individuals can learn to practise whatever function is appropriate for a given situation. This theory is central to the philosophy behind self-managed work teams.
In addition to there being numerous and occasionally competing theories of leadership, many authors have made contributions to the field by writing about leadership styles, for example Bolman and Deal (1991 in Beruldsen & Buchanan 1997, p. 125) who speak of four styles—structural, political, human resource and symbolic; Woyach (1993 in Brady & Kennedy 1999), who argues that leaders have different levels of each of two major styles: an information processing style and an action-taking style, and Weiner (1995), who advocates and critiques numerous patterns of management style. Their approaches and views, however, are not consistent, not that I would expect them to be, though they have taken a reductionist and structuralist approach by listing qualities and actions supposedly identifiable in good leaders and in a manner that reflects the earlier period of the Scientific Management Movement. Agency is attributed to the style of leadership being practised; not on the individuals practising it.

And perhaps this is what a group of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students at a Sydney university were also thinking when they developed an Indigenous Management Model. They saw the model they developed as a reaction to the ‘… often autocratic, dictatorial and extremely bureaucratic’ approaches to management (Sherwood, Costello, Congoo, Cohen, Duval, Gibbs, Kelaher, Kelly, Marshall, Tubai & Winsor 1999, p. 18). Highlighting three phases—the past, the present and the future—the authors have developed their own model that acknowledges and respects traditional philosophies. Consequently, the various dimensions that make up appropriate management practices, such as quality assurance, person management and professional development and training,
are underpinned by a number of cultural ways of working, such as participation in decision-making; seeking and giving feedback, and the constructive resolution of conflict.\footnote{From my own experiences with an urbanised Aboriginal organisation, these attributes—not unlike attributes of other leadership models—should be seen as being ideologically driven, for when “the going gets tough”, many of these so-called ‘cultural ways of working’ come under great pressure, and alternative competitive and less functional practices seem to be adopted.}

It is worth noting Schein’s (1997) perspective whereby he interlinks leaders and their organisations:\footnote{Schein’s view is far from being unproblematic, however, for it posits that “cultures”—itself a problematic term—are made by an individual and develop not only in a linear fashion, but also homogeneously. Organisational discourses are discussed further in one of the following sections (refer “Self” and the Organisation).}

Culture and leadership are two sides of the same coin in that leaders first create cultures when they create groups and organizations. Once cultures exist, they determine the criteria for leadership and thus determine who will or will not be a leader (p. 15).

This linking of the individual with the group and its culture marked a new way of thinking, one in which a humanistic perspective on administrative theory was recognised (Owens 1995). An example of such a theory to emerge is Transformational Leadership Theory, developed by Burns in 1978 and which has been referred to previously (Beare \textit{et al.} 1989). It aims to draw upon the inner motivation of followers by tapping their enthusiasm and energising their emotional resources.
Transformational Leadership

One of the theories of leadership that has collaboration as a core is that of transformational leadership, the key features of which are the focus of this section. It needs to be stated, however, that collegiality and collaboration—qualities often attributed to transformational leadership—do not represent some sort of a "golden age" that existed in the past (Currie & Vidovich 1998). The era of god-professors and their hidden agendas should remind us that collaboration and collegiality are not panaceas. Just as collegiality and collaboration might be useful tools, they can also be used as weapons.

There are several views about what comprises transformational leadership (Collard 1997a). One view is that leaders with charisma are said to inspire followers to achieve change not only in the organisation, but in themselves as well, thus the use of the word ‘transformational’. Another view, such as that advanced by Gurr (1996 in Collard 1997a), sees transformational leadership as being much more participative and collaborative than hierarchical and charisma-driven. Followers are empowered by the leader to take an active role in a change process, so that, over time, they function at a higher level than previously (Owens 1995, p. 125).

Transformative leadership, Sergiovanni (2000) explains, concerns itself with the higher-order, intrinsic and moral motives and needs. This means that leaders and followers become united, in an evolutionary process, towards a common purpose. The transformational leader provides a climate of interpersonal support that enhances aspects of the followers' needs for achievement and esteem, from which the leader and followers develop a shared set of
values and commitments, until they reach a stage where the leader and followers commit to shared ideas that morally oblige them to be self-managing.

This represents the evolution of a purposeful—as opposed to a prescribed educational response (after Smyth 2001)—collaborative approach to leadership, because the vision of the future is built on the followers' values as well as those of the organisation of which they are part. The leaders also have the communication skills to share a vision, which, in turn, provides a goal for transforming the ways in which the leader and followers relate to each other (Owens 1995). They also build trust and support by showing commitment to followers' needs. And although studies might confirm the qualities of transformational leaders, Sinclair (2002) contends that very few actually exist, thereby suggesting a gap between the ideal and the real.

Notwithstanding the concerns expressed by Collard (1997a) about the slippage that has occurred in the many definitions of transformational leadership, the stance I am taking in this study is to view transformational leadership as being participatory, rather than hierarchically or charismatically driven. This locates the concept more closely to Burns' original position in which his two key dimensions were:

First, it raises leaders and followers to a lofty plan of moral discernment; second, it dissolves hierarchical boundaries between the two groups, enabling leaders to step aside and follower-leaders to emerge in appropriate situations (Collard 1997a, p. 77).

Implicit in a transformational approach to leadership are the motivations of leaders that are concerned with a distribution of
power across the group. Drawing upon the conceptual framework of Habermas (1972 in Grundy 1993), Grundy explores various leadership practices that draw on the technical, the practical and the emancipatory interests of leaders. Technical action, explains Grundy, concerns itself with a leader's ability to set unambiguous short-term goals and ability to structure and sequence implementation strategies. A practical leader, she says, has a concern for the welfare of staff and clients and an ability to facilitate the use of deliberative processes for decision-making. Whereas the technical action leader could be described as someone who is task oriented, the practical leader has greater concerns for the interpersonal nature of the workplace.

An emancipatory leader is someone concerned with others' freedom for being human. While an emancipatory leader will approach things in much the same way as the practical action leader, they will enable and encourage participation by all individuals affected by an action in an effort to develop group processes and distribute power across the group. Planning thereby becomes a problem-solving process, challenging that which is taken for granted. Collaborative action, negotiation and evaluation all employ critical self-reflection, says Grundy (1993).

A study commenced by Wilson (1997) examined managers' perceptions of empowerment of staff at Queensland University of Technology. Wilson's primary aim was to gain an illuminative understanding of the managers' perceptions in an environment of change and discontinuity. She noted that the notion of empowerment considered in the study was not 'an answer to social inequality' (Wilson 1997, p. 6), but did encapsulate various notions
of empowerment such as it being an enabling process implying more power to all; a sharing of power and interdependence; a connectedness with others in mutually productive ways, and an ability to create individually and collectively to change the condition of people’s lives.

Empowerment for teachers, says Owens (1995), means that teachers participate in the process of leadership and they also take on personal ownership, growing personally and professionally in the process. A consequence for a leader who operates in this manner, cautions Grundy (1993), may well be seen as ‘failing’ because they do not provide a traditional leadership role. This is also a criticism levelled at Robert Greenleaf’s (1991) writings about servant leadership, which is a particular example of transformational leadership.

Greenleaf states that to be a servant-leader, the person must want to be a servant first, that is:

It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served (Greenleaf 1991, p. 13).

Greenleaf contrasts the notion of servant-first against the notion of leader-first. At the leader-first end of the continuum, Greenleaf says, the person has a drive to appease the need for power or the need for material possessions. Greenleaf’s concern is that the servant-leader ensures that other peoples’ needs are being met, whilst at the same time, ensuring that the least-privileged in society will benefit, or at least, not be further disadvantaged. Greenleaf’s
The concept of servant-leadership is therefore embedded in a broader concern for social justice and it is this concern that has drawn me to consider his writings, for they highlight a point of tension in the current higher education environments: making time for people in an environment that expects much more for much less.

One of the ten key elements of servant leadership is the ‘recognition that servant-leadership begins with the desire to change oneself’ (Spears 1994), which resonates with the concept of self-leadership advanced by Neck and Manz (2000), who argue that:

The existing literature on leadership is almost universally focused on influence exercised by one or more persons over others (in other words, influence exercised by ‘leaders’ on ‘followers’). In taking an initial step toward understanding and improving our own self-leadership, we must first recognize that leadership is not just an outward process; we can and do lead ourselves (Neck & Manz 2000).

In this regard, there is seemingly a link between the philosophy of servant-leadership and that of self-leadership. It is difficult to imagine how one philosophy could be adopted without the other.

The discussion to date has made certain assumptions about how individuals function as part of groups, whether they be leaders or followers. In the following section I move to a consideration of personal identity and tease out some of the implications for identity formation when the “self” is located within a workplace, complete with attendant threats to that identity.
“SELF” AND IDENTITY

In Reupert’s (in production) consideration of “self”, she points out that it is a term that encompasses a variety of meanings—from the everyday usage that sees it being used synonymously with terms such as ‘identity’ and ‘personality’, through to the manifold understandings of “self” used, she says, by numerous scholars from a variety of disciplines.

Early modernist attempts to define and study identity and “self” saw it as being portrayed as a particular individual with a unique personality that was fixed and unitary but with the capacity to develop over time (Walker 2000). Images of multilayered traits in which some traits are more central than others—such as a person’s central beliefs and ideals that make up the private and personal self—are represented in seminal texts such as Combs and Snygg (1959) using an onion metaphor to illustrate the layering of various aspects of “self”. A postmodern view of “self”, however, is that “self” is socially constructed through language and that different selves come through in different contexts—or as Walker puts it, ‘… there is no self other than what is presented’ (p. 2). He remains critical of the singular reliance upon the postmodern notion of “self”, for he argues that it fails to take account of an individual’s ability to integrate and reflect upon experience.


... is not a passive entity, determined by external influences; in forging their self-identities, no matter how local their specific contexts of action, individuals contribute to and directly promote social influences that are global in their consequences and implications (p. 2).
The notion of the self as being dynamic is one that Giddens refers to on many occasions, such as when he speaks of the continual re-ordering of one’s self-identity ‘against the backdrop of shifting experiences of day-to-day life and the fragmenting tendencies of modern institutions’ (Giddens 1991, p. 186).

The significance of social relations in the formation of identity—that is, through the involvement in relationships with other people, especially those who are emotionally important—is fundamental to the understanding of how “self” is constructed (Reiger 2002). This point is elaborated upon by Alvesson and Billing (1997):

> Identities must be constructed: they do not exist as an objective set of characteristics, but involve the creating of meaning on the part of the individual persons and others contributing to the definition of identity ... It is important to stress that this fluidity—the processual nature of identity—is contingent upon social relations and language use. One does not develop and maintain identity in splendid isolation, but in close interaction with other people, who confirm, support or disrupt different identity claims (p. 96).

The postmodern preoccupation with ‘fluidity of identity’, however, needs to be tempered by the suggestion that ‘... theories of multiples selves leaves us with the risk of becoming overpopulated with selves’ (Walker 2000, p. 7).

One of the problematic notions for individuals trying to accept different aspects of themselves is that the societies in which they are located can variously encourage desirable characteristics or even deny and silence undesirable aspects of ourselves. Over time, we realise that what we do, think and feel depends on what we are doing and who we are with (Smith & Mackie 1995).
Walker (2000) adopts the position that neither the modernist (as represented in the psychological interpretations of “self”), nor the postmodernist positions provide adequate conceptualisations of their own and that it is more appropriate to consider an integrated “self”, which is essentially an individual with a central core of beliefs and values that are capable of change over time along with a “self” that is constructed differently in different contexts.

The view that I am taking about the nature of identity and of “self” is consistent with that advanced by Walker (2000), that is, that social processes influence and maintain an individual’s personal and private identity and also react upon a given social structure to maintain, modify and reshape it. What one does, how one does it and how one is perceived by others, along with the relationships that are formed, all coalesce to shape the core of an individual’s private identity—an identity that results in a self that is classed, gendered and racialised (Blackmore & Sachs 2000).

At the other extreme of “self” is ‘Other’, which is, as Riggins (1997) explains, about being different. The term ‘Other’ has recently become part of the common terminology of sociology used to label men, in this case, who are measured against dominant masculinities because of their rejection of traditional masculinist orientations (Alvesson & Billing 1997), although it needs to be said that women have always been judged against masculinity and have had to contend with the label of ‘Other’. ‘Other’ is a label that replaces words such as ‘deviant’ and ‘outsider’. Buchbinder (1994) makes the observation that the use of the word ‘Other’ is a useful aspect of feminist theory:

‘The Self’ is constructed as unified and unitary, the ‘Other’ multiple and scattered; and that construction not only allows for
the “self” to become occulted and invisible as a construct, so that it comes to be identified as the natural position (p. 92).

It follows, then, that being ‘Other’ is about being identified as unnatural, with outsiders tending to perceive ‘Others’, such as gays, Asians, and people of colour, each as a homogeneous category.

Our notions of “self” are not fixed; they are constantly responding to, and at the same time, influencing other social forces, yet I remain convinced that these are interactions with an internalised set of values and beliefs. I suspect that the conundrum of being simultaneously “self” and ‘Other’—something that I experienced when I discovered my own “self”, only to discover that as a gay man, I was also ‘Other’—is an experience not uncommon to a number of people: individuals from marginalised groups and women, for instance. As Plummer (1999) notes,

... “self” becomes ‘other’ (and the divide between “self” and ‘other’ becomes arbitrary, volatile, and miscible). If so, there would be significant implications for boundaries, which might lose their power and meaning (p. 215).

Identities are not formed in a vacuum, so it is appropriate to consider work as a context for identity formation. The concept of ‘work’ is problematic, as feminists have made clear, for tensions exist about why it is that the unpaid domestic work performed predominantly by women, is not valued to the same extent as the paid away-from-home work of males (Collinson & Hearn 1996). Workplaces are sites where identities, including gender identities, are constructed and evaluated, so it is away-from-home workplaces that I now turn my attention in order to further develop the fluid
nature of identity formation, which may lead to a sense of agency\textsuperscript{9} within individuals’ work structures.

\textbf{“Self” and Identity at Work}

What Casey (1995a) adds to the debate about the meaning of “self” is a consideration of the role of work in identity formation, for, she argues, work remains a dominant activity in people’s lives, and regardless of whether one likes one’s job or not, ‘… work as it is conventionally organized significantly shapes everyday life experience for most people in industrial societies’ (p. 25). It is also argued that the ‘lessons’ of work are carried over into non-work situations (Kohn & Schooler 1983 in Casey 1995a). It is Casey’s contention that work remains significant in shaping the lives of individuals, in the character of “self” and in social organisation.

Casey’s own studies of workplaces have brought her to the conclusion that one aspect of the new, corporate, post-industrial culture is the movement towards team and family structures. This, she says, is an effort to reform work practices; an attempt to take them back to the compartmentalisation of work tasks and roles of an earlier era. What is happening now, Casey explains,

\ldots is a nostalgic restoration of industrial solidarities, and pre-industrial mythical memories of family and belonging, to hold together the social sphere and to ensure production for the time being. It is an effort to shore up the corporation against the effects

\textsuperscript{9} Agency, according to Kidd (after Giddens 1993 in Kidd 2002), is about choice to achieve an outcome and a freedom to exercise that choice. The notion of reflexivity, the ability for people to think about themselves and those around them, is central to the concept of agency.
of wider cultural changes that are now upon us and has the effect of making the emotional management of work more important (Casey 1995a, p. 137).

By developing a team ethos loyalty to the organisation is also enhanced.

The effect on one’s personality for those who work in large organisations, according to LaBier (1986) can be ‘modern madness’, made up of sometimes invisible surface symptoms, and which may affect large numbers of success-oriented men and women—intriguingly, mostly within the 25 to 47 year-old age group:

Modern madness is the invisible link between careers and emotional conflict. Its victims suffer various disturbances—genuine emotional conflicts—that range from mild distress to feelings of self-betrayal, to stress and burnout, to acute psychiatric symptoms and irrationality’ (p. 3).

Outwardly good at their jobs, LaBier contends that ‘victims’—itself a value-laden term—of the modern madness typically feel emotionally numb and lacking in passion and motivation.

Whereas individuals have abilities enabling them to adapt to organisational demands and to enjoy the subsequent material rewards, LaBier asserts that this can come at a cost. Individuals, he says, can harbour feelings of guilt that relate to a sense of trading off too much, or of betraying their own values, leading to feelings of rage, depression and anxiety—‘the negative side of normalcy’ (p. 5). The sources of these work-related inner conflicts are two-fold: the first is a response to adopting the values, attitudes and behaviour necessary for career progression in large organisations; the second
are the conflicts generated by the transformation in work from a production-oriented economy to a ‘techno-service economy’. Ironically, work environments and organisations support and reward the sickness, with most people dealing with conflicts and compromises by adapting more successfully and simply working harder; by rebelling, or by suffering visibly or invisibly. It is these behaviours, Casey says, that become perverse standards of normalcy and are accepted as part of the job. The person, the new corporate self, adapts to a 'disturbed work environment' (Casey 1995a, p. 84).

Three types of corporate selves are thought to emerge in these work environments. The first of these, writes Casey (1995a) is the defensive self, an individual who would rather be somewhere else because of their confusion that arises from an association with the corporation, but are tied by the financial rewards and kudos. The second is the colluded self. In a traditional industrial hierarchy, Casey argues, it was a matter of simple conformity, but in the corporate culture, this individual becomes ‘... dependent, over-agreeable, compulsive in dedication and diligence, passionate about the product and the company’ (p. 191). The third corporate self is the capitulated self, which is one who ‘... recognizes but denies the processes of discipline, enforced self-restraining and evangelical optimism—a wearied surrender on negotiated terms’ (pp. 191-192).

Casey’s (1995a) three-tiered representation of corporate selves does not, however, seem to fully reflect other statements made within her text. For instance, when referring to the work of LaBier (1986), she makes the statement that most people are able to deal with conflicts and compromises by adapting more successfully and
simply working harder; others rebel whilst others suffer visibly or invisibly (Casey 1995a, pp. 82 - 83). Providing an image, as she does, of the defensive self, the colluded self and the capitulated self, does not seem to create a ‘space’ for those who are more successfully able to adapt to the tensions of the workplace—those who could be thought of as practising self-leadership (Neck & Manz 2000). Individuals who adopt behavioural and mental approaches, that is, those who are able to observe themselves in the work context, are sensitive to the antecedents of their behaviours and prepared to modify the consequences of their behaviours as well as being prepared and able to alter their belief systems, assumptions and thought processes. Self-leadership, as an alternative perspective, or even as a way of framing what it is that we all do from time-to-time, is the process of influencing oneself to establish the direction and self-motivation to perform and to find the balance between group cohesiveness and the values of individual employees.

Similarly, individuals who possess abilities of emotional intelligence which Goleman (1995) defines as ‘… being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one's moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope' (p. 35), seem to be overlooked in Casey’s categorisation of the corporate selves. An individual who possesses emotional intelligence would appear to be well-placed to adapt to the modern workplace, for they are said to practise the following five domains of emotional intelligence, these being: knowing one’s emotions;
managing one’s emotions; motivating oneself; recognizing emotions in others, and handling relationships (Salovey 1990 in Goleman 1995, pp. 43 - 44).

“Self” and the Organisation

Individuals do not exist in isolation, and for most, life within work organisations is a reality. From Schein’s (1997) perspective, assumptions and ideas are taken for granted in a culture, and individuals are not always consciously aware of their culture because it is taken for granted and familiar; it is ‘unshakable real’ (Krefting & Frost 1985, p. 156).

But as Alvesson and Billing (1997) point out culture is shared by a group at an ideational level and reflects a value-laden belief system, as opposed to individuals who might comprise that group. And although there may exist a set of values, beliefs and understandings between employees in a workplace, there may be different orientations, say between the men and women who work there:

There is often limited awareness that social reality can be experienced and understood in radically different ways, and that an infinite number of approaches are possible … Culture closes minds. Behaviour assumed to be feminine is for example seen as natural and self-evident when performed by females, but surprising, odd and unnatural when characterizing a man and vice versa (Alvesson & Billing 1997, p. 105).

A leader within an organisation may well think that he or she is creating an organisation’s culture by trying to define the way of life within the organisation and, by implication, obtaining the
compliance of the employees (Sergiovanni 1984, pp. 106 - 107), however, to do so would mean that many things are being taken for granted. Embedded in the culture of organisations when considering their gendered practices are the ‘… subtle innuendos, images, valuings and languages which exclude [original emphasis] many women, such as dominant "masculinist" images of leadership and administration’ (Blackmore 1993a, pp. 28-29). (These issues of exclusion and masculinity(ies), whilst noted here, will be pursued later.)

Although organisational cultures are frequently described as ‘how we do things around here’, it is troubling that “we” is accepted as the norm and that there is an assumption that there is only one way of doing things (Blackmore 1999). An alternative way to view the functioning of organisations is provided by feminist poststructuralists, who explore and critique organisational discourses by considering the particular power arrangements and practices of organisations that are embedded in networks of relations within those organisations.

Viewed this way, the concept of an organisation having a single culture that is recognisable to all its members becomes problematic, for ‘the interests of some particular groups can be furthered because of their capacity to impart legitimate meanings while subjugating the meanings of other groups’ (Blackmore 1999, p. 16). There are consequently numerous ‘truths’ that exist in an organisation, but because ‘truth’ is linked with systems of power which produce and sustain it, it is as though there is ‘A "regime" of truth’ (Foucault 1980, p. 133). The dominant ‘truth’ — oft portrayed as the culture of an organisation — subjugates all other ‘truths’. The threat of fear and
uncertainty of not conforming shapes individuals’ identities, as Alvesson and Billing (1997) describe:

Corporate culture stands for ideas, meanings and norms bringing about homogeneity and predictability in understanding, thinking and valuing among people ... the importance attached to knowing the rules of the game, means a strong pressure toward conformity ... (pp. 107-108).

An additional dimension in the formulation of one’s “self” is the manner in which individuals cope with the demands of their workplaces. Coping is itself an identity-forming process and is very much dependant upon not only the resources of the individual, but on the resources and supports offered and available by others, including those in the workplace. I have therefore extended the consideration of “self” and identity by exploring literature that pertains to coping and self-care.

**DEFENDING “SELF” AGAINST THREAT**

What follows is a consideration of some of the literature in relation to coping and self-care strategies that individuals might adopt when confronted with work situations including burn-out and stress. Exploration of the coping and self-care strategies of the sample of male academic leaders in this study is believed to be important because, as Connell says when drawing on his own experience, ‘... work on these [counter sexist] issues is stressful, often painful, and difficult to sustain without support' (Connell 2000, p. 210).
‘Feeling rules’, the norms that prescribe behaviours and feelings (Doka & Martin 1998) act as a 'manhood-making process', in which men are expected to be in control and confident; more concerned with thinking than feeling; able to endure stress, and to be a provider. What is not expected of men include them losing control over a situation (or themselves); being insecure or anxious; exhibiting typically feminine characteristics—whatever these may be—touching other men or expressing loneliness, sadness or depression (Shapiro 1984 in Staudacher 1991). In situations in which men take on counter sexist issues, there will be expectations placed upon them about what is and is not appropriate in the way they deal with the issues. Support, when it is sought, can come from internal sources as well as sources external to the individual.

A 'masculine' pattern of grieving has been advanced by Doka and Martin to describe a gender-related, but they stress—and this is important—not gender-specific, way of dealing with a loss10, in which '… grief is often processed cognitively, behaviourally, and solidarily' (Doka & Martin 1998, p. 149). Masculine griever, the authors say, are more comfortable in cognitively dealing with their grief, rather than using affective expressions. Masculine griever usually become immersed in some form of activity, which may include immersion in work or in some task directly related to the loss, but may also be reluctant to share their grief, preferring to master their feelings alone (Doka & Martin 1998).

10 The losses being referred to by Doka and Martin (1998) and other authors in this section of the literature review are in the context of losses associated with death. Grief, however, is a response to loss—not only a particular loss when someone has died—so this literature is being called upon to explain gender-related approaches to dealing with a loss (such as loss of job security).
The relevance of stress and coping literature to this study is germane, particularly when the results of recent studies into the health status of Australian academics are considered. Government policy changes since 1996 that have seen the introduction of new work for academics (and non-academic staff) include client liaison, marketing and fund-raising, along with a variety of restructuring measures. As a consequence, the National Tertiary Education Union (2000) reported that some 81.9% of academics reported increased stress levels and that they attributed this to increased workloads, the climate within universities—particularly the management culture—low morale, continual change, and the lack of time for research and scholarly activity. Ironically, perhaps, the NTEU claimed that the majority of staff still finds their job satisfying. Two years later, the NTEU released another study, the key findings of which were that approximately 50% of the Australian university staff taking part in the study were at risk of psychological illness ‘due to stress and pressure in the workplace’, compared with 19% of the general population (Winefield, Gillespie, Stough, Dua & Hapuarachchi 2002).
Relationships Between Stress and Coping

When discussing the concept of stress\textsuperscript{11}, Smith and Mackie (1995) argue that three types of events can pose significant threats to “self”: failures; inconsistencies to our usual ways of doing things, and stressors, both small and large. These threats to the self have the potential to affect not only the emotional well-being, but the physical health of individuals, with the most damaging threats being those that we consider as being uncontrollable. ‘Psychological stress, therefore, is a relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being’ (Lazarus & Folkman 1984, p. 21). The internal resources to cope with stress are usually considered to be cognitive and emotional (Smith & Mackie 1995). In the context of higher education, it would not be unreasonable to expect that other resources could include intellectual, political and social support.

In order to defend “self” against threats, a variety of responses are possible such as escape, distraction, self-expression or a reframing of the event’s significance. These responses, according to Smith and Mackie (1995) are examples of emotion-focussed coping, whereas attacking perceived controllable threats ‘head on’ by using

\textsuperscript{11} The concept of stress is usually defined as either stimulus or response. Stimulus definitions focus on environmental effects, such as natural disasters, illness and work-related effects; response definitions concern themselves with the manner in which the person responds to stress, being under stress, reacting stressfully and so on (Lazarus & Folkman 1984). Coping is best understood when viewed within the larger context of the stress process, though it should be emphasised that coping does not imply mastery of a situation (Pearlin 1991). Stress can be viewed as a disruption of meanings; coping is what one does about that disruption.
strategies such as attempting to remove the negative event, making excuses, or seeking to take control, are considered to be examples of problem-focussed coping. Sometimes, they say, the best option is to try to use both types of coping simultaneously.

Coping has an interpersonal dimension to it. Although individuals will have their own responses to a stressful event, Pearlin states that the expectations or actions of others influence the response:

... by definition, coping is a construct ultimately anchored in individual actions, it is often in response to stressors that arise in social situations where other people are also involved with the stressor, either because they have helped to create it or because they, too, are attempting to cope with it. In both instances, the coping actions of one person will be constrained, encouraged, or channelled by the expectations and actions of the others (Pearlin 1991, p. 270).

Responses to threats will vary according to the cognitive and emotional resources that an individual has, combined with the perceived controllability of the threat.

**The Usefulness of Coping**

The functions of coping, says Pearlin (1991) are threefold: to modify the circumstances that give rise to the stress; to manage meaning cognitively and perceptually in a way that minimises the potency of stressors, and the control and relief of the symptoms of distress that result from the stressors. Coping serves to manage or alter the problem causing distress and/or to regulate the emotional response to the problem. Generally, emotion-focused forms of coping are
more likely to occur when the individual judges that nothing can be done to modify harmful, threatening, or challenging environmental conditions. When individuals consider that conditions are amenable to change, problem-focused forms of coping are more likely to be used, though there is an interrelationship between these two coping strategies (Folkman & Lazarus 1980 in Lazarus & Folkman 1984, p. 150).

Changes that occur in the workplace can lead to various losses such as a loss of security, loss of competence, loss of relationships with others, as well as experiencing uncertainty, fear and guilt about one’s sense of direction such as in the context of down-sizing, and being unsure about the new limits to one’s territory, both physical and psychological. The way in which a person will respond to a loss of any kind, is influenced by complex factors such as the relationship/s between individuals, the circumstances involved, reactions to previous losses as well as considerations that include the individual’s personality, cultural background and their personal support networks, though men are seen as having more difficulty adjusting to a loss because of the perception that they are less likely to show their feelings, share their reactions to the loss, and accept help from others (Doka & Martin 1998).

Sometimes, the complexities of stressful encounters create demands that can exceed a person's resources. These factors can include personal constraints (those internalised cultural values and beliefs that limit certain types of action or feeling, and psychological aspects of an individual's make-up), environmental constraints (the competing demands for the same resources) and the perceived level of threat.
In an on-going study of occupational stress in Australian universities (Winefield et al. 2002), the authors note that even though problem-focused coping may be utilised by individuals in their attempts to reduce stress and strain, negative coping strategies—for instance having negative thoughts and self-blaming—are associated with high stress and poor health. Furthermore, problem-focused coping is predictive of lower levels of occupational stress (Winefield et al. 2002). The authors view stressors as being the potential causes of stress and that stress may cause poor emotional health, poor physical health and poor quality of work, phenomena that they refer to as strain. Coping strategies, they argue, are said to mediate the stressors-stress and stress-strain relationships.

**Self-care Strategies**

Looking after oneself, which I have referred to as self-care strategies, relates to the coping strategies that a person adopts. As a coping strategy, self-care could be seen as a means of avoiding a potentially stressful event—anticipatory coping—creating a buffer, and/or dealing with an event that has occurred—crisis management (Pearlin & Schooler 1978 in Murgatroyd & Woolfe 1982).

At work, wellness and well-being are enhanced by job satisfaction and morale, whereas stress is a factor that detracts from well-being (Conn 1995). The discourses of health professionals and health educators are built around the concepts of wellness and various models have been developed that incorporate aspects of the individual’s physical, spiritual, occupational, financial, recreational,
and social lifestyle (for example the Davis Model in Lowdon, Davis, Dickie & Ferguson 1995). Nevertheless, it needs to be acknowledged that not everyone’s self-care strategies will embrace these notions of wellness and well-being. Self-care strategies are varied and are not always based on established concepts of wellness or well-being.

Foucault’s (1986) position in relation to self-care through the cultivation of “self”, is informed by the writings of several Greek and Roman philosophers, amongst them the reassuring words of Epicurus:

> It is never too early or too late to care for the well-being of the soul … both the young and the old should study philosophy, the former so that as he [sic] grows old he may still retain the happiness of youth in his pleasant memories of the past, the latter so that although he is old he may at the same time be young by virtue of his fearlessness of the future (Epicurus quoted in Foucault 1986, p. 48).

Contemporarily, and when speaking of health care practitioners, Kellehear (1999) maintains that they need to be both reflective and critical, that is, ‘… practitioners need to regularly reflect on and seek to understand how their personal and professional backgrounds shape their responses, biases, and prejudices …’ (p. 62). One of the consequences—and benefits—of being both critical and reflective, is that it enables us to discover our own voice:

> In becoming critically reflective, we also learn to speak about our practice in a way that is authentic and consistent. Speaking authentically means that we are alert to the choices inside us that are not our own, the voices that have been deliberately implanted
by outside interests rather than springing from our own experiences (Brookfield 1995, p. 45).

Addressing this notion of critical self-reflection, Schon (1984), when writing of the practices of skilled managers, suggests that they frequently conduct ‘a reflective conversation with the situation’ (p. 42), but whereas they might reflect-in-action, they seldom reflect on their reflection-in-action. When critical reflection occurs, however, it is then possible to criticise the tacit understandings that inform particular practices, ‘... and can make new sense of the situation of uncertainty or uniqueness which he [sic] may allow himself to experience’ (Schon 1991, p. 61).

In this way, self-care strategies, particularly those that include critical self-reflection, could be considered as giving agency—a means of providing power—to the individual. Smyth (2001) suggests four actions and related questions that will facilitate critical reflection: describe (what do I do?); inform (what does this mean?); confront (how did I come to be like this?), and reconstruct (how might I do things differently?). Dealing with threats via emotion-focussed coping or problem-focussed coping, or a combination of both, does not mean that an individual is automatically able to alter his or her context. When critical self-reflection is added to the mix, however, I would argue that the individual is injecting a sense of agency into his or her self-care:

A practitioner who reflects-in-action tends to question the definition of his [sic] task, the theories-in-action that he brings to it, and the measures of performance by which he is controlled. And as he questions these things, he also questions elements of the organizational knowledge structure in which his functions are embedded (Schon 1991, p. 337).
Once practices are named and questioned, the potential for change increases: ‘As soon as you name something, you begin to have power over it’ (Golden 1996, p. 49). This may be so, but there is an assumption here that individuals are capable of a seamless transition from reflecting, naming and challenging. If individuals are to identify via critical self-reflection both the constraining and liberating forces that affect them, they are then in a position to challenge the status quo, particularly if they ensure emotionally intelligent interactions with others also occur.

It would seem therefore that those men who are able to utilise both their intra and interpersonal intelligences are not only coping, but are well-placed to introduce agency into their workplaces by consciously challenging the status quo, utilising resistance, collaboration or transformation as strategies (Goode & Bagilhole 1998), tackling problems as a first defence.

The chapter that follows embarks into the gendered territory of leadership within organisations. I make frequent reference to the role of masculinity(ies) in the workplace in general, and on leadership in particular, so it is my intention in the chapter to explain some of my understandings of the dimensions of the issues.
CHAPTER 3: MASCULINITY(IES)

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF GENDER

Feminist writings have challenged assumptions about the roles of men and women in society in general, and workplaces in particular, and one outcome has seen the emergence of writings about different masculinities. The concept of masculinity, and indeed its plural form, masculinities, is increasingly being questioned. No longer is masculinity the 'monolithic unproblematic entity' (Mac an Ghaill 1996, p. 1) it once was, and the situation for women is unlikely to be changed unless masculinity is problematised. The interaction between feminist and masculinist discourses, as well as gay and lesbian writing and HIV/AIDS activism (Hearn 1996; Mac an Ghaill 1996), have contributed significantly to explain the way in which workplace and societal interactions have evolved to our current understandings of the social relations of gender.

Significantly, increasing numbers of male academics, (including Collinson & Hearn 1996; Coltrane 1994; Hearn 1996; Whitehead 2000a), who write about masculinity(ies), are at pains to ensure that they are not ignoring the concerns of feminist authors, for the potential exists for men to colonise this arena of academic discourse, and worse, to render invisible the role of patriarchy.

The taken-for-granted assumptions about the roles of men and women in society have ensured that one set of interests—usually that of white, middle-class, heterosexual males—are upheld, and that all other interests are portrayed as the 'Other', 'particularist' and self interested (Blackmore 1995a). Through this process a particular form of masculine experience becomes stamped as the
only legitimate form (Seidler 1994). Males learn, from very early in their lives, the masculine roles which are expected of them. Aggressiveness, rationality, independence, strong achievement orientation, impatience, hostility, overt externalisation of inner feelings, a sense of being under constant pressure, and the celebration of physical strength are frequently characteristics of typical masculine values\(^\text{12}\) (Philarteou & Allen 2001; Weisner 1993). In pursuit of the perfect performance (Edley & Wetherell 1996), '... many men spend their whole lives ensuring that they have the word "excellent" on their reports for masculinity' (Humphries 1985, p. 77).

A social relations framework means that the smooth and harmonious progression advanced by sex-role theorists is challenged for the latter fails to recognise the struggles for social power that exist in the formation of gender identities (Edley & Wetherell 1996). Each culture constructs men and masculinity(ies) through its social institutions, resulting in a range of different—and sometimes contradictory—images of manhood. What one’s gender identity comes to mean, therefore, is both contestable and relational (Edley & Wetherell 1996; Kimmel 2000). Men (and women) come to understand what it means to be a man or woman in relation to the dominant models of masculinity, as do those who experience marginalisation because of their race, sexuality, ethnicity and/or class.

---

\(^{12}\) The typicality of these attributes is questioned by Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) as being too ‘broad brush’ and stereotypical in description. Whereas some personal behaviours are accepted as being more legitimate than others, and therefore more rewarded and powerful, not all men live out these behaviours of hegemonic masculinity.
This does not mean that men and women necessarily have different understandings of what it is to be a man or to be a woman. Rather, it is through men’s ability — typically unchallenged — to control how society not only gives men power but that consequent understandings become premised upon this fundamental source of power (Edley & Wetherell 1996). This is nevertheless significantly problematic, for there is nothing that predisposes men to assume this position (Moodley 1999).

Examples of gay men with a collective diverse range of masculine expressions are drawn upon to develop this concept further, for gay men not only demonstrate how representations of masculinity(ies) have changed over time, but are said to provide ‘the most significant and radical response to conventional masculinity …’ (Lingard & Douglas 1999, p. 33). According to Moore’s (1998) analysis, gay Australian men in the 1970s lived out a gender inversion as ‘limp-wristed fags, poofers, flouncing about in semi-feminine attire’. Come the 1990s, as evidenced by the Mardi Gras Parade in Sydney and other media representations, this earlier image is replaced with one of ‘rampant masculinity: gym-trained taut muscles and an unrestrained maleness’, even though this latter image may be one of the manifestations of a reaction to the often cadaverous-looking physiques caused by HIV/AIDS illnesses.

Elsewhere too, there is acknowledgment that the concept of masculinity(ies) is changing and gradually becoming inclusive of a range of behaviours such as showing emotion and demonstrating passion, hitherto believed to be ‘feminine’ behaviours (Blackmore 1995a). In some organisations in which the executive culture has
changed to alter the balance of power to include women, Sinclair (1994) notes that

There is a shift from masculinity as a phlegmatic and solitary toughness to a tentatively nurturant masculinity: executives as men who work and "interact with peers in a healthy working relationship" ... a very different image of the executive, and a very different sense of masculism (p. 19).

Contexts affect, and in turn, are affected by, the potential for a hegemonic masculinity to arise. The view, notably from early in the 1990s, is that the particular type of masculinity that pervades educational administration and which acts to exclude certain people, is one that is 'heterosexual, white, rational and [a] technically capable male' (Blackmore 1993a, p. 30). And whilst this might give the impression that it is only certain males who perpetuate this notion because most men have the potential to benefit from it (Donaldson 1993), it is worthwhile considering how the status quo is maintained by some women who see particular benefits to their own femininity, notably in contexts in which dominant masculinity(ies) encourage and reward particular femininities (Connell 1987 in Blackmore 1993a).

Cheng (1996 in Billing & Alvesson 2000) and Whitehead (1999) take this further with the contention that women who are successful as managers are performing hegemonic masculinity. This view may overlook, and indeed oversimplify, the tensions that many women experience when working in male-dominated environments. Within one educational bureaucracy, for instance, Blackmore (1993b) reported that women needed to learn to work strategically and that this created a tension: traitor to some; accomplice to others. Whether some women are complicit in the reinforcement of a
hegemonic masculinity in a manner similar to the way in which Indigenous feminists see all white women as being complicit in the perpetration of all dominant white patriarchy (Moreton-Robinson 2000), and/or whether they are operating strategically, is a moot point. What is clearer, however, is that a particular type of masculine dominance is maintained and that this is effected by ensuring that there are no challenges to the norm. The positions of particular men can be threatened not only by women, but also by men who have a different expressions of masculinity (Blackmore 1993b), and who may, as a result of this, be humiliated and brutalised by other men who are pursuing power (Jenkins 1994 in Hare-Mustin & Maracek 1994).

The concept of hegemonic masculinity and its usefulness in the theorising of masculinity has been criticised for some time (Kimmel 1990). Attempts to reduce the myriad of men’s experiences and actions to that of an illusory single type of masculinity are problematical. ‘... [the] experience of masculinity and of being a man are not uniform and ... we should develop ways of theorizing these differences’ (Hearn & Morgan 1990, p. 11). The diversity amongst men needs to be acknowledged, although when this occurs

... men will lose access to a collective and normative masculine identity which has been the justification for the exclusion of women from social power (Douglas 1995, p. 194).

Alvesson and Billing (1997) make the point that profeminist male researchers who adopt a feminist standpoint position, and who investigate masculinity and patriarchy as oppressive forces, can be seen as adopting an ‘anti-masculine’ stance that associates men and masculinities with privilege and who are active in the domination
of women. Connell (1989) notes that for men recognising and acting upon feminist principles, it is unlikely to be either an uplifting or enjoyable experience. 'Feminist textual politics are inaccessible to most men and require a teeth-gritting effort from the few who make contact' (Connell 1989, p. 301). It might be noted, however, that this experience by men trying to access feminist politics is essentially no different than the experiences of women trying to access masculinist politics.

**WORKING TOWARDS A CRITICAL THEORISING OF MASCULINITY(IES)**

Feminist reforms have clearly opened the way for men to explore themselves as culturally constructed persons (Connell 1995; Douglas 1995). These authors believe that some men have been able to examine themselves largely because the inadequacies of a purist form of feminist discourse—one that excluded some men as well as some women (see Radford-Hill 1986)—have been critiqued. The result of these critiques has been for men to increasingly think about taken-for-granted assumptions (Grundy 1993), amongst them that there is no longer a single definition of ‘masculine’—thus, the use of the term ‘masculinity(ies)’.

Attempts to create some sort of middle ground, that of the development of an androgynous self, have been promoted by some (see Erikson in Weiner 1995; Philarteou & Allen 2001). An idealised model of androgyny, although somewhat appealing because it suggests that masculine and feminine qualities can be melded within the same person, rather than resolving the tension between masculine and feminine qualities, ‘... may do just the reverse,'
argues Connell (1987, p. 283). He suggests that the interaction between the individual and the socio-cultural context is complex and not a unilinear transmission because of the relations of power underpinning gender. He also argues that combining masculine and feminine qualities, in the form of an androgyne, will not necessarily resolve the tension because the suggestion is more concerned with attitudes rather than the material inequalities and issues of power (Collard 1997b; Connell 2000).

Blackmore (1995a) for one, acknowledges the exploration of different masculinities that is being undertaken. What this has made evident, she says, is that it is not only women who are excluded by masculinist practices, but also some men, as can be seen in the following statement: 'Given multiple masculinities and femininities, particular forms of masculinity are sustained, reproduced and privileged in certain management practices in ways which render other forms of masculinity (for example homosexuality) and all forms of femininity as lesser ...' (Blackmore 1995a, p.46). Gender, say Alvesson and Billing (1997), is too often taken to mean 'women', and as Blackmore (1999) has noted, women are treated as an homogenous group without differences and which 'effectively conflates "being female" into "being feminist" ... the "feminist osmosis thesis"' (p. 57). In an effort to ensure that men are not alienated by one-sided, anti-male orientations, Alvesson and Billing call for critical studies of men, masculinities and oppression, and that these become context-driven.

Masculine identities, Collinson and Hearn (1996) argue, are negotiated and constructed in workplaces and elsewhere through the simultaneous processes of identification with, and
differentiation from, others. This is considered to be an unnerving process and one which the authors consider preoccupy men as they seek to find coherent identities for themselves. This task is made more difficult by changes brought about by technological advances, threats of unemployment, feminism and equal opportunity initiatives.

Workplaces are sites of 'homosocial reproduction' (Kimmel 2000, p. 175), that is, they are sites where men can define their masculinities. Just as work site cultures change, so too do the expressions of masculinity within them. In so much as sites vary according to occupation, industry, culture, class and type of organisation, it is argued that ‘multiple masculinities interconnect with multiple sites’ (Collinson & Hearn 1996, p. 66). Despite some evidence of change amongst individuals and groups, such as profeminist men, the majority of whom are heterosexual (Lingard & Douglas 1999), the dominant discourse of social institutions is still that of a hegemonic masculinity.

Concern is expressed about the manner in which masculinity(ies) are considered as being a reference point against which behaviours and identities can be evaluated (Hearn 1996). The term ‘masculinity’, Hearn argues, becomes something of a descriptor for a wide range of social phenomena and has been viewed as the primary cause of many social effects, whilst at the same time, being used as a controlling mechanism. Consequently, Hearn argues, it may be more appropriate to refer to ‘men’s practices’ and ‘men’s social relations’ — in other words, moving away from ‘masculinity’ and back to ‘men’ and their actions.
Elsewhere, there are increasing calls for the diversity of men’s experiences to be acknowledged, rather than being limited by varying labelling processes. Perhaps, say Alvesson and Billing (1997), the personal experiences of men may not have been seen as being very interesting, or are considered too unreliable or dubious, which has meant that it has been easier to problematise the concept of masculinity instead. In so doing, they contend, there is no delineation between men as ‘oppressors of women’ and men who have personal experiences. Dichotomous thinking about male-versus-female positions, argue Hare-Mustin and Maracek (1994), obscures the diversity and power differences that exist. Further, according to Whitehead (1999), the use of the words ‘hegemonic masculinity’ manages to simplify the debate and nullify the experiences of many men. The complexity of the meanings of masculinity are lost—perhaps purposefully—by the adoption of generic terminology (Coleman 1990).

There are some cautions in the literature about the way feminist authors might deal with the multitude of masculine expressions, for social justice, anti-sexism and anti-racism are not the monopoly of feminists alone (Blackmore 1999). Butler (1999), for instance, reminds us that ‘The feminist recourse to an imaginary past needs to be cautious not to promote a politically problematic reification of women’s experience in the course of debunking the self-reifying claims of masculinist power’ (pp. 45-46). The idealisation of certain forms of gender, she says, has the capacity to produce new forms of hierarchy and exclusion. Her concern is that feminists may begin to adopt modes of regulation and domination that had previously been, and still continue to be, used as models of oppression against them (Butler 1992). The “blame all men” approach, says Blackmore
(1999), is a negative guilt-based starting point, and she suggests that it is better to begin from the position of what men will gain from changing dominant modes of masculinity. And whilst not dismissing the many things that women have long been obliged to contend with, Seidler (1994) hopes that ‘this should not discount what men have to share about their experience’ (p. 113)\(^\text{13}\).

Notwithstanding these cautions, it is not enough for men to simply attest their allegiance to a new way of being, sometimes considered as a profeminist way of being (Lingard & Douglas 1999), as though it is ‘proof of our good intentions’ (Hearn 1992a, p. 5). Men may well be capable of changing the cultures that define them (Mac an Ghaill 1996), but feminists may be right to be sceptical about studies of men and masculinities, for they could have the effect of legitimating or justifying all manner of men’s actions (Hearn & Morgan 1990), or of colonising the territory (Whitehead 2000a). To critically engage with masculinity, says Whitehead, continuous and genuine reference to feminist scholarship is essential. In like manner, feminists too need to learn to work not only with men who are sympathetic to feminism, but also men who are in power relations with other women (Blackmore 1999).

A more inclusive approach to feminism in general is steadily emerging for it acknowledges diversity, as does the following view of Baker and Fogarty (1993), which heralds a shift in seeing feminism from a woman-centred analysis to a broader social

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{\textsuperscript{13} This discussion assumes that there are men who will want to share something of their own experiences. There is a view that there are male academics, for instance, who consider issues of gender to be silly or irrelevant, or who simply ignore it altogether.}}\]
construction of gender identities. One consequence of this shift is that feminism is able to broaden out and to become more inclusive:

Gender is constantly being negotiated within culture; it is dynamic, not static and therefore the processes by which gender is constructed within society is ever changing and able to be changed … Feminism is not just a women's issue: men are affected by feminism whether they choose to acknowledge it or not (Baker & Fogarty 1993, pp. vii - viii).

The contribution that diverse individuals can make seems to be what Blackmore (1993) proposes when she writes that just because males and females are different, they are not necessarily opposites. To arrive at a postmasculinist institutional politics, Blackmore suggests three strategies. The first is for feminists to intervene in the play of the discourse, which means that they need to become conscious of how they are being positioned in relation to others. Second, feminists need to better understand men's oppositional behaviours that resist change. The third of Blackmore's suggestions is to 'form a dialogue across the differences':

A post masculinist politics would involve a dialogue across difference in ways which meant feminists would work with profeminist men, for many men see feminism as offering them viable and more endearing alternatives to dominant models of masculinity … (Blackmore 1993b, p. 89).

If one of the ways forward, then, is to form alliances between women who espouse feminism and men who are ‘outside their ranks’, such as the profeminist men studied by Pease (2000), it is worth exploring which men might take on the feminist objective of social justice and empowerment. Yeatman (1993) suspects that most men in organisations will want to avoid middle management and
that they might be reluctant to take on these roles because they are not valued ways of working within the malestream. Yeatman also considers that an equity-oriented vision for universities will not come from the university's traditional academic leaders and managers. 'Instead it is more likely to come from academics who are placed as marginals in relation to this traditional culture of academic leadership and management' (Yeatman 1993, p. 20).

Alliances or coalitions between feminists, gay men and progressive heterosexual men will, several authors caution (Blackmore 1993b; Connell 1987; Hearn 1992a), bring with them a number of consequences. Perhaps not surprisingly, men who challenge the malestream paradigm are likely to be regarded sceptically by some feminists. There are likely to be difficulties too if men are to challenge the malestream paradigm, and these difficulties do not only come from the fact that they are '… labouring under and against the weight of men's power in the public domains …' (Hearn 1992a, p. 9).

To attempt to challenge the malestream, individuals need to be aware of the costs involved. Men and women in workplaces who see themselves as being political activists, particularly in the arena of sexual politics, are likely to find themselves in tough territory and perhaps likely to be met with derision from many other men and from some women (Connell 2000). Profeminist men represent a ‘submerged voice’ within the malestream and making that voice heard is akin to challenging the patriarchal discourse (Pease 2000, p. 4). Said Connell:

Daily confrontation with sexist businessmen or bureaucrats is no life for the thin-skinned. It matters to find ways of conserving the human resources and repairing damage. This issue is common to
all radicalism, but sexual politics has a unique personal dimension. Breaking down the gender system means, to some extent, tearing down what is most constitutive of one's own emotions, and occupying strange and ill-explained places in social space (Connell 1987, p. 282).

If it is true that men involved in counter-sexist and gender-reform pursuits are in for a rough ride (Connell 2000), then the way that they cope with this is worthy of consideration. The extent to which the above claims are borne out in Australia’s higher education sector is the focus of the following section.

**GENDER AND LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

In the preceding section I considered some general discussions about gender, and in particular, masculinity(ies). In this section, I sharpen the focus onto what has been happening within Australian universities in recent years. The scene is one of having to do much more with less, and I consider the emergence of studies in gender in higher education leadership against this backdrop. Whereas considerable research has been undertaken on gender in higher education, much of it concerns women, as though the terms ‘gender’ and ‘women’ are synonymous and interchangeable. Much less has been written about men in higher education from a gender perspective, as this chapter will demonstrate.

Socio-culturally and historically, Collard (1997b) says, women have been portrayed as being ill-equipped to handle leadership and that preferential hiring and promotional practices have favoured men on the basis of this stereotypical belief. Collard argues that in
psychological theory, women have to contend with male theorists taking men as the benchmark of normalcy in the development of psychological theories. Women have become 'the other' and the behaviour patterns that stem from this become socially embedded (Steinberg 1993 in Collard 1997b). Yet, due to the masculine dominance of academic and organisational life, and the tendency for research to uncritically reflect cultural beliefs, the lives of working men—and not women—have become the standard (Alvesson & Billing 1997). In situations in which transformational approaches have been adopted and which see a flattened hierarchical structure and more team-based approaches, women are ostensibly given an equal role, but due to assumptions made about their emotional management abilities, may end up being asked to take on more than their fair share of responsibilities (Deem 1998). Whereas it is unlikely that male academic leaders who are committed to emancipatory and transformational approaches to leadership would experience the same gender-based organisational norms as those experienced by women (Porter 1994), it is probable that different versions of masculinity will be exposed to 'rules' that will attempt to govern and control their behaviour.

Yeatman (1993) concludes that many senior men in universities are sympathetic to equity issues, not because they are necessarily committed to the principles involved, but because in their positions in universities, they see the importance of these values to the organisations' growth—as well as the costs of non-compliance. Similarly, she says, they are also largely unthreatened by the few women coming through; women who are frequently asked or required to wear the flack as equity change agents. Unfortunately, Yeatman believes, these senior men, rather than providing active
support and challenging the resistance, '... will uphold a fratriarchal social order within the institution' (Yeatman 1993, p. 24).

According to Blackmore and Kenway (1993) and Porter (1994), a common finding by researchers in the area of educational administration is that where women achieve senior status, they experience feelings of high visibility, although they might have a tokenistic role on committees. They can also feel isolated and lonely in a workplace perceived as being male-dominated and sometimes hostile. Women have historically been, and continue to be, subjected to gender-based organisational norms. Educational administrations are largely seen as masculinist enterprises that perpetuate hegemonic masculinity in their modes of organisation and role expectations.

Kanter (1977) questions whether gender determines leadership styles, but emphasises that there is inadequate research to substantiate the case put forward by many female writers. Says Collard, drawing a conclusion from Kanter’s work, '... the styles of both sexes vary over the same range and that there are no conclusive sex-related strategies' (Collard 1997b, p. 163). This may be related to women's need to adopt particular tactics, such as the women who were studied by Blackmore (1993). The women in this study reported that they coped in their male-dominated environments by using tactics that included choosing when to take on certain issues and how to play the game, using approaches like using language that men might use, that is, learning to work strategically within the bureaucratic culture. For some of the women, this created a tension, which Blackmore (1993b) paralleled
with simultaneously being an insider and an outsider. There is some evidence though, that femininities and masculinities affect management practices of both sexes, but that this appears to be dependent on the individual managers as well as on their gender (Collinson & Hearn 1996 in Deem 1998).

Aiming for a life which the authors describe as being more 'people-friendly', Goode and Bagilhole (1998) quote one of the senior female academics in their study of post-1992 universities in the United Kingdom, who said,

I'm passionately committed to changing things ... I dislike the games that men play, but I'm very good at playing them. I think that I hang on too—I think the thing is to know that you're playing them, and to reassure certainly other women who may be involved in the same business, that you're playing them, but that you don't support the values that underpin them. But you see that they get you where you want to be. Because I don't like the games in the first place, I don't feel that I'm very vulnerable to adopting them. I also think that I'm trying to get somewhere else which is not about preserving the status quo. But I'm conscious that if you don't obey the rules, if you're simply seen as rocking the boat all the time, you don't get the chance to influence anything (p. 157).

It is possible that this is similar for some men as it is for this senior female academic.

Various attempts have been made to sensitise men in some of our universities to the issues of gender in higher education. Klinck and Allard (1994) conducted such a project at the University of Melbourne in 1994, the purpose of which was to have male participants examine, and perhaps even change, the masculinist culture of their workplace. They made several assumptions at the
outset, including one that saw teaching, as well as administration, as a leadership activity. Of 1,200 invitations Klinck and Allard sent to male staff members, only eight signed up, with varying (and gradually diminishing) numbers attending each of the sessions. They observed significant jockeying for position and noted that some males seemed to have more rights than others. There also appeared to be a valuing of 'expert' knowledge and of 'right' answers—very much a reflection of the participants attempting to impose structure, and perhaps even control, on the proceedings.

The participants did not see themselves as either agents for change or in need of change: 'From their comments, it appeared that the power to change seemed to reside either higher up in the academic hierarchy or in women themselves.' Further, the participants did not seem to make a connection between how their teaching practices could change the culture of the university to empower women. The participants also reported that they found the literature that the authors provided as 'a hard read'—echoes here of Connell’s (1989) comments about the ‘teeth-gritting effort’ it took for some men to read such literature—and could not make connections with their work.

The limited ability to see and name the privileges of being male, and consequently, a seeming paralysis about doing anything about challenging the masculinist culture in their university is troubling, particularly if the situation mirrors that in the United Kingdom in which ‘higher education management is severely and chronically gendered’ (Hearn 1999, p. 127). Research in non-educational organisations conducted by Sinclair (1998), attests to the existence of a masculinist social order, one that values maleness, a type of
'clubiness' to which only certain men are admitted, and an approach that enshrines sport and combat\textsuperscript{14} as ways to function. Or as Capling, Considine and Crozier convey it, images of sport stars, heroes and risk-taking entrepreneurs have dominated our expectations of leaders in universities (Capling, Considine & Crozier 1998 in Marginson & Considine 2000).

Cautions exist that employing a discourse of ‘a woman’s style of leadership’ is potentially damaging: first, women are reduced to one homogenous style of leadership, and second, due to their supposed differences, are considered complementary — that is, secondary and lesser — to men (Blackmore 1999). From a feminist poststructuralist perspective, women’s power is derived from their differences, but as Blackmore says, ‘It is a difference … valued only to the extent that it serves organisationally defined goals’ (pp. 82-83).

The gendered nature of university operations, once acknowledged, requires considered responses if the real diversity of our institutions is to be utilised, and it has largely been left to feminists within the higher education sector to lead any such moves. One initiative, which mirrors the more general calls made by Ward

\textsuperscript{14} It is worth considering the words of Alvesson and Billing (1997) on linking metaphors such as these directly with suppositions of masculinity: ‘In the case of the sport and military metaphors the masculine meanings are rather obvious, but one should be somewhat cautious in drawing firm conclusions on their gender-discriminating effects without having listened to the people in the organisation’ (p. 113).
(1996) and others, is a call for a shift in feminism from a woman-centred analysis to a broader and dynamic social construction of gender identities.

Locating the current research issue in the context of universities, it is worth reconsidering Yeatman’s (1993) view that an equity-oriented vision for universities will not come from the universities’ traditional academic leaders and managers, but instead, from the 'core marginals'. Without wanting to compete for the 'most disadvantaged' label, nor wanting to twist Yeatman’s meaning, many of the writers referred to in this review of the literature seem to be raising the notion that it is not women alone who are affected by hegemonic masculinity (see, for instance, Hearn 1992a; Douglas 1995; Donaldson 1993; Grundy 1993; Connell 1995, 2000; Blackmore 1995). The concept of 'core marginals' then could be extended to include certain male academics and other leaders in our universities.

A particular group of male academic leaders, some of the 'marginals' in the university system, may well be those who are best placed to begin to effect the changes hoped for in the literature that has been reviewed, namely, changes that will embrace social justice and empowerment. Douglas (1995) speculated that there are three types of men distinguishable in their reactions to sexual politics: the ugly, the mute and the good. Of the final grouping, ‘the good’, Douglas says that these are

… [the] minority of men who have welcomed the changes in sexual politics as an opportunity rather than an infringement. These are usually men whose relationship with the dominant expression of the masculine self has always been problematic, or become so at some point of change in their lives ... The 'good'
occupy an uncertain terrain between their positioning as a man who still benefits materially from traditional practices, and a dissident male who publicly espouses a rhetoric of support for women's struggles for autonomy and equal access to public resources (Douglas 1995, p. 192).

It is this group who might potentially be seen as being outside of the hegemonic masculinity and who, if not already doing so, might be able to work alongside women to bring about social change in Australian universities, particularly in relation to the social relations of gender.

Hearn (1999) sought to work in a feminist-inspired way as a departmental manager in a British university, and after two years of doing so, made the following comment:

Personal/political profeminism is certainly in tension with masculinist managerialism; and there were many times when I felt it was difficult, if not impossible, to be all things to all people. However, it would be a mistake to assume that profeminism is necessarily incompatible with management, or that it is impossible to do profeminist management. Perhaps it is more accurate to recognize the specific and variable contingencies—gendered, organizational, hierarchical and so on—that affect the attempt to be both profeminist and a manager. Accordingly, the experience of being, or trying to be, a profeminist manager is likely to be rather different in such different organizational cultures (p. 136).

It is possible, however, that male academic leaders who practise collaborative styles of leadership will be discredited and marginalised in bureaucracies in which masculinity is organised around technical rationality and calculation, in a manner described by Buchbinder (1994). If these men exhibit assumed ‘feminine
attributes’, such as having consideration for consensual relationships as well as a focus on tasks (Bersoux 1987 in Weiner 1995), then they are likely to be further marginalised, as feminine attributes are ‘not valued ways of working’ (Blackmore 1993b, p. 76). Alternatively, if these men do not exhibit supposedly ‘feminine attributes’, it may be more acceptable for them to be transformational for this conforms to a view of men as being risk-takers, flexible and adaptive, in which case their expressions of masculinity(ies) are likely to be rewarded and sustained.

Just as Blackmore (1999) cautioned against a discourse that saw homogenising of women’s different approaches to leadership, so too should the same concern be extended to men practising transformational and profeminist leadership. The practices will necessarily be as different as there are men in those positions, according to their discipline, their university (after Austin 1990), their own personal attributes and their workplace identities (after Casey 1995a).

**SENSE-MAKING OF THE LITERATURE**

The bodies of knowledge that I have consulted and those that I have represented in this and the previous chapter, reflect my evolving understandings of the elements and interconnectedness of the issues. Just as I have explored particular themes in the literature that I have reviewed, I realise that there are many other themes of which I am either ignorant or which I have chosen to ignore. As an interpretative study, this is part of my interpretation; a reflection of the way in which I see and make sense of the world.
I am gradually becoming the ‘knower’ (Stanley & Wise 1990), but in order to have reached this position, I have had to challenge—and keep having to challenge—previous assumptions, values and certain blindness of which I was previously (and of which I continue to be) unaware. This has been assisted through the consideration of various feminist discourses. The probability that other men—potential ‘knowers’—might also access, let alone stand in, these discourses, is not great. From my own experiences of talking about gender to my students—male students, in particular—a common response from a small number of students is one of defensiveness. There are a very few male students that I would recall being prepared to put in the ‘teeth-gritting effort’ (Connell 1989) required.

To recap the literature considered: Chapter 1 provides a depiction of the current scene of Australia’s higher education system. The changing discourse of power in universities now includes a focus on the performativity of individuals within it (Ball 1999), as university personnel are busily seen to be doing things that are of increasing value to the university (Blackmore & Sachs 2000). Policies of economic competitiveness evidenced by product innovation, the preparation of students at lower costs and the management of personal, faculty and institutional work more effectively and efficiently are creeping into our universities (Slaughter 1998). Whereas a focus on performativity can be culture-building, it can also have an opposite effect—one of guilt, shame and envy. The nature of professionalism has changed; professional insecurity exists as individuals react to the requirement to meet organisational goals (Blackmore & Sachs 2000), whilst the autonomy of teachers is illusory rather than real (Smyth 2001).
addition to the stresses placed on staff, there are claims of abuses and intimidation being practised (Radio National 2001).

Chapter 2 reveals how the multi-faceted and fluid nature of identity, both away from work and at work, contributes to how it is that we construct who we are (Alvesson & Billing 1997; Casey 1995a; Giddens 1991). The new work practices in which we engage, even when they cause us to adapt to ‘disturbed’ work environments because of the inner conflicts and the modern madness (LaBier 1986) they prompt, are integral to the relational aspect of our identity and gender formation (Collinson & Hearn 1996).

In Chapter 3, I build on this knowledge of identity and gender formation with the assistance of feminist scholarship—scholarship that challenges the taken-for-granted world in which we exist (Grundy 1993). Whereas previously, ‘masculinity’ was considered by many as a blanket term that adequately described all men as well as their behaviours, the literature that I have considered demonstrates that there are many expressions of masculinity. There are, in fact, many masculinities. Not all of these versions of masculinity will be dominant (Connell 1987; Kenway 1997), however, for the local contexts in which they occur need to be considered (Alvesson & Billing 1997) and that this contextualising will provide a sense that certain masculinities are rendered as ‘Other’ (Riggins 1997). It is evident from the literature I have chosen that there are privileged versions of masculinity(ies) and that there are other men who are marginalised and silenced because of their race, sexuality and/or presumed ‘feminine attributes’. The loose way in which masculinity(ies) is used in some of the literature, has the effect of over-simplifying the issues (Whitehead 1999) and can
also lead to an homogenizing of what it means to be male. It is now considered more appropriate to refer to men’s practices and social relations rather than simply using the term ‘masculinity’ (Hearn 1996).

We tend to take our own culture for granted, for there is no reason—ordinarily—to question it (Krefting & Frost 1985), yet there are many reasons why it should be questioned. The popular ‘this is the way we do things around here’ translation of what a culture means is problematic, for it privileges certain actions and certain individuals over others (Blackmore 1999). There is also a low tolerance for deviation (Alvesson & Billing 1997) and exclusionary practices exist (Blackmore 1993a).

The characteristics that have been valued in leaders privilege one set of interests, that being the interests of the majority of white, heterosexual, and able-bodied males (Blackmore 1995), and which has seen human emotion sidelined (Sinclair 2002). The concept of a transformational leader has been proposed as an alternative, a feature of which is the ability to enable interpersonal support (Sergiovanni 2000) leading to the redistribution of power in the group (Sherwood et al. 1999) through the use of emancipatory praxis (Grundy 1993). A transformational leader has an over-riding concern for the welfare of staff and clients, yet ensures that the organisation’s goals are achieved, Grundy argues, which can create tensions in the current climate of doing more with less. The postmasculinist leader represents diversity in representation and decision-making, inclusivity, democracy, and is concerned with the development of alliances between those who are excluded and marginalised (Blackmore 1995b).
A range of possible outcomes for the postmasculinist transformational leader exist: they might be rewarded for taking risks, but at the other extreme, they might also be marginalised by the malestream. Either way, they are not likely to be automatically embraced by feminists and profeminist men until it is demonstrated that their actions speak louder than their words, and this may well require crossing the gap that frequently exists between the ideals and the reality of such leadership practices (Sinclair 2002).

Challenging the malestream will have its consequences (Connell 2000; Hearn 1992a), and regardless of the ways in which people cope with this stress, they will involve interpersonal dimensions and continue to be part of the identity-forming process (Lazarus & Folkman 1984; Pearlin 1991). Masculine approaches to coping tend to be immersed in activity—such as more work—and mastering thoughts and feelings alone (Doka & Martin 1998). However, these are not seen as gender-specific responses (Golden & Miller 1998). Just as ‘Other’ men in our society, such as gay men and Aboriginal men cope—or not—with their marginalisation, it is tempting to think that transformational leaders who are practising leadership differently to their organisational culture would be able to cope in similar ways. It is suggested that some coping strategies will lead to a greater sense of agency than others: working smarter may have more benefits than working harder.

Little, it seems, is known about what it is actually like for men who operate outside of the culture of their organisations, for the majority of leadership literature has been written about the hegemonic approaches to leadership. Similarly, more is written about masculinity(ies) than about the experiences of men themselves.
(Alvesson & Billing 1997). Therefore, it is not surprising that the experiences of dissident male leaders do not appear to have been extensively considered. It is only relatively recently that people like Ward (1996) have expressed a desire to learn more about the experiences of men who could be seen as allies to women. Ward argues in favour of hearing men’s stories:

I want to undo the whole package, I want to understand the whole issue. I don't want to hear whining stories of how the women's movement has been hard for men … what I do want to hear is those real stories, what life has really been like for men—and I feel privileged when I do (Ward 1996, p. 203).

It is likely that Ward speaks for many other women who want to know what men's experiences are. Men too, namely 'the mute' and 'the good' (Douglas 1995) would benefit from hearing of these experiences, as this is largely unexplored territory. Personal accounts from men, however, are often not forthcoming, because

We have to recognise this as part of a process, for men's perceptions of themselves, at least in personal and sexual relationships, are likely to be on the skew, defensive, superficial and many other things, because of the disconnections which often exist between inherited forms of masculinity and men's relationships with their emotions, feelings and desires … While it is crucial for men to recognise what women have been obliged to put up with for years, this should not discount what men have to share about their experience (Seidler 1994, pp. 111, 113).

Although a consideration of various feminist literatures was one of the principal catalysts for this research, it does not necessarily follow that this should be the sole yardstick against which men's accounts are considered (Seidler 1994).
I remain mindful of cautions expressed by several authors, amongst them Alvesson and Billing (1997) who suggest that, to date, it has been relatively easy to enter the discourse on masculinity(ies) by concentrating only on the conceptual frameworks of masculinity(ies). What is missing from this approach, are the diverse accounts of men’s experiences, and whereas it is undesirable to write women’s concerns and their experiences out of the account, the experiences of men who practise leadership collaboratively need to be named and critiqued.

Making sense of the gendered nature of these changes means considering the lack of power and opportunities that limit women’s distribution across all roles within universities (Collard 1997b). Nevertheless, it is women who are more likely to be the ones to create new rules in order to adapt to the changes, but it is understandably hard-going (Goode & Bagilhole 1998). The majority of senior men in the higher education system are considered unsympathetic to changing the fratriachal social order (Weiner 1995; Yeatman 1993). Gender-based organisational norms exist for women that are not expected of men, such as having a desirable appearance and being non-assertive and supportive (Porter 1994), with the women needing to adopt strategic behaviours that they know will work in such contexts (Blackmore 1993b; 1999).

Male clubiness exists in many organisations (Sinclair 1998) and many men, including profeminist men, are unable to see the privileges of being male, let alone consider that they might hold some potential for changing the way things are (Douglas 1995; Klinck & Allard 1994). Changes to the unequal situation for women
will therefore need to be driven by core marginals (Yeatman 1993)—women and also men from marginalised groups—who are able to recognise the social relations of gender and how they work in their organisations (Baker & Fogarty 1993). Men who engage in this pursuit, such as the self-declared collaborative leaders with whom I wish to speak in this study, may risk being seen as running counter to the masculinist organisational goals of their universities, and of being further marginalised (Blackmore 1993b; Buchbinder 1994; Weiner 1995). But as Hearn (1999) experienced, it may be difficult, but not impossible.

**Conceptual Framework**

Whilst presenting the truths that I have come to know in the preceding section, one of the common elements permeating through them is that of power. That mainstream masculinity is fundamentally linked to power is a postmodern position arrived at primarily by feminist and gay theorists, with the relationship between masculinity and power being organised around the issue of domination (Connell 1995). The subordination of women and domination of men, referred to as patriarchy, shows evidence of being challenged as local reversals of this catch-cry become evident (Connell 2000). A gendered division of labour is a result of male-dominated power structures and a tendency for homosocial reproduction, that is, men seeking and preferring the company of their own sex (Alvesson & Billing 1997; Kimmel 2000), though there is nothing that predisposes some men to assume a dominant position over women, or for that matter, over other men (Blackmore 1993b; Hare-Mustin & Maracek 1994; Moodley 1999).
Power is not a static phenomenon, and because of the complex interactions between people in organisations, ambiguous and unstable social relations on the part of individuals and groups can arise. The threat of fear and uncertainty of not conforming, particularly in large organisations, is significant (Alvesson & Billing 1997). Weber’s concept of the use of power whereby those with privileged access to material resources and with high status exercise power over those with less access and with lower social status (Graetz 2002) seems somewhat limited when viewed in this way.

In order to understand gender identities, the exercise of power controls how one should feel, think and act:

> Power here operates through normalization, through defining what is normal, natural and acceptable, and through invoking fear and uncertainty about deviating from this ideal—not through knocking people on the head or preventing them from doing anything (Alvesson & Billing 1997, p. 97).

In higher education institutions, just as in other educational institutions, unequal power relations ‘are established and constructed [original emphases] through the lived experiences of people … ‘ (Smyth 2001, p. 203). Yet, as Klinck and Allard (1994) observed, when a person is part of the privileged group, the person does not always see the benefits to him or herself and consequently fails to realise where they might be located in a hierarchy of power. Ideally, however, people make choices about how they live and work, and about how they might ‘ultimately penetrate the object of their struggles’ (Smyth 2001, p. 203). The type of leadership required to enable such a challenge of the existing power, says Smyth, is that which enables people to see the conditions that constrain them
through a process of critical self-reflection. The leader’s task is not to lift individuals out of the inequitable situation, but to transform the way individuals see the situation and for them to then make considered responses about how they proceed; to change the structures and processes that otherwise limit them. To transform them. Once the sources of power and the interests they support are recognised, established meanings and power structures need no longer be taken for granted.

Yet, I know from my own musings about the world and of the individuals in it, that explanations of power as interpreted from a postmodern perspective do not tell the full story for me. I am also intrigued by the behaviours, thoughts and feeling states of the individuals within that world. Recognising that this is how I process information, I rely as well on insights gained from the study of social psychology\(^\text{15}\) for it considers the individual within a social milieu. This dual perspective approach is similar to that taken by Walker (2000) in his research with men about their lives and who argues that understandings of “self” are informed by both psychological and postmodern interpretations, for neither on its own provides an adequate conceptualisation. Says Walker,

> Giving greater attention to self-in-relationship is one thing, to seemingly abandon the concept of a felt sense of self that can be experienced outside of relationship is another. Psychology may well have been overly focused on the individual. However, it hardly seems to be an advance to leave the individual out of the equation altogether (p. 2).

\(^{15}\) Social psychology: the study of ‘the effects of social and cognitive processes on the way individuals perceive, influence and relate to others’ (Smith & Mackie 1995, p. 3).
I liken the approach that I shall be taking in the interpretation of data to that of looking through a bifocal lens, that is, a need to look through both parts of the lens from time-to-time in order to better appreciate the world around us. This is certainly not an attempt to develop a meta-theory by combining aspects of two ways of looking at a phenomenon, for meta-theory is too grand a title to attach to what it is that I will be doing. My intentions are much more pragmatic—I need to understand what is happening, both from a power-political dynamic as well as from the dynamic of the individual.

My purpose in using a composite approach to interpret the data arising from my discussions with the men in my study is so that I can tease out the power relationships that exist, as well as considering the effects of social and cognitive processes on the way individuals relate to others (after Smith & Mackie 1995). My interest is not limited to explanations of power or to the psychology that drives people and helps to explain their actions—it is a combination of both; the individual interacting in socio-political contexts. I will be developing a way of thinking about the identities and subsequent leadership practices of the men in the study.

I anticipate that in the final analysis, I will be able to generate an account of men’s experiences as leaders as well, that finds a balance, just as Primecz (2000) adjudged of Alvesson and Billing’s text, *Understanding Gender and Organizations* (1997): being neither under- nor over-sensitive to gender. For as Alvesson and Billing themselves said, ‘It is also too easy to read masculinities and femininities into everything’ (Alvesson & Billing 1997, p. 100).
In the following chapter I begin by discussing narrative research methodology in broad terms before I then go on to detail how the research in this particular study has been conducted.
CHAPTER 4: THE RESEARCH NARRATIVE

This section of the dissertation is written with two purposes. The first purpose is to consider the general nature of narrative research methodology and why it is that I am using a narrative approach to research, and the second is to explain the particular research methods used in this study.

NARRATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: A DISCUSSION OF PRINCIPLES

Walker and Nias (1995) describe a continuum of research approaches. At one extreme they position positivist research, complete with its claim that it is value-free research. Ethnographic research (a matter of 'me' talking about 'them') is positioned in the middle of the continuum and this is described as being an attempt to be objective whilst conducting qualitative research. At the other extreme, Walker and Nias consider, is the 'postmodern position' (a matter of 'me' talking about 'us') which makes it evident that the researcher is indeed part of the research and that there is more than one 'truth'. Building subjectivity into research, as is the case in postpositivist research, provides an opportunity for insight into how all research is, in fact, done and how it is presented and represented.

Representation, however, is not problem-free, because the notion of "self" is constantly being brought into question because of how both participants and researchers position themselves and are positioned by others in the process. Further, any claim that one
research paradigm is 'more real' than another is artificial. It is much more important to make explicit what it is that the researcher is trying to understand, which, in turn, will lead to an increased theoretical understanding and to a clearer research strategy (Cherryholmes, Popkewitz, Walker & Schratz 1992; Hammersley & Walker 1992).

Because of the assumptions and values that the researcher necessarily brings to the research task, the researcher’s “self” intrudes into the research process. As argued previously, the notion of “self” is at least partially a socially-constructed one, and the same applies in the construction of the researcher’s “self” (Walker & Nias 1995). Added to this is the fact that I work in a university myself, which makes me an insider in the research process and which provides me with certain insights and assumptions. Walker and Nias argue that we end up with multiple selves and that we can never be free of the multiple selves when doing research. To them, the researcher's identity(ies) become part of the subject of research.

The research itself should not be about the researcher, yet clearly the researcher has control over what is to be researched and how it is to be reported. This is indeed a complex interaction, and is made more complex because in postpositivist research, Walker and Nias contend, there are no rules to follow—apart from one: if you are going to be part of the research then you have to question yourself, your assumptions and your perspectives in relation to how you describe the outcomes of the research. This is why the Prologue of this dissertation concerns itself with My Story. It is also why I insert myself at various times throughout the representation of the
research—my musings, my engagement with a linking of the
literature and the data. In the words of Walker and Nias (1995),
'Your truth is part of the story as well as the participants' truths'.
Being subjective, however, does not mean placing the researcher at
the centre of the research (Elliott, Lather, Schratz & Walker 1992),
and I consciously attempt to ensure that this does not happen.

Researchers need to be theoretically and methodologically
competent and postpositivists argue that the research question
needs to be identified before the researcher can become competent
in the method (Cherryholmes et al. 1992). Further, in the pursuit of
trying to increase understanding, researchers need to be free to
construct methods of obtaining data if existing methods are
unknown, and this may mean taking risks in research
(Cherryholmes et al. 1992; Elliott et al. 1992). Research methodology
texts provide some guidance, but the researcher needs to determine
his or her own methodology on the basis of what it is that the
researcher wants to find out, whilst bearing in mind two critical
questions to be asked of research: Why is the research being done,
and for whose benefit is the research being carried out? (Hamilton,

**Narrative Research Methods**

A number of authors, as this section will explore, have contributed
to the on-going discussion about the place of narrative research.
Whereas it is possible to have a consistent ideological position for
both doing the research and for reporting the research findings, the
process of representing the data is separate (Kincheloe 1997). This
statement should not be taken to mean that there is a distinction
between writing in the research process, sometimes referred to as ‘writing up’ the results of research (Kamler & Thomson 2001), and writing throughout the research. Far from it. The process of writing is part of the process of research.

As Hamilton, Holly, Walker and Schratz (1992) argue, the telling of the story, that is, the representation of the findings, is the most important part of research because it has the capacity to touch peoples' consciousness and therefore has the potential to make a difference. ‘Making a difference’, it should be noted, is not merely the result of what participants might say, for, as noted by Tierney, 'As researchers, we are participants in the creation of data ... narrative texts cannot be seen as other than co-created' (Tierney 2000, pp. 543-544).

The representation of the interplay of the research becomes something of a challenge. A personal account of what happened, without critique, say Walker and Nias (1995) becomes a work of fiction. They suggest that one way with which to deal with this is to present multiple perspectives and to reflect on these by identifying similarities, differences, patterns and causal interpretations. Letting the data 'speak for itself', they caution, is dangerous too because it leads people into presenting raw data for the reader to make what they want of it, while at the same time representing a 'biased' response to questions from a positioned researcher. All researchers are positioned in relation to their research one way or another, ' ... the challenge is to come to terms with the position in which authors locate themselves' (Tierney 2000, p. 543).
On the matter of how data are (re)presented, Hamilton et al. (1992) describe a shift when reporting research findings towards increased readability, plain-speaking and more accessible to practitioners, which is a reflection of broader trends in poststructuralist social research. There are several benefits from the use of narrative as a means of conveying research outcomes: it opens up a dialogue that is not present when people write traditional case studies; narrative makes it possible for multiple perspectives to be adopted; and whereas narrative does not tell people how to change, it does provide some parameters to initiate change—presumably, as Golden (1996) would argue, once you can name something you are then able to do something about it. The use of plain language and the improved readability of research findings may well be being seen as important (Hamilton et al. 1992), but, cautions McWilliam (1997), this should not suggest a movement towards anti-intellectualism. One of the tensions that results, therefore, is that of wanting to represent findings in a way that engages the audience, but which is also true to the voices of those who have participated in the research, whilst at the same time being able to incorporate theoretical perspectives. These, and other issues, will now be addressed.

**Narrative Inquiry: a Search for Truth(s)**

Elbaz-Luwisch (1997) describes the process of narrative analysis as one in which the researcher studies particular cases by collecting material, usually descriptions of events obtained through conversation and/or personal writing, and from this data, produces storied accounts which render the data meaningful. 'Through fiction … we rearrange facts, events and identities in order to draw
the reader into the story in a way that enables deeper understandings of individuals, organisations, or the events themselves' (Tierney 1993b, p. 313).

The individual who is the focus of the research has particular views about his or her own “self”, for when the individual agrees to participate in research he or she is making a conscious and informed decision about the nature and intent of the research. The social interaction between the researcher and participant will have some influence on the construction of the participant’s experience, though researchers are only able to access what participants understand of their experience, not the experience itself—self-concept is one thing, reality is another (Walker 2000).

Narrative story-telling, the re-telling of an individual’s experience, is one of the two major forms of arts-based educational research that has become popular over the last two decades, the aim of which ‘... is to entice the reader to reconceptualize the educational process through intimate disclosures from the lives of individual educators and students’ (Barone & Eisner 1997, p. 82). Arts-based research methods of inquiry represent a move away from the scientific, often meaning that such approaches will not readily be embraced by the academy, for, as Tierney (1997) acknowledges, few dissertation committees will consider experimental fiction.

Perhaps the status of narrative has been devalued because it is ‘the discourse of fairy tales, dinner conversation [and] pillow talk’ (Briggs & Woolbright 2000, p. xii). One approach for introducing narrative inquiry into the academy may be to follow this advice: break the science habit, ‘and go cold turkey into a new life’ (Lincoln
1997, p. 51). To do so, however, may mean that narrative researchers risk ridicule by bringing personal materials into what many consider to be a scientific endeavour (Elbaz-Luwisch 1997). Academe will need to be convinced that it is possible to produce academic narratives ‘that tangle story and theory inextricably’ (Briggs & Woolbright 2000, p. xii).

Proponents of narrative research methodology, however, can themselves be confused as to what is meant by narrative inquiry, with Casey (1995b) describing it as an overarching category for numerous research practices—from the collection and analysis of autobiographies and personal documents, through to ethnopsychology. Burnett (1999) at the time of writing his doctoral thesis, said: ‘… for those undertaking narrative research for the first time, unearthing literature that deals specifically with what to do, what to expect and what outcomes may be generated, is difficult to accomplish’ (p. 24). His contention is that much more is written about the theoretical developments in the field than how to write a narrative in specific research projects. Fernstermacher (1997) concedes that ‘All of what we call “narrative” does not appear to be the same’ (p. 122), and that he is troubled about what actually constitutes a narrative. He has been told, for instance, that his writing is variously too analytical, too autobiographical and too conceptual to be considered narrative.

Getting the balance right—for author, audience and research participants—is clearly not an easy task. Perhaps it is made more difficult by concentrating on concepts of reliability, validity and trustworthiness, at the expense of reality, which is a point reinforced by Prichard (2000), who contends that it is possible to
become preoccupied with the minutiae of the research process, at the expense of substantial issues of the experience being researched.

Gough, Kamler and Shacklock (2001) explain that the process of writing entails making choices and selections and that there are many influences upon what is included and what is omitted, such as the social context of the writing; the purpose and intended audience; other texts of similar kinds, along with the writer’s own personality, values and priorities. Further, the meaning of the text will vary according to what the reader brings to the piece and what he or she finds there. As Tierney (1997, p. 24) so aptly puts it, ‘… the struggle for the author is to ensure that the data accurately reflects social reality’.

In an exploration of the life stories of participants the researcher is exposed to individuals and their own social realities. It may be that self-understanding is determined by the context and participants may well make choices about how they present themselves in interviews, wanting to make positive sense of their lives or even be motivated to take part in studies because of the opportunity to explore and reflect upon certain aspects of their lives (Walker 2000). The ability to ‘know’ what the participants’ realities may be is hampered by our research processes; we cannot always know what constitutes the bigger socio-political picture, even though we may be attempting to see things through participants’ eyes (Fenstermacher 1997; Hones 1998). Knowing is one thing; telling is another (White 1980).

Importantly, Kamler warns, life stories that are co-produced and shaped through the interaction of researcher and participants are
representations of experience, although many are told as though they are the truth. ‘This is not to imply that people are lying when they tell of their experience, rather that they are selecting certain things and omitting others, foregrounding some elements, backgrounding others’ (Kamler 1998, p. 13). But rather than taking the view that narratives told in interviews create various ‘selves’, Walker (2000), on the basis of interviews conducted with men who told him about their lives, is convinced that the interview context facilitates the sense-making of people’s lives, rather than providing opportunities for truths to be created.

Given the co-produced nature of narrative, it is generally understood that there are four general positions or voices used to construct narrative text: the main character tells the story; a minor character tells the story; the narrator tells the story as observer, or the analytic or omniscient narrator tells the story (Hatch 1996 in Prichard 2000). The dominant convention, Prichard maintains, is that the narrator takes the stance of a seemingly neutral observer16.

16 After grappling with a variety of approaches, I have opted in this study to be the ‘seemingly neutral observer’, yet one who appreciates the burdens associated with this task—burdens that include being faithful to the stories and the voices of the men in the study and always being mindful of the multitude of truths that exist. The end-product is akin to Connell, Ashenden, Kessler and Dowsett’s (1982) Making the Difference: Schools, Families and Social Division, which manages to integrate commentary, participants’ comments and theoretical insights in a seamless way, although in my own attempt I feel a need to be more explicit about the connectedness with relevant literature and conceptual frameworks I am using.
Researchers, Kamler (1998) says, must be attentive to the way in which we form our research and our representations of what we are told—a search for the ‘floating value’ that constitutes truth, as Doyle (quoted in Fenstermacher 1997) would express it. ‘And rather than trying to produce supposedly factual narratives as though they are free from distortion, we may be more pragmatic as researchers if we generate ‘realistic fictions’ (Gough 1994, p. 47).

**Fictionalised and Experimental Narratives**

The issue of protecting the identities of participants is a very real ethical concern in this piece of research. Simply changing the names of the participants and of their institutions, I thought, would not be enough, for included in the men’s life stories are accounts that are spectacularly peculiar to them. Unless protected, the men potentially stand to lose a great deal. I initially considered some ways of avoiding unintentional disclosures through the use of fictionalised accounts. Elbaz-Luwisch (1997) suggests that fictionalising the accounts is one way of protecting identities, but advises that doing so is difficult, both technically and methodologically. A further concern is expressed by Denzin (1997) who issues a caution for those authors who intend to protect their informants by using fictionalised accounts, or where composite cases are moulded into a single story. Authors are obliged, he states, to make this clear to the reader, and further, that ‘the text must be realistic and concrete with regard to character, setting, atmosphere, and dialogue’ (p. 283).
Yet, there are ways in which it is possible to fictionalise accounts, not only to mask or protect informants, but in order to draw readers purposively into the accounts. Tierney (1993b) claims that the reader of ethnographic fiction does not judge the text according to standardized scientific criteria, or expect that the text is meant to explain all similar situations. Rather, he contends, the reader calls upon a number of questions:

a) Are the characters believable? b) Are there lessons to be learned from the text for my own life? c) Is the situation plausible? d) Where does the author fit in the formation of the text? e) What other interpretations exist? and f) Has the text enabled me to reflect on my own life and work? (p. 313)

If the story ‘works’ because of these aspects being incorporated into the account, it has succeeded from a literary perspective (Sparkes 1997).

The aesthetics of this form of inquiry also warrant comment. Arts-based educational inquiry, of which narrative is one form, entails particular features, one of which is the use of expressive language that engages the reader’s imagination, ‘… inviting the reader to fill gaps in the text with personal meaning’ (Barone & Eisner 1997, p. 75). Another of the features, they go on to say, involves an aesthetic form that constitutes three phases of story-telling: the framing of a dilemma, followed by the development of a plot, which then concludes with a resolution that provides a sense of growth or change on the part of the main character.

Several examples have been sourced where the use of literary devices has been used to link narrative with interpretation. Kegan (1994) in his efforts to combine both, says, ‘I have written [the book]
in the same strange two-toned voice that one moment draws its authority from analytic criteria, the next from aesthetic ones. I respect both these sources and frankly suspect all writing that is all one or the other. In either mode, I’ve tried my best to write more accessibly’ (p. 2).

Other attempts to increase readers’ accessibility have included Lather’s (1997) split-page approach, with the narrative at the top of the page, and separated by a horizontal marker, the interpretation sits at the bottom of the page. This occurs after an introductory section in which she refers to relevant literature. Tanaka (1997) formats his writing slightly differently, with the page split into two columns: the first is where the story takes place; the second column is where he writes his sidenotes. Tierney (1993a) in his study of four gay academics in a university spends the first few pages contextualising the issue by relating it to relevant literature, but then gradually eases into the descriptions of the characters, eventually having them speak. He concludes the chapter by again reflecting on the literature.

17 This approach appears to represent a shift for Lather, if one considers the addendum to Arnold’s doctoral thesis (Arnold 1994). Lather, it transpires, was one of Arnold’s examiners and reacted negatively to Arnold’s purposeful experimental style. Arnold responded by asking: ‘As I was both very moved and inspired by her [Lather’s] own body of work, and cite it as a starting-point for mine, I must ask her: is the post-paradigmatic diaspora a chimera in practice, or only open to initiates after [original emphasis] their thetic acceptance into the established norms of the institutionalized academy?’ (p. 244).
In another application, Tierney (1993b) also uses ethnographic fiction to draw the reader into an account of a dispute in a university around a social justice issue. Five stories are told, each of different characters involved in the dispute. Tierney does this in the first part of his article and then follows this in the second part with a discussion about the use of such literary devices, arguing that the approach represents a move away from concerns such as validity and reliability, and towards concerns about reality and an engagement with the characters and events that force us to question our own stance on the issue in question.

Sparkes (1997) uses ethnographic fiction in his construction of a gay, male, physical education teacher called Alexander. He used this approach because he was concerned that as a white heterosexual male, he wanted to represent a silenced group—and he needed to do this by piecing together a narrative for he had never knowingly met any gay, male physical education teachers. He begins the article by foregrounding Alexander’s story, indicating that this is a story that he then reads to his university students. The story itself extends over several pages and one gains a sense of what life is like for Alexander. At the conclusion of the story, Sparkes reflects on the usefulness of the literary technique he has used, concluding that ‘Ethnographic fiction and other kinds of story by their ability to condense, exemplify, and evoke a world, are as valid a device for transmitting cultural understanding and achieving these goals as any other researcher-produced device’ (p. 38).

Simpson’s (1994) approach is similar to Sparkes’ in that he provides an introductory chapter in which he engages with literature on
masculinity(ies), particularly gay masculinities, and the male body. In the subsequent chapters, he writes a series of essays around particular themes, developing his arguments as he proceeds: ‘They lend themselves to browsing and can be read in any order that appeals to the reader, but they are arranged in such a way as to follow a line of development which should aid those unfamiliar with the theory invoked’ (p. 18).

Making his stance more political, Jackson (1990) takes a ‘tentative step towards … a new form of autobiography’ (p. 4), which is a critical commentary informed by a questioning of the assumptions associated with maleness (such as the taken-for-granted privileges and benefits of being male) positioned alongside his personal testimony. Because he is challenging the chronological, linear sequencing characteristic of male autobiography, Jackson arranges his chapters thematically, and actively cuts across and scrambles chronological sequences.

Burnett (1999) provides three fictional ‘24 Hour Narratives’ that he co-produced with some of his Japanese students. At the conclusion of the narratives, he includes a section entitled ‘Dismantling the Narratives’, which created a space, quite separate from the narratives themselves, to analyse their contents. Parker (2000) used a similar approach, although his narratives were written in the third person. Leaving his analyses until after the narratives, Parker reflected, meant that he was able to concentrate on the readability and maintained a high level of interest for the reader; that he was able to use particular devices to assist the reader to see the organisation that he saw, and finally, it allowed him to structure the narratives in a way that supported his particular interpretations.
Notwithstanding the different, and sometimes experimental, approaches to the practice of writing narratives, tensions remain. ‘Getting it right’ remains an elusive ideal (Parker 2000). Having explored a number of alternative and experimental fictional narratives, I did initially set about trying to create some of my own. I was primarily concerned with ensuring the anonymity of the men with whom I had spoken, but as it transpired, pulling out excerpts from one person’s life story and adding them to another in order to make composite characters, became quite farcical. It felt as though whilst I was trying to protect everyone, I was representing no-one. Perhaps if I had grappled longer with the genre I may have been more successful, but I conceded the methodological and technical difficulties alluded to by Elbaz-Luwisch (1997) and decided against writing a fictionalised account that seemed more akin to writing a novel.

**RESEARCH PLAN FOR THIS STUDY**

The approach to this research project then, is as a narrative research methodology — one in which I intend, as far as is possible, to interpret the world in a similar way as the people being studied (Hammersley & Atkinson 1983; Smith & Hope 1992). The appeal of this approach is that I do not wish to prove or disprove accepted ‘truths’, although it is very clear in my own mind that what the men tell me is only part of a bigger collection of truths. Nor am I interested in amassing ‘facts’. Rather, I am curious about what the male academic leaders’ experiences are of living in a ‘border country’ as males who may reject organisational hegemonic masculine practices, yet who are also shaped by them, but who also promote alternative practices.
My own reasons for wishing to pursue a narrative research methodology are several. I could simply reiterate here the arguments advanced previously, but in addition to these points, I wish to reflect upon the telling of my own story in the Prologue. In that instance, I was able to recollect and reflect upon past events, but to also to link—in a deliberately limited fashion I must say, for I did not wish to have my own story bogged down and limited by a reliance upon citations and supportive evidence—these reflections to related literature. This approach to narrative mirrors that which I shall be utilising throughout this dissertation, for I want to craft a piece that conveys a story that is understandable to the reader. Plainspeaking, as far as possible, without ‘dumbing-down’ what I would be writing about.

I was also amused—initially—by McWilliam’s (1997) observations about her doctoral experience, but upon reflection found them mired in pathos:

I was told in my doctoral days that my Ph.D. would serve as a kind of driver's licence, permitting me to steer around the twists and turns of scholarship as an academic, an insider. For the overwhelming bulk of the population, including academics, a doctoral thesis certainly has something in common with a driver's licence in that it is about as interesting a read as a driver's licence, with the disadvantage that reading it takes a lot longer (p. 223).

I had no intention—naively perhaps—of being similarly saddened knowing that few people might read this dissertation and glean at least something from it. I considered aspects of audience and purpose, the fundamental issues of writing, as well as a
consideration of my own voice in my writing, and rationalised that narrative was the way in which I wanted to proceed.

There are four aims to my research for the dissertation. The first aim is to explore the experiences of a group of male academic leaders who live out approaches to leadership in their workplaces that are considered “different” to mainstream leadership practices. This aim arises from my assumption that such male leaders exist, even though they might not be in designated leadership or management positions. The concept of “different” approaches to leadership is one that has been prompted partly by the title of Sinclair’s (1998) text: *Doing Leadership Differently*, as well as a recognition (explored further in the literature review) that the hegemonic leadership practices in universities at this point in time are characterised by traditional masculine attributes that include risk-taking, notions of heroism and acting independently of group support (Capling, Considine & Crozier in Marginson & Considine 2000). “Difference” therefore includes those practices that are genuinely collaborative and collegial, and which are concerned with service that advances the organisation as well as the individuals within it.

To be able to select a group of men whose leadership practices are considered “different” to the hegemonic expression of leadership in our universities, I shall be relying on peers and professional colleagues to nominate potential participants. Once identified, I am interested to learn of the positions they occupy, how they see that they might have become considered as leaders whose practices are not the same as the malestream, and what, if any, opposition that they have encountered as a consequence.
The second aim is to write a narrative that draws together common themes of the life stories of these leaders that highlight variations and similarities in their experiences. Here, I am interested not only in the ways that these men say they operate as leaders and in their understandings of what they say they do, but also how they make sense of what they do and how they theorise their practices in the current university environment. It is very much a phenomenological approach, rather than being theoretically driven (Walker 2000). I am particularly intrigued as to how the men might name different versions of masculinity that exist in their contexts and whether they might be considered—by themselves or others—as being treated as “Other”.

The third aim is for me to understand and articulate the coping strategies of these leaders in the predominantly traditional masculine environments of Australian tertiary institutions. Regardless of whether the men see themselves as practising leadership differently or not, I am fascinated by the ways in which the men say that they take care of themselves. This fascination stems from my interests in health and well-being, very much brought to light in my role as a loss and grief educator, when I would see many professionals such as doctors and nurses not only not coping with their work, but not able to recognise that there were ways in which they could cope differently with their work demands. I would also like to delve further so that I can become more informed about the nexus between coping and agency. The attitudes of the men in this study to self-care is of interest to me—not only because their comments can be interpreted in light of current literature, but also because I will have much to consider.
about my own coping and self-care strategies and the sense of 
agency that I might be able to bring to my professional practice.

The fourth and final aim is to see the experiences articulated by the 
men, along with their insights into their identity formation and 
their coping strategies in the light of current literature on gender, 
masculinity(ies), identities, and on institutional leadership.

**Identification and Recruitment of Sample**

**Selection of Sampling Approaches**

Caulley (1994) stresses the importance of selecting information-rich 
cases in good qualitative research. In order to do this, the reasons 
for individual case sampling need to be carefully articulated and 
made explicit, just as it is important to be explicit about the study's 
limitations, including how the use of a particular sampling method 
could lead to a distortion of the findings.

There are numerous types of purposive (or purposeful) sampling¹⁸, 
and all types are reliant upon selecting information-rich cases 
pertinent to the purpose of the research. Important types of 
purposive sampling include typical case sampling, criterion 
sampling (where cases are chosen to match some pre-determined 
criterion), snowball sampling or a combination of approaches 
(Caulley 1994). The sampling procedure used is mixed purposeful 
sampling, which was established to include two sampling 
procedures, these being snowball sampling and typical case

---

¹⁸ Purposive sampling is a strategy used to examine certain, select cases without 
need to generalise to all such cases (Caulley 1994).
sampling. This combined approach to sampling is purposeful because I wanted to contact people who are thought to behave in a particular way (Blackmore 1995a; Caulley 1994).

In the instance of typical case sampling, I was attempting to access individuals whom other academics and university personnel, that is, the subjects' colleagues and associates, believed are typical of the men with whom I wanted to talk. This typicality, however, is subjective and I need to acknowledge two things from the outset: first, that not all of the subjects' colleagues would necessarily see them in this light, and second, that it is possible that I would not end up necessarily sharing the same perspective as that of the informant/s. Whilst these issues needed to be thought through, I did not see them as huge issues of concern—just as there are multiple expressions of masculinity(ies), I expected to find examples of men who approach leadership in a variety of ways. My mental image was of a continuum of possibilities rather than a single way of doing things.

In the instance of snowball sampling, I relied on informants to identify other possible informants. I suspected that some of leaders would have worked in settings that are in themselves transformational and cognisant of social justice practices. The majority, however, if the literature painted an accurate representation of what is happening in higher education institutions, would have seen these leaders working in settings that are particularly masculinist. The actual means of making contact is described in the following paragraphs.
Starting Points

There were two starting points. The first starting point was with those male academics whose names I had been given by their colleagues and academic associates during the development of the research proposal. Of the names I had been given, I decided to begin by interviewing one of the men who was known to me and whom I considered practised a collaborative style of leadership. (He had also been suggested as someone I should talk to by three different people.) Contact was made with all of the men using the letter version of the plain language statement developed as part of the Deakin University Ethics Committee application process.

A back-up position was established so that if the snowball sampling approach had ‘dried up’, then it would still be possible to make contact with prospective respondents. As it eventuated, this was not necessary, however the second starting point would have involved making contact with Equal Employment Officers (EEOs), or their equivalents, in universities and asking them to nominate men who they believe could then be approached by me as informants. EEO Officers, the key informants and 'gatekeepers', to use Blackmore and Sachs' (1997) terminology, would have been asked by me to suggest the names of male academics who ‘practise leadership differently’, and regardless of whether they formally held management positions within the university. In hindsight, it is perhaps fortunate that I did not need to use this method of recruitment, as the notion of doing things ‘differently’ would have been hugely problematical because of the uncertainty implied in the use of the word ‘different’ and because of the value ladenness of the term.
The criteria I established for the recruitment and selection of participants was developed as a word picture (see Table 1, below) based on the description of an emancipatory leader used by Grundy (1993) and employing the notion of teacher-as-leader from Klinck and Allard (1994). The reason that a word picture was used rather than a list that could be checked off was my somewhat heightened sensitivity to criticisms that lists are reductionist and therefore masculinist. Although the list was not circulated to participants, it enabled me at the conclusion of each interview to decide whether or not the person I had interviewed had articulated a commitment to a collaborative approach to leadership, and therefore, whether or not the data from the interview should be used.

On the matter of sample size, Caulley (1994) suggests that what is important is the validity, meaningfulness, and insights generated in terms of the information-richness of the cases selected and the observational/analytical capabilities of the researcher. He also suggests that at the outset of a research project, a minimum expected sample size could be proposed. Ryan and Bernard (2000) signal that at least six participants are required in studies where one is trying to understand the essence of a particular experience, which is the case in this study. It was envisaged, therefore, that for this study, the size of the sample might be approximately twelve (12) informants, though, consistent with the approach to purposive sampling, I would proceed until no new patterns were emerging from the interviews.
Criteria Used for Recruitment of Participants

A collaborative leader is someone who has an overriding concern for the welfare of staff and clients and who encourages staff to participate in decision-making. To do this, the collaborative leader will ensure that all members participating in decision-making will have access to the necessary background materials and that there are clear group processes open to them in order to reach their decisions. When there is conflict, this leader will see differences of opinion as being legitimate and will encourage others to negotiate and solve problems together. The collaborative leader recognises a variety of ways in which others can achieve their work goals and will assist others to set broad, long-term goals and to pursue broad professional development options. The collaborative leader will encourage others to share in taking a leadership role and to reflect critically upon the outcomes of their action. The leader who works in this manner is genuinely collaborative and much more educational than managerial. This approach will be the antithesis of a bureaucratic form of organisation.

Specifically, the collaborative leader will challenge the traditional understandings of masculinity in his workplace. He will seek to represent diversity and build a sense of inclusivity and emotional connection for all his colleagues and students.

Teaching, as well as administration, can be seen as a leadership activity.

| TABLE 1: A WORD PICTURE THAT DESCRIBES THE ATTRIBUTES OF A COLLABORATIVE LEADER (ADAPTED FROM GRUNDY 1993; KLINCK & ALLARD 1994; CONNELL 2000) | 124 |
GATHERING OF DATA

Interviewing

A traditional approach to the collection of data in social research is via open-ended or semi-structured interviews, which in addition to being a tool for data collection, is also a specialised form of conversation. Typically, in these exchanges, interviewees become passive individuals and interviewers become questioners who are also concerned with rapport-building (Oakley 1981).

These characteristics, in addition to the practice of conducting one-off interviews, says Oakley, conform to supposedly masculine 'values of objectivity, detachment, hierarchy and “science”' (Oakley 1981, p. 38). She claims that this is different to a feminine set of values that see a consideration for individual concerns. Oakley provides three reasons for abandoning the textbook version of interviewing practice: first, that it is not reasonable to adopt an exploitative attitude to interviewees as sources of data; second, that sociological research is an essential way of giving the subjective experiences of women a visibility in sociology and in society by using the interviewer as an instrument to promote a sociology of women; and finally, that good interviewing requires being sensitive not only to questions that are asked but to those that are not asked. No intimacy without reciprocity. Oakley concludes that

… the mythology of 'hygienic' research with its accompanying mystification of the researcher and the researched as objective instruments of data production be replaced by the recognition that personal involvement is more than dangerous bias—it is the
condition under which people come to know each other and to admit others into their lives (Oakley 1981, p. 49). Interviews remain a popular means of collecting data from individuals, though it ought be acknowledged that the interview is a contrived space (Prichard 2000) and an interruption in the natural flow of events. Further, because interviews rely on people’s reports of their behaviour rather than on their actual behaviour, the interview itself creates certain discursive practices, which can be found elsewhere in the narratives, texts and stories of the settings in which the interviews occur. Thus, Prichard contends, although interviews are inherently artificial and may be seen by some participants as a public relations opportunity to promote themselves, the text that results will be akin to a sub-set of texts that are the norm for particular institutions.

I have drawn upon two particular research projects that enact specific interview methods. In the first, Blackmore (1995b) describes a study in which she was involved that featured a series of unstructured, recorded interviews, with Blackmore describing the interviews as being more like conversations—an approach influenced by Oakley’s (1981) stance on interviewing. Several points in this study stand out: they were a series of conversations and not a one-off conversation; they were conversations rather than unstructured interviews; they were conversations around pre-

---

19 Oakley’s (1981) argument about the reciprocity that can occur between a female interviewer and a female interviewee prompted subsequent debates between feminists, which Oakley takes up several years later (Oakley 1992). In this more recent account, Oakley speaks of the ease with which social researchers can conduct interviews ‘which deviate from the strictures outlined in the research methods textbooks’ (p. 16), and she acknowledges Finch’s questioning of personal disclosures during interviews as a means of adding to knowledge. (Finch 1984 in Oakley 1992). Instead, this is now seen as a means of generating ‘a sociology for women’ [original emphasis] (Oakley 1992, p. 17).
determined themes, and the conversations featured reflections as well as theorising by the participants. A feminist research methodology underpinned this research, which is characterised by three positions: first, a feminist research methodology rejects the possibility of value-free research; second, its focus is the lived experience of everydayness and third, it has a political commitment to produce change towards a more just situation for women (Weiler 1988 in Blackmore 1995b).

In another study, Blackmore and Sachs (1997) approached Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) officers at universities, TAFE institutes and schools, 'the gatekeepers', as they referred to them, in order to identify three groups of women academics/managers who would subsequently be interviewed. The three groupings comprised women who had succeeded in obtaining formal leadership positions, women who were aspiring to leadership positions and women who were doing informal leadership work but did not hold formal positions. As well as asking EEO officers to identify potential participants, the women themselves were asked to name other women they perceived to be leaders, though not in formal positions, as the start of a snowball sampling procedure. In approaching the creation of a sample this way, the process of having key informants providing the names of likely participants was a way of nominating leaders without necessarily having them linked to designated positions. From this particular study, several points in relation to research methodology can be ascertained: EEO officers became key informants; information for participant selection was based on three descriptive statements rather than by the use of criteria; snowball sampling was used, and perceptions were used in making decisions about participant selection in
relation to 'leadership' which is, after all, a quality bestowed through others' perceptions.

Influenced by these studies in particular, a combination of data gathering approaches was employed. The specific techniques used are listed here in the order in which they were usually utilised: mail (for the dispatch and return of the initial plain language statement and consent forms); e-mail and telephone contact (to make arrangements for interviews and also for follow-up questions and clarifications post-interview), and face-to-face contact (of around ninety minutes).

The first discussion with informants was done face-to-face, as this remains one of the best ways of not only establishing rapport, but also for ‘reading’ the full range of responses in both verbal and non-verbal communication. Verbal responses certainly provided much data, but the pauses and facial expressions of the informants also guided the direction that each of the discussions took. Although desirable to have had a series of discussions with each of the informants for the purpose of getting to know them and their situations in more detail, the practical limitations associated with travel from my regional location precluded this. This is where the use of e-mail, in particular, was used to continue the discussion with each informant.

In order to facilitate discussions with the informants, a Discussion Guide, or semi-structured interview schedule, was developed, the details of which are located in Table 2, below.
Discussion Guide

- Overview of research: men who perform leadership differently. Different version of masculinity. It’s OK to stop, if desired.
- Position in the workplace, how long there, the nature of employment (fixed term or permanent);
- The culture of the workplace, the particular work section and how this is similar or dissimilar to the culture of the university campus or university (in total);
- How duties are performed: how information is shared with colleagues; how decisions are made; how conflict is dealt with.
- Fitting-in in the institution;
- Philosophical stance of educational leadership.
- Theoretical information that influences practices.
- Coping—personally and professionally—as a leader.
- Self-care strategies
- Other men whom I might consider interviewing?

TABLE 2: DISCUSSION GUIDE USED IN DISCUSSIONS (SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS) WITH PARTICIPANTS.

Trying to determine the significance of gender in interviews, I considered, would be difficult to interpret, for its meaning may remain hidden (Alvesson & Billing 1997). I opted for an open-ended and less-obtrusive questioning approach—compared with an approach that would ask specifically about gender, for as I have indicated previously, the word ‘gender’ can be enough to raise a
number of defences\textsuperscript{20}. ‘A considerable problem is of course that gender constructions may not be made explicit in talk. Not all communication is verbal and explicit’ (Alvesson & Billing 1997, p. 214). The focus in my analysis then, relates to when and how the categorisations of man, woman, masculine and feminine appear—or do not appear—in the conversations.

**Triangulation**

In addition to using interviews as the primary means of data gathering, I was also concerned to employ additional methods of systematic data gathering, which can be referred to as triangulation. To assist this, I maintained a reflective research journal, and adapted Brookfield’s (1995) notion of having four lenses through which to conduct critical self-reflection. Whereas Brookfield speaks of incorporating our own autobiographies, with those of our colleagues and our students, as well as reference to theoretical literature, the way I used this approach enabled a methodical reflection of my research practice, as outlined below.

Initially, I began my critically reflective research journal by extending the reflective journal that I had been maintaining previously within the earlier stages of the doctorate, and this enabled me to continue, reflect upon, and if necessary, review, particular lines of thinking. Entries were made on a semi-regular

\textsuperscript{20} This concern may have been ill-founded, for the men interviewed had read the plain language statement that made it clear that gender was one of the concepts being researched.
basis and included self-narrative where I was ‘thinking out aloud’, but also incorporated some related notes in relation to literature I was reading and musings about ‘What I’m Thinking at the Moment’. To these, I added notes I made during discussions with my respective supervisors and relevant e-mail correspondence.

Of greatest value, however, were the mind-maps that I used during the conversations with each of the men and the other ethnographic-style notes that I made immediately following each conversation. These notes were compiled under the headings of ‘Setting’, ‘Duration’, ‘Mood’ and ‘Themes Emerging’, and provided an overview of the conversation and the main ideas conveyed.

In summary, the three means of data collection used in this study were first, the conversations with participants; second, the use of fieldnotes, and finally, my introspective and reflective thoughts that were maintained in a critically reflective research journal.

**Self-disclosure in Interviews**

One of the issues I did quickly identify by using simultaneous data gathering and data analysis, was the use of my own self-disclosure and occasional statement-making. This I did to not only maintain or even redirect the flow of the interview, but as a means of rapport-building, establishing trust and as a means of assuring the men that I really did hear what they were saying—a form of emotional engagement. I have long held the belief, even before I became aware of the work of Oakley (1981), that an interview is essentially a conversation—albeit a somewhat specialised conversation, and on the basis of the counselling skills I have acquired over the years and
which I am convinced parallel many research skills, I certainly had no reservations that I would be able to maintain conversations with the men.

On the issue of self-disclosure, however, I was asking personal questions of the men in my study and I felt it not unreasonable that they could ask questions of me, or that I could choose to disclose, or not disclose, certain information about myself. This, as Oakley describes, are not characteristics normally attributed to the ‘proper’ social research interview\textsuperscript{21}.

\textsuperscript{21} By this Oakley (1981) means that particular functions are being pursued in a ‘proper’ interview, namely being a mechanical instrument of data collection whereby one person asks the questions and another gives the answers.
ANALYSING THE DATA

The Men in the Study

Prior to explaining how the data were analysed, I believe it appropriate to introduce the men, for they were not merely anonymous ‘subjects’—they were people with whom I developed a relationship, and in some instances, have maintained contact.

As it transpired, eleven men were interviewed and were drawn from a total of five universities from the south-east of Australia—regional, rural and metropolitan, but essentially from two university “types”, Gumtrees and New Universities\(^{22}\). (The absence of men from other university “types” should not be taken to mean that such men do not exist in other types of universities. It is more related to the limitations of the snowball sampling procedure.) Whereas aliases have been used, their positions and roles as designated leader/manager are provided below in Table 3, along with an indication of the university “type” from which they are drawn. I would also have liked to have included their discipline area, but I fear that astute readers may well be able to figure the identities of some of the men—clearly something that I wish to avoid.

---

\(^{22}\) This taxonomy developed by Marginson has been used to differentiate between Australian universities on the basis of historical features and characteristics in common. Group of Eight (G-8): includes the Sandstone universities built pre 1945 plus the research intensive Red Bricks (built post 1945); Gumtrees: universities built in the growth period 1960s and 1970s; Unitechs: universities that grew out of large institutes of technology—some of which have operated for over a century, and New Universities: post Dawkins universities that comprise former colleges of advanced education and institutes of higher education (National Tertiary Education Union 2000).
The Men in the Study

**Charlie**: Gumtree university; Senior Lecturer; formerly head of a department.

**Daniel**: New university; Associate Professor; currently head of a unit.

**Ewan**: Gumtree university; Associate Professor; formerly head of a school.

**Geoff**: New university; Associate Professor; currently a sub-dean.

**Ian**: Gumtree university; Professor; currently head of a unit.

**James**: Gumtree university; Senior Lecturer; formerly member of a university council.

**Martin**: New university; Professor; currently head of a school and an acting dean.

**Ray**: Gumtree university; Senior Lecturer; formerly head of a school.

**Steve**: New university; Associate Professor; currently head of a school.

**Tom**: New university; Associate Professor; currently chairperson of a unit.

**Wayne**: New university; Associate Professor; currently head of a school.

---

**TABLE 3**: ALIASES OF THE MEN WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY, ALONG WITH THEIR UNIVERSITY “TYPE” (AFTER NATIONAL TERTIARY EDUCATION UNION 2000) AND ROLE PERFORMED WITHIN THEIR UNIVERSITY.
Development of Transcripts of Interviews

During each interview, I constructed a mind-map of responses so that I could track key words and expressions used by each of the men. This was also used to assist with the transcript, for sometimes, some of the words were difficult to decipher.

Transcriptions were undertaken of each tape. In the level of detail adopted, ‘ers’ and ‘ums’ were not transcribed, however, incomplete and incoherent sentences were noted. Pauses and laughter were also noted. Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that there are many layers of detail that could be adopted in such circumstances and that a certain amount of ‘slippage’ occurs in the transcription process. The prime focus, they stress, is on words—words that have been refined so that the text is clear to the reader.

Once the transcriptions were completed, the relevant transcripts were e-mailed to the men as per our agreed process and they were invited to read the draft to ensure accuracy and to provide an opportunity to add additional information or amendments if they saw fit, to delete material or withdraw their transcript altogether. In this way, participants had an opportunity to remain active partners in the data gathering process with informants defining what is important for the researcher to find out (Caulley nd). This process also provided opportunities to continue the conversations with each of the men.

Whereas the initial intention had been to use computer software to assist in the analysis of the data, I decided instead to manually process the data. Perhaps naively, I had imagined that keeping the data in front of me would better assist me to remain immersed in
the men’s comments, rather than designating codes that could have the effect of prematurely providing structure to the men’s responses.

Some of the men provided reactions to reading their transcripts, which further reinforced my concern for anonymity and confidentiality, not only in relation to the men being identified, but also in relation to them being identifiable. A response from two of the men was an expression of surprise about how clumsily-worded their words looked on paper. For instance, ‘I thought I was more articulate than that’ was a comment made. Two of the men corrected the draft, by which I mean one used the ‘Track Changes’ word processor command and the other used editing symbols to note changes required. One of the men simply highlighted certain sections that mentioned names and identifying places and indicated on an attached note, ‘The marked bits identify me and I would want to avoid that.’ One, very matter-of-factly responded with, ‘I’ve looked it over and it’s fine. What can I say? That's what I said.’ Wrote one of the men in an e-mail, ‘I guess my intention is to remain anonymous. I am sure that it should be possible to retain the text but delete the names, places etc.’ Similarly, another wrote, ‘I assume that any names I may have mentioned in the course of the interview will be deleted and treated as confidential.’

As a consequence of wanting to protect the identities of the participants, I saw that I also needed to mask some identifying information. Initially, I adopted two approaches in addition to a simple use of pseudonyms. The first was an approach modelled by Tierney (1993a) in his case study of four gay academics at Normal State University, which involved replacing identifiable comments
with a generic descriptor inserted in square brackets, and secondly, was to use ellipses to omit identifying information without interrupting the flow of the comments or altering the participants’ meanings. Whereas this approach afforded a degree of ‘protection’, I was aware that certain anecdotes either did not make sense or became unreadable when annotated in this fashion, and further, due to the specificity of some of the anecdotes, an alternative method of representation was required.

First Steps in Analysis
As each participant approved use of their respective transcription, the first step in analysis was to group the comments into very broad themes, and of course, the number of categories increased along with the number of participants. It would have been different if the analysis had have been suspended until all interviews were complete, but the volume of material to be analysed if it had have been left could have turned into the giant and potentially overwhelming task alluded to by Miles and Huberman (1994). Interwoven periods of data collection and broad-brush data analysis meant a particular engagement with the task, and it also meant being able to identify any gaps in my questioning.

Whereas there were obvious broad themes that could have been anticipated, these being themes that related to the groups of questions I asked, numerous sub-themes quickly emerged, and these were topics about which I had no conscious preconceived ideas or which related to particular anecdotes shared by the men. Conceivably, there are many other themes that could have been created from the data, but to which I was blind.
At first, I did not double-group responses. Responses were grouped according to one heading or sub-heading initially, and this was done so that once all the interviews had been analysed, I would have a clear idea of how many themes and sub-themes I believed existed, before physically moving statements to multiple themes.

**Using Matrices to Generate Themes and Exemplars**

Once an initial grouping was conducted, I then set about to establish a matrix of conceptually-ordered displays (Miles & Huberman 1994), something that I had been encouraged to consider doing by one of the participants\(^{23}\). The rows featured the men’s names and the columns in the matrix featured the relevant responses. This enabled me to read across the rows to give me a profile of each of the men and down the columns to make comparisons and note similarities between the men’s responses.

\(^{23}\) Interviewing participants who are also social researchers did provide a number of spin-offs in relation to the conduct of my research. It also meant that, on occasion, I needed to explain and justify why I was using the approach I was using, which, when coming from some experienced researchers, was something I found daunting and occasionally intimidating.
After what seemed to be an endless period of sorting and re-sorting the men’s life stories, I concluded this phase of the research by making statements (using the first person plural) that expressed the themes and sub-themes that I considered had emerged. Some of the themes and sub-themes were predictable, in that they reflected responses to questions that were asked, but there were also themes and sub-themes that emerged from the data. (A summary of the themes and sub-themes that emerged from my analysis appears at the conclusion of this chapter, in Table 4.)

At this point I made two other important decisions that affect the representation of the men’s life stories. The first was that I would not write about each and every theme and sub-theme, but that I would concentrate on those that seemed to be the most frequently occurring and which appeared to provide some sort of answer to the research questions that I had posed for myself. The second decision was to intersperse the men’s comments with critical comment based on the literature and, in particular, analyses arising from social psychology and postmodern interpretations of power.

To put these decisions into effect, I then made some choices about the comments that seemed to be exemplars, of the themes, in a manner also suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994). Rather than being swamped with data, this made the task of interpreting the data more manageable for me, but in doing this, I was acutely

24 It is significant to note here that I was not consciously filtering the men’s life stories. Instead, I was, as Tierney (1993b) wrote, re-arranging facts events and identities in order to come up with storied accounts that would enable deeper understandings of the individuals themselves.
aware of how I was imposing myself into the research yet again, once more affecting the representations of the men’s life stories.

What follows in the remaining chapters, therefore, are the narratives that I have constructed around the major themes emerging from the men’s life stories. Despite my initially fanciful ideas of how I might represent the men’s responses, I ended up opting for what Prichard (2000) describes as ‘the dominant convention’—that is, where I am the narrator who takes the stance of an observer and critic.
List of Themes and Sub-themes

**Theme 1**: The good old days have passed, and some things had to change.

**Theme 2**: New managerialism in our universities has meant changes in the way we, and our senior managers, act and interact.

- **Sub-theme A**: Sometimes the interaction can be brutalising.
- **Sub-theme B**: The new discourse of management can be ostracising.
- **Sub-theme C**: Commercial pressures affect the way we function as academics.
- **Sub-theme D**: Women occupy some positions of influence within our universities.

**Theme 3**: Surviving in our universities means developing a range of considered responses.

- **Sub-theme A**: It is not impossible to survive in our universities.
- **Sub-theme B**: Consciously adopting certain principles or ideological stances enables us to practise transformative leadership.
- **Sub-theme C**: Some of us can say how we see gender influencing our work practices.
- **Sub-theme D**: As academics, we see ourselves capable of, yet questioning, certain practices in our universities.

**Theme 4**: Our own leadership practices are a function of our own experiences.

- **Sub-theme A**: We have learnt much about leadership through observation and discussion.
- **Sub-theme B**: We engage in critical reflection to inform the way we practise leadership.
- **Sub-theme C**: We act according to our considered responses.
- **Sub-theme D**: For some of us, we can name the influence of gender on our leadership practices.
Theme 5: We are sceptical about, and disinclined to participate in, leadership training activities.

Sub-theme A: Existing leadership and managerial expertise is not called upon within our universities to further develop our own abilities.

Sub-theme B: We resent being treated as being uninformed about leadership. Our own expertise is ignored.

Sub-theme C: We differentiate between being a leader and being a manager. There are some potentially valuable management training activities in which we would participate.

Sub-theme D: We are more prepared to theorise about leadership than we are to theorise leadership.

Theme 6: We react in different ways and at different levels to the demands of being a leader. We are affected by the role and, in turn, have an effect upon others.

Sub-theme A: We usually personally acknowledge the stresses associated with being a leader, and are mostly aware of the intrapersonal approaches we adopt to cope.

Sub-theme B: We are mostly aware of the approaches we adopt to cope with being a leader and which involve interpersonal interactions with one other person at work.

Sub-theme C: We are mostly aware of the approaches we adopt to cope with being a leader and which involve interpersonal interactions with other individuals and groups of people at work.

Theme 7: There are physical, emotional, cognitive and spiritual ways that we care for ourselves.

Sub-theme A: Our families, and particularly our partners, influence our working lives.

Sub-theme B: Our families strongly influence the way in which we care for ourselves.

Sub-theme C: We like to think that we can separate work life from home life, but sometimes we find ourselves doing work-related tasks at home.

Sub-theme D: We try to find a balance in our lives by engaging in a variety of recreational activities — mostly active, but sometimes passive.
Theme 8: There are other male academics that we think might lead the way we do.
   Sub-theme A: We are more readily able to name female leaders who act in this way.
   Sub-theme B: We know how other males interact with us, but we don’t always know how they interact with their staff.

Theme 9: Only some of us explicitly talk about gender in our organisations.
   Sub-theme A: We are comfortable talking about gender in our organisations and do so in explicit ways.
   Sub-theme B: We rarely talk about gender, or even use language that includes the categorisations of man, woman, masculine and/or feminine.

TABLE 4: LIST OF THEMES AND SUB-THEMES EMERGING FROM THE RESEARCH.
CHAPTER 5: NEW MANAGERIALISM: COOKING A FROG SLOWLY

The Dawkinisation of Australian universities introduced many changes into the system, not the least of which was the introduction of an ethos of new managerialism, which would see competitiveness between institutions and between staff within those institutions. According to the National Tertiary Education Union (2000), some of the changes implemented into the higher education sector since 1996 include a 6% reduction to university operating grants between 1997 and 2000; a reduction of $172m in discretionary funding to universities; increases in Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS) fees for students of between 35% and 125%, and halving of Commonwealth support for staff development.

Added to this, the NTEU claims that there have also been additional developments that have affected staff workloads, which include an increase in full fee-paying international students, and changes to governance structures such as the introduction of middle management separated from departmental and faculty levels. The NTEU suggests that the effects of these changes include increased work pressure, higher expectations upon academic staff and a reduction in training and development opportunities. Reductions in university staff have been achieved by non-renewal of fixed-term contracts, an increased casualisation of the workforce, non-replacement of retiring or resigning staff, and voluntary and involuntary redundancies (National Tertiary Education Union 2000, p. 14).
The changing discourse of power in universities now includes a focus on the performativity of individuals within it as university personnel are busily seen to be doing things that are of increasing value to the university (Blackmore & Sachs 2000). Increasing numbers and types of students to be prepared for highly specialised occupations, an expectation that universities will do more for a lower cost and an expansion and specialisation of knowledge that outruns the resources available are manifestations of a higher education system undergoing change (Clark 1998). Hybridised versions of new managerialism have emerged, with Trow (1993 in Deem 1998) differentiating both “soft” and “hard” versions. In the former, Deem explains, explicit agreement and consent is gained from all those involved in the university so that inefficiencies can be addressed through the adoption of rational measures. The “hard” version of new managerialism, she goes on to describe, involves the imposition of discourses and the introduction of rewards and punishments for those considered ‘fundamentally untrustworthy and thus incapable of self-reform or change’ (p. 53). Either through the more transparent means of “hard” managerialism or through the covert subtleties of “soft” managerialism, Deem remains concerned about the potentially undermining implications for equity and other feminist values.

The nature of professionalism has thus changed as individuals react to the requirement to meet organisational goals (Blackmore & Sachs 2000). Survival and growth in this environment, suggests Taylor (1997), may be made possible by several things, including
academics learning to live in a ‘web of rules’, whether they be tacit or based on new social interactions.

A competitiveness that did not previously exist started to emerge (James).

Clearly, things had begun to change for academics, and they probably needed to have changed as well, for

There was huge fat in the system (Martin).

Change came to Australian universities in a variety of different forms, but as Tom put it,

… it’s a bit like cooking a frog. If you throw a frog in to boiling water, it’s most likely to die of shock immediately. But if you put it in cold water and gradually heat it up, it will last a long time and it’s, and working in a university’s been a bit like starting off in quite relaxed circumstances, well relatively, when I look back at it. Relaxed circumstances, and it just got progressively more demanding and more hectic (Tom).

This gradual progression may well have been the case for Tom, who was a member of a former college of advanced education (CAE) before it became transformed into a university, but he was not alone. Others, such as Charlie, had been part of an established university for much longer, and by the time the screws had begun to turn for him as a head of his department towards the end of the nineties, it had become

… so intense in terms of continual crises, insecurity relating to the future of the Department as a department … (Charlie).

This is a taste of what academics in the United Kingdom had come to know as the ‘industrialization’ of higher education, in which a
profit-oriented logic was imposed upon them (Goode & Bagilhole 1998). The challenge in the UK was whether there was enough ‘space’ for academics to develop progressive practices, for it seemed for some that the changes were simply destructive developments to be withstood (Goode & Bagilhole 1998). Space to develop progressive practices seemed to be scarce, with academics being required to churn out various forms of economic indicators at the expense of their teaching and research (Ball 1999). Providing a sense of what Australian universities have moved away from, several of the men explained what it had been like, expressed here by James:

… an era in which it was possible to air opinions, and be listened to, knowing differing points of view would be considered when decisions were made. Once the decisions were made … the protagonists were able to meet together afterwards for a drink (James).

Notwithstanding the multifaceted nature of academics’ professional roles and responsibilities, the life of an academic is a privileged one, and one which ought be considered in the context of the broader social milieu, as Martin explains:

So I mean, one of the important things I think that academics in general need to, need to come to term with, they need to get their heads out of their own arseholes, and they need actually to see themselves as part of the community, a wide community. We serve a very small, very elite group in the community in very, very privileged circumstances … This is an extraordinarily privileged and elite job we do. Comfortable, secure, reasonably well paid … And I think one of the important things that we all need to do is to know that we are in this incredibly privileged position, and a lot of the people that you work with in academe, don’t see themselves like that you know (Martin).
Perhaps it is because of the privileges afforded by academics’ positions in society, that despite the high levels of occupational stress brought on by workloads and reactions to senior management, the majority of staff still find their job satisfying (National Tertiary Education Union 2000).

Universities have changed, but in the broader social context, academics, to follow Martin’s line of argument, remain relatively privileged members of society, and would do well to remind themselves of this. At a macro level, however, the experiences and feelings of individual academics and other higher education personnel should be acknowledged and named. This chapter, then, considers concepts and issues relating to the emergence of entrepreneurism into our universities and some of the effects it has had on the interactions between senior managements and other staff members, the way in which some people have been ostracised, and the effect of commercial pressures on academics’ work roles and consequently upon their identities, and why it is that people continue to work in this sector.

**Ostracising Discourses of Management**

Consistent with the assumptions made about the aloofness and distancing of senior managements, are the processes that they were said to have employed in their universities. At one of the universities that had grown from a previous CAE, there was a sense that senior management needed to insist on a top-down approach because of the CAE history of the place:

… leadership was required and senior management would provide it (Geoff).
And in his former CAE, Tom described it as being a situation of
... lots of chiefs with too few Indians (Tom).

For many of the men interviewed, the changes that occurred within
the senior managements of their universities were not only
disquieting, but also represented a shift in power. Senior
managements of the different universities were described in various
ways by the men, although a common theme was the sense of
ostracisation they experienced, and in some cases, continue to
experience:

[the Vice Chancellor] won’t take advice except from a few of his
drinking club mates (Ewan);

Senior management remains invisible ... and out of reach of all
but the most senior academics, let alone the likes of lecturers and
others (James);

One of the things about the central managerial group is their
aloofness or distance from most academics (Ray).

Whereas there had once been a sense that all academics and other
members of staff could access senior management, there was now a
recognition that the distance between senior managements and
others had grown, and that the agenda for interaction between
themselves and their senior management teams had changed. This
resonates with research undertaken by the National Tertiary
Education Union, which reported that 48% of university staff
thought that the senior staff was untrustworthy, that is, that they
did not act with integrity, competence, openness or concern for staff
(Winefield et al. 2002).
The men provided some explanations as to why leadership in their universities had suffered:

...there are so many bad managers within universities. They just seem to attract bad managers like, anybody could. I don’t know why, but they do (Daniel);

Rather than listening to their staff, they have a view that they then push and impose upon people ... They seem to want to make people unhappy ... which is obviously something that they had not learnt to do in their management training courses ... there is something about the personality development of these people that pre-selects them for high office (James);

... I’ve got quite a lot to do with the Executive ... But what I think you’ve got to understand, that the key issue with [this University’s] Executive, is a substantial number of them come from working class backgrounds, and so do I ... [Various members of the Executive are named and their backgrounds described] ... So, you know, you do get that, seeing as people – you don’t get remade because you get an education ... You just pick up extra skills. I think that’s about all (Ian).

These are indeed troubling accusations: that the managers are inherently ‘bad’; that their behaviour is something that they’ve been trained to do, or that it might be a combination of both.

Several of the men commented on the abilities—or otherwise—of senior managers to act in a corporate manner:

... how good are the administrators at doing corporate things? They weren’t trained for that. It’s just something they’ve heard
about, you know, they’re ex-professors, or guys who came up through the ranks in the administration. But the answer sometimes seems to be, not very good at all (Charlie);

I get these bullshit messages from HR, most of which I can’t understand, all in sort of managerial terminology which may mean something to an American Vice-President, but is meaningless [here]. You know, it’s got to be meaningful. You’ve got to understand it and you’ve got to be connected to it. Otherwise it doesn’t happen (Martin);

My point, for what it is worth, is that current managers almost universally seem to lack it [emotional intelligence]!! That is, unable to understand themselves, these people, of course, have no hope of understanding other people, including those that they manage! (James: follow-up e-mail).

From an organisational culture perspective, new managerialism destabilises the organisation’s culture and its organisational climate, which, in turn, unsettles the basic assumptions that individuals and groups have about themselves. Once the equilibrium is challenged, it is possible that personal authority may supersede existing rules and organisational boundaries fail (Taylor 1999). The following section provides some examples from the men with examples of what they consider to be inappropriate expressions of personal authority.
BRUTALISING INTERACTIONS

One of the consequences of the amalgamation of CAEs and universities was that opportunities existed for academics from established universities to gain promotions by moving to newly-established universities. In Daniel’s instance, this meant that he was given a title without specific designation, becoming, like everyone else at his university, ‘a Jack of all trades’. It also meant that he became involved in supervision of higher degree students, and incurred the wrath of his then Head of School (HoS), who wrote to him²⁵, chastising him for what the HoS saw as poor leadership.

Daniel’s reaction:

This is the story that the staff were telling me. He felt incredibly threatened because he didn’t have any publications and he didn’t have any recent, or any decent, research track record, and all of his PhD students were leaving in droves … So, he felt incredibly threatened by me, and I think his response to me was a sort of a self-defence mechanism (Daniel).

Personnel from CAEs—considered to be part of the New Universities group (National Tertiary Education Union 2000)—had become vulnerable as a result of Dawkinisation, and this was partly because a culture of academic scholarship and research had been imposed upon institutions that had previously had a strong teaching culture. Coming from a research-based university as Daniel says he did—his previous university was from the Gumtrees

²⁵ Daniel provided me with a copy of this memo that supports this.
University group, relative newcomers to a tradition of research—
appears to have resulted in a clash of the cultures that shaped each
institution’s values and behaviours (Austin 1990).

When viewed through the lens of social psychology, Daniel had
difficulty in identifying with the practices of some of his former
colleagues. He was not part of the in-group (Smith & Mackie 1995).
In other words, because he did not share the same goals and
interests as other in-group members, he was seen as a threat—
someone from the out-group—and was subjected to ostracising
practices, at least by his then Head of School. Considered as ‘Other’
(Riggins 1997), Daniel’s sense of identity that had previously linked
him to others in the group, would have understandably been
challenged. Daniel’s response was initially to withdraw from the in-
group, and ultimately, from the university altogether.

A number of the men spoke about the ruthlessness of our
university system and the heavy toll the system can exact on some
of its members, especially those who speak out publicly (once a
highly valued characteristic of academics within universities):

*I’ve seen so many people in universities be brutalised by the
system that I don’t want to have that, you know* (Daniel);

*People are fair dinkum and play for keeps* (Steve).

Polya’s public claims on *Radio National* (2001) about bullying and
intimidation caused me to probe for examples of this:

*At his first meeting with senior management, as well as on a later
occasion, the new dean was told ‘Silence [me] or you’ll face a
budget cut’. There was no doubting the seriousness of the threat,*
and given this intimidatory environment, the dean found the situation intolerable and eventually moved on (James).

Presumably, this intimidation did not come from nowhere, and it transpired that James was seen as something of a ‘stone in the shoe’ because of the way in which he would speak out as then head of school about perceived injustices. James’ speaking out needs to be considered here in light of his earlier comment about the more egalitarian nature of his workplace that had existed previously, where it had been possible to air concerns in a more open environment. This too, however, may also be reflective of a privileged position that he may have held, which could have enabled him to speak out on issues.

Despite plaudits at the beginning of his period of Head of School for taking stern action in relation to a termination, the tide turned against Ewan, who told of his experience in his university when he applied for a promotion. Ewan was verbally advised by the chairperson of the selection committee that he had been successful. He received congratulatory comments from the most senior levels of the university: ‘Ideal person for the job. I’m very pleased to see that you’ve been appointed,’ the Vice Chancellor was said to have stated. As it transpired, Ewan, around the same time, had spoken with a government minister about a shortfall in university places in the school of which he was then head. Ewan was consequently

---

26 Verbatim comments have not been used here for they would reveal far too much identifying information about Ewan and his university. The use of ellipses and other devices would have detracted substantially from the readability of the text.
advised that the Council Executive had not confirmed his appointment and that it had been re-advertised following the Council’s receipt of a letter from the minister. In this instance, making public comment had been sanctioned by senior management, but the implications for Ewan were personally taxing, even though the thought of a large pay-out was tempting:

... I went along to [the solicitors] and they said, ‘Oh yes, we’d love to take it on, you know. You’ve got a contract, you’ve got a verbal contract. You’ve got witnesses and that sort of thing but it’s going to cost, right, and it’s going to be a lot of stress, you know. If you want to put your house on it, we’ll go ahead.’ So I decided I didn’t want the stress and I pulled out. But they don’t know how close they were (Ewan).

Ewan, however, seems to have raised the ire of his senior managers. In another encounter, Ewan recounted a meeting with senior managers about redundancies in his School:

E: So, I said, ‘If you instruct me to do that in writing, I’ll do it, otherwise I won’t because I don’t want to be in the Industrial Court, or whatever it is over this, the Union will take you there.’ And [the Head of Personnel] said, ‘You’ve got to realise that this is a consultative process and by the time we’ve finished consulting you will either sign it or resign’ ... So that’s the management style that I would like my management style to contrast! It gave me a model to work against.

K: It’s a nice twist on a consultative process.

E: And the same sort of consultative process has been going on with the Agreement that the Union’s been arguing about. It’s not true consultation – it’s just a series of ultimatums.
Ewan’s account is in contrast to Ray’s claim that retribution for making public comments is all bluff—particularly interesting when both men are from the same university:

*I think they’re all talk, but they can, just by talking, bluff enough people into thinking that they can’t be seriously critical of what goes on at the university for fear that their area will be victimised. So, I don’t know that there’s a great deal there, that they’ve done much that you could call victimisation, or behaving vindictively, but they talk about it and that talk is conveyed to you by people who are privy to the top. But my view is it’s all part of a tactic to keep people under control* (Ray).

Whilst it might be all bluff, as Ray says, he is right in suggesting that talk is conveyed to create a sense of fear for speaking out. The exercise of power in Ewan’s anecdotes goes much further than the invocation of fear and uncertainty of which Alvesson and Billing (1997) speak. Ewan may not have been ‘knocked on the head’ (to use their imagery), but by his account, Ewan was censured via bullying tactics. It would not take too many experiences like Ewan’s for word to be circulated about the intimidatory practices that the university’s senior managers were practising.

This, when linked with the claim that between 75% to 85% of bullies in Victorian workplaces are managers (WorkSafe Victoria 2001a), leads to a perception that intimidation, bullying and harassment are not only the norm, but are expected ways for management to behave. The caution is, however, that it should not be inferred that
all managers or supervisors will go on to exhibit bullying behaviour and that it is inappropriate to draw conclusions about the behaviours of all managers or supervisors on the basis of this statistic (WorkSafe Victoria 2001b).²⁷

One of the findings of the NTEU study into occupational stress in Australian universities was that academic deans and above—by implication a fairly small and select group of people—‘have a more positive perception of procedural fairness compared to all other staff groups’ (Winefield et al. 2002, p. 96). It would seem to be important that having high levels of faith in the system of which you are a part is one thing, but it is difficult to escape the conclusion, if the WorkSafe Victoria estimate is to be trusted, that senior academics (and above) are perhaps not at arms-length from instances of bullying, intimidation and/or harassment.

It may be true that the power differentials vary depending upon where one is located within a university hierarchy, and that when intimidation occurs between relatively high-ranked people, there can be a perception that they have less to lose. But bullying is bullying, and regardless of whether it happens in the backyard or in the boardroom, to paraphrase the title of McCarthy’s (2001) text, it is inappropriate. Bullying, as the Victorian Government’s Guidance Note on workplace bullying and violence points out, is ‘repeated, unreasonable behaviour directed toward an employee, or group of employees, that creates a risk to health and safety’ (p. 6), where the

²⁷ Interestingly, neither the statistic nor the mention of bullying being perpetrated by managers appears in the resultant Guidance Note for the prevention of bullying and occupational violence (WorkSafe Victoria 2003).
risks include mental as well as physical aspects. The stress caused to individuals, such as that described by Ewan, ought not be tolerated or explained away. Under relevant State legislation, namely the *Occupational Health and Safety Act 1985*, employers and employees have particular responsibilities to reduce and eliminate bullying in the workplace (WorkSafe Victoria 2003). A particular role for employers, and herein lies a responsibility for senior management of universities, is to develop prevention measures. Such measures, according to WorkSafe Victoria, include increasing awareness through policy development and implementation to training and risk management.

Change in universities does not mirror change in other business organisations, for in the former, there is a desire for ideas to be tested and reformulated before they become part of the culture (Clark 1998). Universities themselves are different from most other business organisations, obviated by the expectation that intellectual freedom is fundamental to their existence, and that universities have certain obligations to the communities in which they are located. The bottom line for universities is the students, but frequently students are left out of the discussions about the changing nature of the higher education sector.

Though a diminishing right, intellectual freedom has traditionally entailed the rights of academics ‘to freely discuss, teach, assess, develop curricula, publish, and research and engage in community service’ (Allport 1998, p. 8). Osborne’s (2001) view that there are tensions in universities as a result of them having to ‘... act like
businesses … as if they were training factories’, whilst seemingly true, understates some of the personal tensions raised by the commercialisation of academe.

COMMERCIAL INFLUENCES AFFECTING ACADEMICS’ WORK

According to the new managerialism ethos, universities need to place themselves on a commercial footing by becoming responsive and service-driven (Keith 1998), with individuals adopting a performative stance (Ball 1999). Chasing private money, however, is discordant with the core business of universities (Allport 1998). Evidence that academics are now required to exercise managerial professionalism (Blackmore & Sachs 2000) and churn out performance indicators and other like statistics in the pursuit of a commercialised reality, was alluded to by some of the men:

Now every senior professor, and more than a few people who are not senior, have these pressures on them today, in today’s universities. Chase the money. You chase the money at a cost and the cost is usually your own natural curiosity … (Ian);

But if you create a university that’s a company, then you do, you go where the money is and you treat academics not as people with agency, but as people with skills to sell into the marketplace. It just changes the whole configuration of academic activity and I think that the pressure on all the professoriate is great. I think the only thing that saves me, frankly, is that I bring in a lot of development money, which is not research money (Ian);
A lot of the stuff you do in the office isn’t worth doing. You’re only doing it to meet the administrative demands, bureaucratic demands in the University, which get more and more complex and demanding and wasteful … (Ewan);

I think we’re caught between playing with the big boys and being something different and special … I’ve put a lot of energy into, sort of, consultancy and commercial activities … as I said to staff, we either do it together or we’ll all decide, or I’ll decide, who’s dropping off the end (Wayne).

The commercial realities for Wayne, for instance, become a balancing act between academics doing the activities they were initially employed to do—research and teaching—and being responsive to the community(ies) in which the university is located. He describes the strategic approach he adopts:

… I see as one of my jobs as really getting in there and showing them, you know, how diverse our activities are, how active the staff are in a whole range of different ways and how good our programs and outcomes are. And so I sort of overtly get the Vice Chancellor’s photo, get him to write bits on our program so that, you know, he’s endorsing what we do you know. And I think those are the things I’m trying to establish and give them an awareness (Wayne).

Although an aspect of being responsive to the community(ies) in which a university is located—a function that some of the academics saw as being important—this has been curtailed by a code of behaviour implemented in at least one university. The code means:
… not bringing the University into disrepute and consequences for misbehaviour, such as summary loss of entitlements in retirement packages. Threats have clearly been made about academics who speak out, so the response has been for them not to speak out. This, in turn, has led to a drying up of public commentators, which means some academics are disinclined to make comments in their field of expertise in case some of this is contrived to be a commentary against the university (James).

This limitation has the potential effect of limiting intellectual health and community identity.

**Interrupting Academic Cultures**

Almost all of the men in the study referred to the less-than-desirable changes occurring in their universities. The issue that is being conveyed from people who have experienced the blustering and the intimidation is that the senior managers of our universities are adopting part of a new managerialist approach (as evidenced by the language, jargon and preoccupation with economic measures), yet the cultures of their institutions do not permit them to practise what those in private industry would be able to do. Ultimately, then, when this new approach to managerialism doesn’t work, individuals fall back upon their own ways of resolving conflict, which, as Ian explained for the executive at his university, saw them returning to ‘working class’ ways of dealing with threats, that is, being up-front and confrontational:

… when you’re from a working class background and you’re a man and you’re Anglo, the race relations stuff and the gender
stuff is the stuff you understand least, or have the least interest in … (Ian).

New managerialism has acted as an interruption to academic culture—a culture that had hitherto been relatively invisible to academics because of its taken-for-grantedness and familiarity (Van Maanen & Barley 1985). The fact that academics’ organisational cultures were able to be named is not altogether a bad thing, although the bullying and intimidation that has occurred can never be condoned. Challenging taken-for-granted assumptions may have enabled the discourse to be widened so that the beneficiaries of privilege could see it for what it is, albeit at a time when privilege is under threat.

Whereas corporate culture functions best when uncertainty is absent and when the ‘rules of the game’ are known (Alvesson & Billing 1997), challenging an organisation’s culture can result in anxiety (Schein 1997). This anxiety might be thought of as the modern madness that LaBier(1986) describes, which arises when individuals are forced to adopt the values, behaviour and attitudes necessary for career progression. How the men in this study position themselves in an environment of conflict and compromise is the focus of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6: SURVIVING

In the previous chapter I considered the ways in which Australian universities are changing, not only in terms of responding to the socio-political and economic environments in which they now find themselves, but also in terms of the resultant human interactions. The men in the study have described some of the changes in their universities and in some cases have provided specific accounts of bullying and intimidation that go much further than the more general, public claims about such practices that have been made in the press (see for instance, Radio National 2001).

These incidents, and others like them, have the effect of adding to the myth-making surrounding questionable practices in the recent past of the higher education sector, and contribute to the perceptions of fear and uncertainty that underpin unequal power relationships. Nevertheless, the men affected directly by the threats and intimidation, as well as those who continue to work in the higher education sector, have not left. Why, then, do they stay?

Part of the answer relates to the benefits and privileges associated with academic positions, along with the preparedness of staff to continue working in the sector despite the occupational stress experienced in these environments (Winefield et al. 2002). Another part of the answer to the question of why the men stay on in the sector lies in the realisation that bullying and intimidation in
universities might not account for a great part of their working life. The very act of staying in a situation suggests that a person, even in a compromised sense, is prepared to live with it, with new ways of surviving and re-ordering one’s self-identity being explored.

Although Ian did not disclose specific instances where he had been targeted by anyone in his university, his following comments suggest he is fearful of this happening, just as he is fearful of situations in which boundaries are less than clear. Perhaps because of this, Ian has been able to engineer a future for himself that is removed from the mainstream university context—the unit he runs is physically removed from the main campus of the university:

You know, I just couldn’t cope with that because I’m a troublemaker you know, in an institutional type context where the pressure to conform is high, I always luck out and I become labelled. I have problems. If the level of conformity requirements are high, I end up either becoming a victim or I become a bad guy, or something like that you know. So, I know that happens to me. So, I need to be in a situation where the boundaries are clear for everybody (Ian).

For the majority of men in the study, their experiences of the changes in higher education involved cut-backs and a preoccupation with aspects of performativity. The men indicated, just as Hearn (1999) did, that although his identity was challenged

28 Having said this, however, I am acutely aware of instances in which people’s lives have been threatened and drastically altered by single events of physical abuse in workplaces, and I would not want to suggest that the bullying that they experienced was less significant because it resulted from a single event.
by being a Head of Department for two years, it was ‘not completely disrupted’ (p. 136). Considering the following comment by Ray, it does beg the question: at what cost, survival?

…it was basically to keep the ship afloat, and heading in the right direction, during a time of serious reduction of staff members … that we were still in existence at the end might be taken as a mark of success (Ray).

When LaBier (1986) talks of modern madness and how this affects identity formation, he points to the costs to the individual and to the conflicts that they experience between embracing the new values, attitudes and behaviours necessary for career advancement, and the sense of betrayal of their own values, or of trading off too much. Most people, says Casey (1995a) adapt successfully and work harder whilst others rebel. The attitudes of toughness, aggressiveness and competitiveness—all stereotypical masculine attributes—can become not only the norm, but the entrenched values of the organisation.

Casey accepts that three types of corporate selves emerge as adaptations to the changed work environment: the defensive self, who would rather be somewhere else but who is tied to the organisation because of financial rewards and the kudos it confers; the colluded self, who becomes dedicated and diligent, and the capitulated self, one who surrenders to the demands of the organisation. Geoff, in the following statement, conveys a sense of collusion, to employ Casey’s terminology, when talking about the multi-faceted aspect of academics’ roles. Whereas he acknowledges
the stresses associated with academic work, it is something that one must just get on with:

*I mean, I don’t, the other thing about this is I guess I don’t have a big stake in a lot of this you know. I think this is one important thing, I mean while academic, academic work – and I think I might come up with this for that coping business – academic work, the fact that you’re doing so many different jobs at once does make it a bit stressful and certainly makes it a bit difficult. But it also broadens academics’ ranges of interests and it means that people share that broad range of interests and it is unusual to find somebody really pushing one particular thing. I mean, it does happen (Geoff).*

The sense I gained from my discussions with the men, and this is reflected in the notes I made immediately following each discussion, was that, with the exception of Geoff, they were not only adopting a defensive stand, but one in which they were being socially active—for their own sakes as well as for the benefit of their colleagues. They were making choices about how they lived and worked so that they might do as Smyth (2001) suggests, introduce agency and make progress against the source of their struggles, or as Tom would probably put it, insist on a moral relationship:

*… I think we tend to add on the organisational demands to what we would see as the core work, which is establishing the moral relationship, a decent moral relationship with the students and your colleagues in schools. I see that as the core of the work. If I felt that I was being pressured not to have an open relationship with students I couldn’t continue (Tom).*
Tom’s concern for moral relationships resonates with Blackmore’s (1999) observation that ‘Good leaders address the moral dimension of change, seek to develop high levels of trust and openness, and display a capacity to make sound ethical judgements, but not from a position of superior moral judgement’ (pp. 206-207).

The men were, in a sense, surviving modern madness and I suspect that they were able to do this due to their heightened emotional intelligence (Goleman 1995). They were seemingly in tune with their own emotions and were not only able to recognise emotions in others, but were also well-placed and able to influence relationships with others, partly also because of their positions, which gave them the space to deal with the issues. The following section provides some instances from the men’s accounts in which they articulate some of the principles that they adopt, but again, I should note that these are the truths from the men’s perspectives – whether the men’s colleagues would concur with these truths remains unknown.

**SURVIVING POSSIBILITIES: A PRINCIPLES APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP**

To assist themselves and their colleagues to move together on issues, the men articulated predilections towards transparency, consistency, honesty and trust, and these became sets of principles that they embraced, as typified in the following excerpts:

*Like a principle I might have if I was dealing with staff, it’s related to terms and conditions ... the principle is to do exactly what the Enterprise Bargaining Agreements or Industrial Agreements have said, exactly that. Not more and not less, but*
exactly that. Because if you do that then it’s very consistent. You’re not looking after your friends or punishing your enemies. You’re just doing, that would be a principle that I would use to operate (Steve);

I do like to reflect upon the things around me and, you know, and what goes on. And I, and you know, yeah, I can’t put my finger on it, in that direct sense. But I think a lot of it has to do with trust (Wayne).

By consciously adopting principles to follow, the academics indicated that this assisted them in their attempts to be fair and consistent—from their perspectives, at least. Hearn (1999) said that this was something that he found difficult, resulting in ‘a puzzling mixture of harmony and conflict’ (p. 136), though the way Martin tells it, it seems straightforward and unproblematic:

Transparency’s hugely important. People need to understand. If you keep people in the old mushroom policy, keep them in the dark and shit on them regularly, you’ll get zero response from them and you’ll get zero help when you need it. So the transparency issue is hugely important. The honesty is hugely important, and the third thing which is usually important is that, at the end of the day, you trust them. Because none of them are here ‘cause they’re thick. They’re all here because they’re competent, bright people and the worst thing you can do is treat them as not (Martin).

---

29 I have employed the term here of ‘consciously adopting’ principles, my reference point being one of the fundamental understandings of counselling. Rather than individuals enacting a flight or fight response to threat, they can be encouraged to make considered responses. I am therefore equating the conscious adoption of principles with making considered responses.
Issues of ‘appropriateness’ and whether members of staff ‘have a right to know’, as expressed in the following statement from Steve, are cause for some consternation, for unlike the implicit sentiments of servant leadership where the leader acts as a servant for his or her staff, here the relationship is conditional upon the leader making decisions on behalf of his staff. In so doing, there is a power differential at play, and it is seemingly weighted in favour of this Head of School:

… other than the obvious cases where it’s appropriate not to be fully honest with people, you know, where it would be hurtful to them. But otherwise I would have a view that it’s much better to have a view that it’s much better to be honest with people … So, I would be, you know, directly honest, you know, even to the extent of potentially adversely affecting my relationship with someone, I would be honest in terms of, if they have a right to know, then I will tell them at the earliest available opportunity (Steve).

In the following comments, Steve takes this further in the way he positions himself in at least three different ways:

… I would tend to if someone’s got an idea, I would tend to try and challenge the idea, or to discuss the idea by challenging it, you know, to really sort of make them defend what it is that they’re doing. Now not everybody likes that and, in fact, some people, you know, feel that you’re actually attacking them personally. Now, you know, I’m usually conscious of the fact that is happening and I then spend some time later building the bridges. But it does mean that the whole issue of debating a topic takes a lot longer than it should … Because I do actually see my role as, if you like, interfering in people’s professional lives a bit, you know, in a sense using my experience to help people think
about other ways of doing their job that may make their lives a bit easier (Steve).

There are tensions evident in what Steve is saying here. In one representation, he is positioning himself as the scholar who challenges and debates, yet he also positions himself as the person whose task it is to patch up relationships as though conflict and its resolution happen inevitably and in a conveniently linear fashion. Finally, Steve takes it upon himself to do things on behalf of others, similar to the benevolent dictator who decides when and what is in someone else’s best interests. For his colleagues when viewed through a power-political lens, if this is the way that his leadership is actually enacted, Steve’s motives might be hard to read, which could result in a climate of uncertainty (if not fear) whereby he is exercising power over them via his manipulations. Viewed through a lens of social psychology, Steve is demonstrating his social interdependence with his group; that is, he is reliant upon the other members of the group to provide him with his own feelings of connectedness and for the provision of social and emotional rewards (Smith & Mackie 1995). He exercises power to reinforce his own identity.

Along with the ways in which some of the leaders enact their ‘principles’, some of the men also referred to the interpersonal relationships that exist between them and their colleagues, and, as Martin hopes, between his colleagues and their students, in a sort of trickle-down effect.

... if you cannot respond to the human needs of staff or the human needs of your students, you really ought to be in another job ... Does it flow through? I hope it does. I hope that the dealings they have with their students are essentially personal,
humane and compassionate … We need to make a distinction, and this is where I think leadership, a lot of the leadership around the place here falls down. We need to make a distinction between the management, the administrative and managerial relationships we have with staff and students, and the human and interactive relationships we have between staff and students, and in most cases if there’s good administration and good leadership, those will overlap (Martin);

…it’s really a matter, I think, as much of leading by example as anything else (Ray).

**Being a Team Player**

Interpersonal relationships between leaders and their colleagues are developed as a means of demonstrating loyalty to one’s discipline as well as to the friends made from within the discipline. Charlie’s perspective is that suggestions coming from his friends and from those within his discipline, are more likely to be pursued:

… my style is to take all suggestions seriously, take all possibilities seriously. But your primary loyalty is to your School. That’s your discipline. That’s where your intellectual commitment is, apart from most of your friends (Charlie);

… if you and I have had a conflict and we have to work together because of staffing arrangements, say we’ve got to work together, then we sit down and we say, well, we admit what’s happened in the past, let’s try and work this out. It’s a pragmatic relationship, you and I may not be best friends but we have to work together (Tom).
Casey (1995a), in her explorations of the formation of corporate identities, observes that this movement towards team structures is symptomatic of organisations re-creating a sense of family and belonging, despite the fact that this frequently happens, almost contradictorily, in organisations with strong hierarchies. Employees, she says, come to believe that it is in their interests to belong to a team, with the result that individuals may become anxious on behalf of the team, or on other occasions, gain anxiety relief from the team—a further example of social interdependence referred to in the previous section.

Consulting about decisions with the other members of the team, thereby acting in a collaborative or consultative manner, can become a normative behaviour for some work teams. Viewed through a political lens, however, the all-pervasive norms of collaboration and collegiality may be little more than a chimera. Smyth (2001) argues that these are glorified concepts that reflect new genres creeping into the world of work, and which represent not only a pretence but also a means of controlling the work of teachers. Whereas the process of collaboration might sound as if teachers have more control over their work, he says, teachers are really enacting a form of ‘impression management’ (Grimmet 1990, p. 2), and are meeting managerial ends. Teachers are, according to Smyth (2001), left out of the loop of making strategic decisions and are therefore not always able to develop their own discourses of teaching and learning. Collegiality should not be seen as a panacea either, for it creates problems for those wishing to make fast and decisive decisions (Currie & Vidovich 1998).
Seemingly oblivious to how collaboration might be used for political ends, in the following excerpts Wayne describes collaboration as being a protective mechanism for him:

… collaborative, yes by all means, as a protective mechanism for myself. And as this is the only way I could ever do anything, because it just doesn’t seem that you could move forward otherwise … It’s harder sometimes, there’s no question it’s harder and you have to go through agendas. But I mean it’s not in a false way. I’d hate anyone to ever think that it creates a sense of a falseness you know, that you are actually doing it, you know, procedurally (Wayne).

Wayne’s preferred reliance upon the process of collaboration acts, as he says, as a ‘protective mechanism’, despite the fact that it is time-consuming and prone to the enactment of differing agendas.

I think collaboration is not through a staff forum, but, we have plenty of those, but it’s collaboration in terms of who the decision affects and who needs to make it. So, it’s making the decision with the right people on the right issues you know. And I think that’s undoubtedly something I go out of my way to do because, I mean, you grow in expertise exponentially as you do that and experience when you seek out the right people to make the decision (Wayne).

Wayne’s concern to make the decision ‘with the right people on the right issues’, but the conundrum remains: who decides the issue and who is advantaged (and who is disadvantaged) by the decision/s?  

30 I am mindful here of the questions that Apple (1979) poses in relation to curriculum: Whose knowledge is it? Who selected it? Why is it organised and taught in this way? To whom is it accessible?
For Wayne, emotional and physical resources are provided by others in the group that enable him to cope with the responsibilities of being a leader. These social supports (Smith & Mackie 1995) enable Wayne to perform his role, and seem to have a direct influence in the way that they prop up Wayne’s own sense of identity. His concern to be sure that collaboration was not seen by his team to be undertaken 'in a false way' suggests that he is aware that collaboration can be used as a managerial device, but he does not provide any insights into how, or if, he is working to develop educationally productive discourses with his staff that would be used in a strategic way. Wayne’s concern, therefore, seems to be primarily a superficial—perhaps even selfish—one, the purpose of which is to ensure his identity survives intact.

The following excerpts reflect a sense of loyalty to the team (and by implication, loyalty to the organisation), whilst problematising the situations that can occur from over-consultation or when it is not always possible to consult with members of the de facto “family”. As inviting as a consultative approach can be, Charlie communicates the frustrations that colleagues can experience when the leader routinely goes down a consultative path:

> Now in retrospect, I realise that this sometimes made my colleagues impatient and what this implies is that you’ve got to think about some things we’re not gonna bother with. Some things I’ll just bloody well tell you, you know. This is what we’re gonna do, we’re calling for volunteers to do Open Day, let’s say. Some trivial thing like that. You, you and you. Why don’t you guys do it? You know, let’s not go through the kind of elaborate procedure with everything. Otherwise we’ll just get tired (Charlie).
In some situations, such as in the following account, Ewan describes a situation that he faced in which he was required to make a snap decision about funding; he was not in his usual work environment and he was unable to consult with his colleagues. It appears he made the decision, realising—or hoping—that he had a trusting relationship with his members of staff, one that would mean that his colleagues would respect the position in which Ewan found himself and that he would act on their behalf:

‘Oh well, you’ve got to make up your mind straight away. You want ’em or don’t you?’ Right? And I’m in the car between here and [another campus]. And, have to make that decision, right. And there’s obviously no consultation, and then people complain that you didn’t consult before you committed them all to extra work … I think the only thing is to persuade people of your good will, I think. That it’s not the ideal way of doing it and to raise it if people are unhappy about something you’ve done to make it a public discussion and to air their grievances with you (Ewan).

Some situations, such as the one above, require a decision to be made in isolation from the people who will be affected by the decision, and from Charlie and Ewan’s statements, they and their colleagues realise that this will be the case. Currie and Vidovich (1998) argue that managers having to make decisions quickly is another business characteristic that is weaving its way into the decision-making processes of our universities. Whilst able to make sometimes difficult decisions by themselves, it may be necessary for a leader to realise that she or he is working on the basis of a trusting relationship, or as Casey (1995a) might well say it, making a decision on behalf of the family. Several of the men, as the
following excerpts demonstrate, developed ways in which trusting relationships were able to develop; approaches that could be seen as collusion:

*Oh yes, I didn’t distinguish between information which the Head of the School is supposed to have and what everyone should know. I mean, I guess, I don’t know how well I did it, but I was operating on the principle of transparency which is part of keeping the door open and letting people know what’s going on. I think I’ve got more of a fault in lack of discretion in what I tell people rather than keeping things to myself (Ewan);*

*I was perhaps a little more open at times than I technically should have been because there were rules of confidentiality governing those things, but I just felt that you had to be ready to keep people informed. And I think most people on that Committee, when they went back to their colleagues, were a little more open than they were supposed to be, you know (Charlie);*

*I imagine that people perceive my management style as being under-managed. It’s really more in terms of personal relationships. I mean, people will do things for me if I ask them to, rather than some formal reallocating of roles, sort of things. I’ve really never had any trouble (Ewan).*

Integral to working with other people are the gender relationships that exist, and it is the influence of gender in the leaders’ lives that I explore in the following section.
TALKING GENDER

Alvesson and Billing (1997) make the observation that gender will not always be spoken of in explicit terms. Because I chose not to ask specific questions about gender when I was talking to the men, it was therefore necessary to trawl through their statements to find references to men/women, males/ females, and so on. In the following section I have considered the language used by the men, and in particular, I have noted inconsistencies and contradictions where I believe that they occur in their gender-related comments. Much more difficult to identify and analyse are those comments that the men made on the basis of their gender assumptions and their reflections—or absence of them—upon their own gendered positions.

Limited gender-related comments came from Charlie, Ray and James. Charlie, when mentioning his female staff—one of whom he finds attractive and spends time gossiping with her—acknowledges that he thinks women were good leaders and describes himself as

... I’m just one of the guys (Charlie).

Ray limited his mention of women to his partner and to a female senior academic responsible for what he considered to be poor training, and James’ only reference to gender was when he spoke of the school he attended that

... reinforced a particular version of maleness (James).

Geoff avoided any gender references at all and used pluralised gender-neutral terms throughout his discussion with me.
Even though the men may have made minimal or no reference to gender, this does not mean that they are without any form of gender identity. Male academics ignoring gender altogether is not unheard of (Whitehead 2000a), though the ‘deep-rooted investments on the part of individuals’ (McNay 2000, p. 18), of which gender is one such investment, means that for some of the men, their non-mentioning of gender may be a statement about the way things are. This can be illuminated by Kress’s (1985) definition of discourse:

Discourses are systematically-organised sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution. Beyond that, they define, describe and delimit what it is possible to say and not possible to say (and by extension—what it is possible to do and not to do) with respect to the area of concern of that institution, whether marginally or centrally (pp. 5-6).

In particular contexts, then, the discourse that controls the recognition or naming of gender, controls actions pertaining to gender.

Several of the men, namely Ian, Steve, Wayne, Daniel, Tom and Martin, however, interspersed their life stories with gender-related references. Steve, for instance, relayed the following anecdote about the perception of an outsider to academic decision-makers, clearly positioning them as ‘Other’ and even not ‘real’ men for they practise supposed feminine leadership traits (after Blackmore 1999):

Yeah, yeah. I mean, again it’s a, you know, like I guess [my friend who I play golf with] is a Liberal voter and we’re not and so there’s a sort of a natural thing that we now accept and don’t even argue about and more or less joke about the differences you know. And yeah, no, we talk about them and I think he would
understand, you know, that although he probably thinks, you know in the same way that we think, you know, corporate ratbag or something! But, in the same way, he probably thinks “academic wusses”, you know … Or, you know, no no, you’ve got soft ways of doing leadership and you’re never going to get anything done. So, but we do it (Steve).

But, it would seem, at least from an insider’s perspective, that some disciplines could be seen as the sanctuary of ‘real’ men. Martin, for instance, reflected upon his academic background, and made a link between science and masculinity:

I was actually science and chemistry … and a Ph D in that area, you know, that’s extraordinarily non-human. It’s all to do with molecules that are inhuman and behave themselves … I mean that’s your height of masculinity model type of, you know, classic science background (Martin).

In the following section, I group the more expansive gender-related comments, that is, those of Ian, Steve, Wayne, Daniel, Tom and Martin, according to the relational aspects that they raised. These begin with a selection of statements made about women who are, or have been, strong influences upon them. I then move through their comments that reveal a level of uncertainty about how to engage with feminism(s) and with feminists, even though most of these men give the appearance of being in concert with feminism(s) and the changes they have brought to understandings of masculinities and awareness of gender issues in the workplace.
Women as Strong Influences

Women have acted as influential academics at various stages in many of the men’s careers. Daniel, for instance was very struck with the efficiency and the supportiveness of a former colleague whom I shall call Jane, and was conscious of these characteristics in the development of his own approach to leadership:

But so seeing how good people can work, and there were other fantastic people at [the other university]. I mean, I could give Jane a paper, I could send her a paper today on the e-mail and she’d have comments back to me tomorrow. Fantastic! Really supportive and I’ve seen her put her neck on the line for staff, you know, at Academic Board and wherever. So seeing good people work, and I think I’ve just probably picked up bits from there (Daniel).

In this statement, Ian also acknowledges the influence of women upon his academic development and asserts that women now constitute his support network. The situation for some women may well be the converse of this in that they would use male leaders as mentors:

I’ve been largely, nearly all my senior colleagues who’ve mentored me and networked for me and been supporters of mine, even today, would nearly all be women. And even now, nearly all my close professorial colleagues are women. It’s just one of those things (Ian).

When I asked the men to nominate other similar male academics I might approach, the most common response was that the first people they immediately thought of were women. Tom, for example, expressed surprise at his myopic view of other males in
his university; for him, women are the important ‘doers’, whom he contrasts against the relatively static males:

Gee, I’ve shown my own limited understanding of what my male academic colleagues do. You see, many of the, many of the people that I acknowledge as important have turned out to have organisational feet of clay. Or they’ve been women (Tom);

In this situation, the outstanding [leaders] for me for Head of School, are all female (Martin);

… the person I was meeting with just now is a very successful leader and she seems to be successful, in that, she actually gets the job done and is able to do her job in as broadly defined. But also the people who work with her really like her. So, even just then we spent a bit of time talking about exactly how she finds the time to work with the staff as well as doing the other things that she does … she’s in a slightly different position to me here in that she, if you like, she’s in a sense the middle person. She interacts negatively with her supervisor in defence of the staff. And it’s obvious she does that. So, she is clearly the champion of the staff to her supervisor. And I don’t know whether that contributes that. I don’t whether I would necessarily seek to take that approach even if, if you like, it was necessary or it was possible to do it (Steve).

Steve’s observations of the qualities that make a successful leader evidenced in his female colleague include not only being able to get the job done, but also being liked by her colleagues—a combination of task and relational qualities. He also sees her as an advocate who is able to work with those above her in a particular way, though the words he uses convey images of the warrior and battlefield
metaphors that are said to typify masculine leadership behaviours in Australia (Sinclair 1998).

Here, the woman in Steve’s mind’s eye is liberating, for she enacts behaviours that take her beyond the limiting beliefs associated with homogenous “feminine” values of nurturance (Blackmore 1999). Doing battle on behalf of her team, however, is akin to playing the games associated with hegemonic masculinity—on one hand she is being strategic, yet on the other she is being complicit—a very difficult balancing act. Choosing when to take on certain issues and how to play the game and learning to work strategically within a bureaucratic culture can create a tension: traitor to some; accomplice to others (Blackmore 1993b). From Steve’s more senior situation, he not only positions this woman as being capable of playing (at least) two games with poise: the games associated with her superiors and games associated with satisfying the needs of her own team, but also being a member of two social groups. In this way, she is socially interdependent, developing a positive social identity by relying on other members of the groups in which she works for various social and emotional rewards (Smith & Mackie 1995).
Not all the influential women named by the men came from within academia, such as was the case with Wayne being filled with awe as a result of Fabian Dattner’s\textsuperscript{31} visit to his university:

It’s interesting because we had a number of students came in with a proposal to have Fabian Dattner – she must do a lot on leadership and ‘at risk’ youth and all those things – and they wanted to do a seminar. I was really supportive and they said it will change all our lives. And these were absolute converts to her whatever program they’d been through, and it really brought out my cynicism. Look, when she came up, she was up here doing a program and it’s my God, she’s so bloody dynamic, it was frightening you know. It really was. It was just awesome (Wayne).

Dattner’s dynamism clearly affected Wayne, yet the attributes she demonstrated are perhaps not greatly different to successful female executives. As Sinclair (1994) noted, successful executive women are strong, smart, direct and demonstrate commitment. Wayne did not see this person as being a threat to himself, for she was obviously outside of the higher education system, though it would be fascinating to see how Dattner would be viewed if she were part of the system.

\textsuperscript{31} Fabian Dattner is regarded as a successful businessperson and author. From my time working in prison education in the mid 1980s, I knew of her attempts to improve the employment prospects of prisoners upon their release through the Second Chance Program she helped establish.
Men Relating to Feminism(s)

Some of the statements that some of the men made betray a level of uncertainty about feminism and its consequences for them. It is impossible to know for sure what their positions in terms of gender relations might be when only considering the language used, but silence on a particular topic—particularly when they had prior notice that gender was one of the issues under examination by me—may be symbolic of the significance they place on gender relations in their workplaces. Had I asked them specifically about this, however, I am certain that they would have articulated a position, and perhaps even theorised a position, but I am bemused that feminism(s) were strangely invisible in the life stories provided to me. To label these men as unaware of or uninterested in gender-related issues may be presumptuous, but in light of previous comments about controlling discourses (Kress 1985), it is likely that their views of gender and its importance in their lives says that their state of affairs is ‘this’ way and not another.

For Daniel, Steve, Tom and Wayne, their declarations are interesting, for on one hand they each spoke of feminism and/or feminists in a seemingly reconciled manner, yet on the other hand, some of the things they said seemed to be conditional or contradictory. First, Daniel. In the following excerpt, he talks about some of his female PhD students who are older feminists who keep him ‘on the straight and narrow’, which he says is ‘great’:

… nearly all of my PhD students, apart from that one there, they’re all women and they’re all, they all tend to be mature women, and they’re all certainly older than me, bar one, and a lot of them have been single. You know, married and divorced
and separated, but so they actually in many ways keep me on the straight and narrow. So, they will say ‘Oh, but Daniel, you dickhead, you shouldn’t have done that, you should’ve said this’ or you know, they keep, some of them are feminists and they have pretty strong views about the world and they keep me right, which is great. As you know I like to work with PhD students, I think it’s an absolute pleasure and privilege. And the relationship with each of them is different but it tends to be that sort of supportive, counselling role rather than the typical out and out science graduate academic supervisor (Daniel).

But in the excerpt that follows, Daniel is troubled by his former female Head of School who took issue with him in a bureaucratic way for his decision to work away from his office. I do not get the impression from what Daniel says that he is angry that it was a woman who was his boss, but rather, that it was a woman who was being so bureaucratic—that if it had have been a male he wouldn’t have been surprised. This may be indicative of an assumption that Daniel has about women, that is, that they be more democratic, collegial, and caring—a view that has the effect of disempowering women because it is a limited way of seeing their skills of emotional management (Blackmore 1993a; 1999):

I had an interesting discussion with a Head of School [at a previous university] and I said, “Look, it’s gonna be nice weather tomorrow. I think I’ll go … for a drive’. She just looked and said ‘What?’ I said, ‘I’ll go for a drive … I might have lunch there you know. It might be a nice day.’ ‘No, you won’t’. ‘Yes, I will’. ‘You’ve got to be at work’. I said, ‘No, it’s alright, I’ll be working on, you know, I was at work last Sunday and I was working last night or whatever.’ ‘But you’ve got to be at work, you’ve got to be behind your desk.’ Some managers still have
that mentality whereas I don’t think you can in a university
system … Yes, if I’m working over the weekend at a conference,
then I’d expect a bit in return. I don’t expect formal payment for
it, you know, like an admin person perhaps, but I certainly
expect a bit of leeway in what I do. And I think a good manager
does that. I mean Cathleen’s fantastic with that (Daniel).

Daniel, like the rest of us, learns about and evaluates his own
personal qualities by comparing them with others, in what is
referred to as social comparison theory (Smith & Mackie 1995).
What is not immediately obvious is the unconscious gender
symbolism (Alvesson & Billing 1997) associated with the type of
support sought and provided; the unconscious association that
Daniel may have made on this occasion about the type of work a
woman does as well as how she does it.

Steve spoke several times about women whom he saw as being
influential leaders and he spoke too of differences he saw between
masculine and feminine styles of leadership:

…it seems like the successful people are people who are, who
create time for everyone, to deal with people’s issues, you know,
and those are important. You know, even if the person doesn’t
think they are important, and I think that’s a characteristic of
leadership that is essential. You know, I think it’s probably, you
know, I think that’s, if you like, what I call a feminine style of
leadership. Whereas a masculine style of leadership is, you
know, ‘Look, just read the manual, it’s all in there’ […] You
know, I think there are what we think of as masculine styles, but
I would think nearly all of the senior women in this organisation
use a masculine style, and yet there are heaps of men who would
use what I would, who use naturally what I would think of as a feminine style (Steve).

In the following excerpt, whilst reinforcing that he is aware of the role of feminism, Steve is also conveying a sense that it is not necessarily something that drives him or to which he is committed:

*I’m also conscious that, in a sense, there is a, you know, a feminisation, or, there’s this sort of, if you like, a strand of educational theory, or even I suppose a theory of, you know, perspective on knowledge that would, could be called a feminist perspective, and I think that it’s important for everyone to become conscious of that, to become conscious of, you know, like I’ll try and understand someone who has a post-structuralist perspective on knowledge or a critical theory or a, you know, a Neo-Marxian viewpoint or something. I try and understand it. But I think in the case of feminist perspectives, it does drive what, in fact, is possibly the majority of the staff members in many education faculties. And so, you know, one does need to understand it, at least to some sense (Steve).

Steve’s concern about needing to be ‘conscious of’, or at least able ‘to understand it, at least to some sense’ conveys a subtlety about the commitment he may have to changes in society in general and leadership in particular, brought about by feminism(s). That Steve might adopt this position is perhaps not all that surprising given his tendency, as speculated upon earlier, to view and deal with issues in a linear fashion. It seems akin to a data-in/data-out model of information processing, such that once an individual has a piece of knowledge, then that will conveniently inform his or her decision-making. In this regard, I am mindful of Moreton-Robinson’s (2000) distinction between knowing something (in her instance, an
Indigenous view of the world, which means you must experience it from within), contrasted against knowing about something (which she states is about imposing a conceptual framework from outside). Steve is able to theorise feminism(s), but I do not gain the sense that he either enacts them or is able to see them as part of a complex dynamic.

This may also be because Steve’s superficial understanding of feminism(s) may see him being preoccupied with different styles and techniques of leadership rather than realising that the woman of whom he speaks may be dealing with substantive educational and political issues and working to promote inclusive and more equitable educational practices and outcomes (Blackmore 1999).

The situation seems to be similar for Wayne. In the first of two passages that I have selected, Wayne lists various ‘sub-cultures’, amongst them the ‘profeminist lobby’, and concludes by saying that his basic concern is to show respect for people. In the second passage, he makes it clear that he is aware of stereotypical masculine and feminine traits, but limits his explanation of staff relationships to the ways that women and men interact—that is, differently to each other:

And we’ve got a few sub-cultures within our culture too you know. There’s ‘big jock’ and ‘little jock’, there’s ‘hate jock’, there’s you know, certainly a profeminist lobby. So, the sub-cultures are alive and strong but they haven’t been divisive to the extent of separating and isolating and alienating. You know, people basically, and I respect them greatly for it, wanted to get on and know that the common good is important (Wayne);
I think, I think our staff is 60% female and I find you know, the stereotypes pervade. The females, by and large, are extremely nurturing of each other, and I would say in terms of their response, even if I gendered that, I’d say within the female staff, absolutely, you know. Within the male population, I think it breaks down to how, the support groups you know. We’ve got a couple of staff who are isolates who you know, no other staff would go out of their way to support. Whereas others have their support group, whether as I said, whether it’s, you know, a sporting, an academic link or whatever. But I think the way in which the female academic staff and administrative staff support each other is very different to the way the male staff who do it. You don’t have to be a Rhodes Scholar to know that. It backs up just about everything else doesn’t it, you know (Wayne).

Tom’s comments are somewhat more complex than those of Steve, Daniel and Wayne. In the discussion I had with Tom, he spent considerable time talking about the strong and reciprocal work and social relationship he has with a colleague whom I shall refer to as Carol:

She does a lot more than I do it’s fair to say and she also does a lot of the work I should be doing I suspect. But I take on the, like the kind of leadership of the relationships with schools and the community organisations we work with. But there is no firm separation. I do a lot of work in the [degree program] and she does a lot of work in the partnership area, and I would see our relationship as, well, collegial. We both answer to a Head of School […] We have, there’s a congruence between us on a whole range of questions. Not identical, but we do fit together really well. We have a similar view of the world, similar view of the way in which [our discipline] should look like in a university
... So that there’s this loose affiliation of a group of people around Carol and me (Tom).

Here (and many times elsewhere in the discussion), Tom makes a great deal of the professional relationship he has with Carol, but at no stage does he say that she’s a feminist, although many of her ways of working would seem to be consistent with a feminist’s concern for recognition of difference, cultivation of relationships, social justice concerns, and so on. What is interesting, then, is Tom’s perception of his Head of School, (whom I’ve called Cathleen), and how she operates. He is seemingly troubled about her operating in a masculine fashion because of her predisposition to planning—a supposed masculine attribute—when he sees her as a ‘strong feminist’.

There’s, you know, the classic masculine environment of leadership is something that’s incredibly planned and monitored and I mean this is, maybe it’s caricaturing it. But we really have little of that … But I’ve got a good, I get a really, I get on well pragmatically with Cathleen. I need to say that. But we don’t, you know, we don’t plan as a group which I think is very interesting. But I think Cathleen is an intense planner at a very personal level. And I think, I mean she’s a strong feminist, and I think, I think feminists of her generation had to plan very strongly and personally, and develop very personally strategic ways of working. And in her case she’s been, I think, highly successful (Tom).

And shortly after having made this comment, Tom revealed more about his view of feminists—a view that conveys a sense of fear, or a sense of wanting to avoid a potentially brutalising encounter with Cathleen, for ‘she’s the strong feminist’:
Well, the question I have is why anybody would want to be a line manager in a university these days, when I step back from doing that. When the previous Head of School decided he was not going to seek reappointment. This is five or six years ago. I said to Cathleen: “Well, if you want to do the job, it’s yours”. One, I didn’t want to compete with Cathleen. That could have been a bruising encounter for both of us. She’s the strong feminist … a whole lot of people might have come off second best. But also, I didn’t want it and I’d had a taste of you know in the moments when Heads of School are away or on leave or something like that, you have a taste of what the job’s like, and I decided I didn’t want to be that kind of line manager. And I think it was an excellent decision that I made (Tom).

This fear of feminism and of feminists by some men is, from my own experience, not uncommon. Whether the men concerned necessarily have up-to-date insights into feminism—that is, beyond the era of radical feminism with the strong anti-male messages it conveyed to men—is a moot point. For many men, it would seem, have interpreted the earlier messages of feminism to mean that they should reject their masculinity, thereby denying them of their potency. One of the responses by men to this perception is to adopt an anti-feminist politics in an attempt to remove the fear of loss of masculinity (Seidler 1990).

And finally, although he said he had never written about gender, Ian made comments about the mentoring and the support he receives from women:

See, a lot of my senior colleagues that I’m friends with are actually women. [Long silence]. Men. [Long silence]. Some of my problem is that you know, you, I’ve got male colleagues who
are really collegial to me—senior to me—genuine and really collegial to me, but I know from friends who tell me about interactions when they relate to junior staff, that they relate differently. And so, they’re probably not what you’re after. You want someone more collegial (Ian);

I’ve been largely, nearly all my senior colleagues who’ve mentored me and networked for me and been supporters of mine, even today, would nearly all be women. And even now, nearly all my close professorial colleagues are women. It’s just one of those things (Ian).

Whereas it is argued that management in universities is not immune from the historical and cultural constructions of management elsewhere in society (Hearn 1999), from the literature consulted in relation to gender in educational institutions, little is known about men who operate outside of the culture of their organisations. Dissident males—that is, those who do not adopt the practices of hegemonic masculinity such as profeminist men—seem to be largely invisible,

However, it would be a mistake to assume that profeminism is necessarily incompatible with management, or that it is impossible to do profeminist management. Perhaps it is more accurate to recognize the specific and variable contingencies—gendered, organizational, hierarchical and so on—that affect the attempt to be both profeminist and a manager. Accordingly, the experience of being, or trying to be, a profeminist manager is likely to be rather different in such different organizational cultures (Hearn 1999, p. 136).
Despite real or perceived limitations imposed by hegemonic bureaucratic practices, life for a senior male academic is one which still values scholarly inquiry, and seeking alternative viewpoints from colleagues, whether males or females, could not be seen as being that unusual. Further, someone who is at the level of professor, as Ian is, would also have a degree of discretion over how he spends his time, and with whom he chooses to spend it. Despite these comments, however, Ian positions himself as “Other”, relative to his male colleagues:

*I've got some close professorial mates but they're tough nuts in terms of management. They wouldn't run this Unit the way I run it. They would just have a different world view. I can lunch with them, have coffee with them and even socialise with them, but I doubt I could be part of a management team with them. I wouldn't play, not with these guys, you know ...* (Ian).

Whereas Ian had previously indicated to me that he would be circumspect in what he disclosed to his senior colleagues for fear of being targeted by them, he is here indicating that he would choose not to operate either in the same manner as some of his ‘professorial mates’ or be part of a management team with them. In this extract he does not convey a fear of being a target for taking this stance, which I think is quite significant.

The literature consulted for this study speculated that men who did not conform to a particular masculinist approach were likely to be in for a tough time (Connell 2000; Hearn 1992a). Notwithstanding that Ian does not give the impression that he has been derided for his leadership practices, it may be noteworthy that he heads a stand-alone unit, and by mutual convenience perhaps, is spared the
trepidation that being part of the senior management team of the university might provide.

I need here to acknowledge the limitations of relying on language, whether implicit or explicit, to gauge the men’s awareness of and/or appreciation of the role of feminism(s) in the gender relations in their workplaces. Although many of the men in the study seem to say little about gender-related issues, what they do say in terms of how they see their relationships with other people may reveal more about the social action in which they are engaged. In the previous chapter, for instance, the men spoke of the principles that they said they followed to guide them as leaders, and in subsequent sections of the thesis, more is revealed about the men’s various leadership practices.

As Blackmore (1999) noted about women in leadership positions, 'Leadership was not just a matter of style … but about valuing certain ways of working and social relationships, it was about promoting inclusive and more equitable educational practices and outcomes' (p. 166). The men, when viewed from this perspective, would all appear to be practising a liberating form of leadership—at least, from what they say about themselves—but viewing them through the lens of practice alone is as problematic as relying on their use of language. Combining both, it seems, moves us a step closer to appreciating what these men do and what it is that informs their practices. In the next chapter, I consider in more detail how the men came to know about being leaders.
CHAPTER 7: FROM THE CRADLE TO A CHAIR

One of the strong insights I have from the previous chapter is of the men staying on in their roles and wanting to make a difference, despite the dramatic changes going on in their universities. How it is that someone like Martin, for instance, develops as a leader in this sort of environment intrigues me:

First rule of leadership here is, know when to break a rule … the second rule of leadership is, you always go to the root cause of what the problems are and that, you know, papering between the cracks provides you peace today but there’s a helluva problem tomorrow … The third rule is: people will always forgive you your mistakes. People forgive you your mistakes. They don’t forgive you your deviousness, or your malicious acts (Martin).

The issue of the social construction of identity has been discussed previously, and Martin’s stance is one that exemplifies the interaction between “self” and one’s social context in identity formation. Martin has formed a work identity that includes a preparedness to be a risk-taker and somewhat rebellious, as is typified in his stance of “knowing when to break rules”. In turn, the responses by his colleagues—that is, a trusting relationship in which mistakes are forgiven—exemplify the reciprocal side of identity formation. From the perspective of power and influence, however, when considering his position as Head of School and Acting Dean, it is hardly surprising that Martin is able to break rules and generally “call the shots”. It would be interesting to know whether this has always been his mode of operation as he
progressed through the ranks, or whether he has adopted this perspective in tandem with the position and influence he now occupies.

The focus of this chapter is upon how the men came to know about being a leader. The relationship between knowing and doing as reflections of each other (Connelly & Clandinin 1985) becomes the narrative of experience, enriched by a multitude of meanings (Elbaz-Luwisch 1997), not all of which are obvious to the outside researcher. Translating the knowing into telling is a challenge that the use of narrative attempts to resolve (White 1980). Here then, I will attempt to name and explore some of the ways in which the men know about being a leader.

None of the men in the study denied that they were a leader, but as revealed previously, excerpts from the men’s accounts suggest that they are resistant to many of the discourses of leadership, especially those that try to control them. Comments from the men suggest that they didn’t really know what was in store for them as leaders or managers. In recognition of Sinclair’s argument,

To understand leaders, one needs to see how these egos were shaped to include the past in the contemporary leadership picture. Leaders, like the rest of us, spend lives and careers seeking to satisfy outstanding needs, compensate for losses, reduce anxieties and inadequacies … personal backgrounds are the great omission from the leadership story (Sinclair 2002).
I felt that I needed to include, where possible, a consideration of the men’s personal backgrounds. Personal backgrounds, and the gendered favouritism of males, such as is indicated in the following comments, may well have groomed men to positions of leadership, the metaphorical ‘chair’ of the professor!

**Families and Schools**

A number of the men spoke of their earliest memories of leadership, which entailed considering their family and school backgrounds. Two excerpts are provided:

*My secondary school provided me with training in leadership by having to take responsibility … it promoted a particular version of maleness, essentially a healthy body, healthy mind attitude … My own modest family background taught me to value everyone at all levels of society, not just those above you (John);*

*… [my mother’s] in her early 80s and she gave me all my primary school reports. And I was having a look at them and thinking you know that, and then I looked at my secondary school stuff, which she also had, and it had, it was a really interesting comment. The primary school one is you know, ‘Wayne is extremely popular and … has plenty of these leadership skills’. And I thought oh yeah, I can remember that teacher. Then in secondary school it had you know, ‘Wayne’s leadership ability is above his actual skills and knowledge but he seems to have the total trust of his peers …’, and you know, that’s interesting … I just grew up, you know. I can’t remember anyone influencing me you know … So, you know, I think it’s*
also, you do get to a stage where you fall into things, and I think my generation fell in to careers … (Wayne).

It is worth reflecting here as well on the gendered aspects of these phenomena. Considering the estimated ages of the two men mentioned above, they would have been at school somewhere between the 1940s through to the 1960s, a time when a male’s ascendancy to positions of influence was not only taken for granted and expected, but was also considered an entitlement.

GOING IN BLIND
A number of the men revealed a level of ignorance about what it was they would be in for when they took on designated management positions, such as James and Ian:

*I did it by the seat of my pants … it was totally intuitive*  
(James);

*I’ve only been a professor for six years so, in that six years, and really there’s levels of activity. So, when you’re a lecturer you don’t, I mean when I was a lecturer there were three professors who drove [my discipline] and I never used to know what they did for a living. You know I didn’t know what their life was like. I knew they had classroom experiences like me, but I wasn’t particularly close to them. My heads of department were the same. I was never particularly exposed to heads of department. I used to be dragged in from time to time to be lectured at about my peculiar interests … but that was about all. Really I didn’t have a lot to do with them. So, the last six years I’ve made a lot*
of professorial colleagues and friends and spent a lot of time here and in other universities, talking with those people (Ian).

For Ian, the presence of professorial colleagues with whom he could talk about issues compensated for the absence of immediate others on whose leadership he could reflect. Not knowing what it was that Ian’s superiors’ work entailed was not an isolated experience. Geoff also made mention of this.

There are different paths that the men have taken to get to where they are, and most of the men identified their professional pathways to me. Opportunities to work outside of educational institutions in some instances have not only been valuable for the experiences they provided, but also because they helped the men to see how relatively privileged academics’ lives are:

For me, I think, I would have had lots of troubles had I come straight out of university and gone in to academe. I didn’t. I came out of university when, as an industrial chemist, worked in industry for a bit, spent six years teaching in schools, chemistry teaching, and came back, had my own business and came to academe later. Did a Ph D when I was thirty-something. So, there was a decade in between there where, you know, when you were out in the world and I think one of the things that you find with academics a lot is, they’ve never been outside of schools (Martin).

Two intriguing observations can be made at this point. First, as privileged as the life of an academic is thought to be by some of the men interviewed, it is typically not thought of as being part of the “real” world. Second, none of the men identified any exclusionary practices that hampered their professional trajectories, but this may
be akin to a phenomenon observed by Blackmore and Sachs (2000) in their study of women in management positions in schools, TAFEs and universities, found, in part, that some of their research participants denied having experienced any forms of discrimination or inequality. Instead, ‘… they wished to believe that they had achieved their position on the basis of individual merit and professional expertise’ (p. 7). The men in the current study may not have experienced any exclusionary practices, but a comment from Ian, an Asian-Australian\textsuperscript{32}, hints that he is aware of possibilities of exclusion, yet is able to operate strategically to ensure that the situation does not arise:

\begin{quote}
And I don’t talk this way with my academic colleagues outside of my unit, because they don’t have the ability to thrash around the ideas. They take it personally and would probably target me because of it (Ian).
\end{quote}

**LEARNING ABOUT LEADERSHIP**

The notion of role modelling that assumes that individuals learn from their observations of people in particular roles and that the modelling is always of their positive attributes is problematised when considered from a poststructuralist perspective. Some of the men, however, as was seen in the previous chapter, thought of

\textsuperscript{32} The vagueness implied by the use of the term “Asian-Australian” is intentional in this instance, though I hope this does not cause offence to persons from particular Asian cultures. Whereas the use of this ‘portmanteau term’ (Lo, Khoo & Gilbert 2000) can act to unite individuals of various Asian ethnicities, I am using it here to mask Ian’s specific ethnic background and to avoid speculation as to his real identity.
themselves as being role models. Some of them, in turn, benefited from being able to model their leadership on other academic leaders they admired:

*I’ve seen people work like that and just thought ‘Well, that’s a nice way to work.’ Like, when I first went to [another university], Simon … he always had time – always had time to sit down with me and took me under his wing. You know we’d go out and a few of us would go to the staffroom at lunchtime and have a two hour lunch and have a couple of bottles of wine and, you know, that stuff. Simon always gave me the idea of, you know, the Oxford or Cambridge Don, sitting with a pipe beside the fire chatting over issues. You know he always gave me that impression. Now I really like that … (Daniel).*

Role modelling can also work in the opposite way, and here, a number of the men cited leaders that they did not want to be like:

*I was here eight years before I had any responsibilities. In my early years, we were a much more god-professor type department, where we did have departmental meetings but people who had different opinions were slyly and brutally slapped down. So, I had years to think about these things and also to think, if I may say so, how to do it wrong, before I was given some chance to do it right (Charlie);*

*I mean, my whole style is, and it’s really interesting because as you reflect on things that you do and don’t do, I always remember a particular, he was a professor and a head of another … department and he’d be talking to you, but he’d be looking around you to see if someone more important to talk to. And I*
Inasmuch as Daniel was able to name two people whom he considered great, this is unusual, says Sinclair (2002), for she claims that most people find it difficult to nominate one or two great leaders for whom they have worked.

The hope expressed by Latemore and Callan (1998) that a leader '... stands upon the shoulders of their predecessors' (p. 76) would seem to be borne out in this instance, even though it is much more likely in Australia that the popular corporate role models are of the warrior-hero or sporting hero ilk (Latemore & Callan 1998; Sinclair 1998). Whilst displaying abilities that enabled them to survive in the higher education sector, the two people whom Daniel described to me appear to be ‘... able to demonstrate emotional intelligence as well as an ability to work in environments typified by rapid change and high pressure’ (Latemore & Callan 1998, p. 81). I do not find it problematic or contradictory that ‘the positives’ of the two people Daniel names include characteristics typically attributed to highly masculinised leadership, for I see this as being illustrative of the influence of the local and the contextual in how masculine and leadership identities are formed (see for instance Mac an Ghaill 1996).
The Value of Critical Reflection

Criticising the tacit understandings that inform particular practices, says Schon (1984), enables professionals to make new sense of their social contexts or to realise the uniqueness of their experiences. For some individuals, Schon argues, they might practise a ‘knowing-in-action’, that is, thinking about what they are doing whilst they are doing it. For others, it may be more of a matter of reflecting on their practices whilst they are doing them: ‘reflection-in-practice’. Taking it further though, and undertaking ‘reflection-on-practice’, is one means of ascertaining one’s role in an organisation:

When a practitioner reflects in and on his [sic] practice, the possible objects of his reflection are as varied as the kinds of phenomena before him and the systems of knowing-in-practice which he brings to them. He may reflect on the tacit norms and applications which underlie a judgement, or on the strategies and theories implicit in a pattern of behaviour. He may reflect on the feeling for a situation which has led him to adopt a particular course of action, on the way in which he has framed the problem he is trying to solve, or on the role he has constructed for himself within a larger institutional context (Schon 1984, p. 62).

Reflection on its own is not enough, however, for professionals need to seek to understand how it is that they come to believe and act the way they do (Kellehear 1999). Knowing and doing potentially become reflections of one another (Connelly & Clandinin 1985), though it is not automatically the case that individuals are skilled enough to be able to reflect upon their experiences (Usher 1991). Smyth’s (2001, p. 191) framework for
action enables the individual to move from a description of the work they do, through to a reconstruction of how they might do things differently. The ability to function in a critically reflective way to get to this end-point, he says, is to link reflection with action in a more politically-informed way.

The act of critical reflection is not problem-free, for not only can it be a threat to the individual by confronting their underlying values and beliefs, but it can also be a threat to stability for those organisations that do not value reflective practice (Schon 1991). Although Blackmore and Sachs (2000) envision that leaders need to be able to function critically, which will ‘provide students with the capabilities of reflexivity and agency in postmodern times’ (p. 16), it seems that this may be contingent upon our higher education institutions letting them.

Having been considered as leaders for some time, most of the men were able to reflect on particular events, and that this reflection now influenced the way in which they handled situations:

But there’s also, you know, I was, I was being that sort of working class … boy … is really important to me. It’s that sense of, I don’t want to, the sense of, you know, ‘working class boy does good type thing’, or the principles of looking after the disadvantaged, if there’s such a thing in that sense, is important. I’m actually currently writing a book with my dad on his life as a riveter in a shipyard … and some of the work practices that went on there are just so inhumane it’s incredible, and so I want to make sure that those sorts of things don’t happen in the university setting (Daniel);
… it was probably an experience with my own PhD, where I was given a lot of space and it worked out quite well. And that’s where basically I learnt, as academics do, that’s where I learnt how to be a researcher and that’s the model that I pursue (Geoff);

Yes, I think I’ve always been fairly observant about other people. And self-reflective too, and much more critical of myself than perhaps a lot of other people would realise I would be. But I set myself fairly demanding standards and get disappointed if I don’t reach them. Particularly in relation to not expecting of people things that are unreasonable to expect of them, but also of being solicitous of their well-being when things aren’t going well (Ray);

Of course, my job requires me to think about relationships a lot (Charlie);

You know where you’re in that situation [of trying to resolve a conflict], and I can literally empathise with the contrasting positions and issues that are being faced, you know, whether it’s someone, you know, and I can feel real empathy. Now, on some occasions it’s actually because I’ve been there myself you know, on one of those particular poles, or whatever it is. I hope it’s not too polarised. And on other occasions it’s just because, oh yeah, I mean I do like to be able to think you know what it must be like to be in that situation you know. So that when I was teaching phys ed you know, my empathy wasn’t with the kids who were the good sportsmen, although that’s supposedly one of the failings of the profession you know. I would honestly feel, what
must it be like to be that kid who can’t do that, you know. What must it be like? I can’t imagine it because I’ve never experienced that (Wayne).

THEORISING ABOUT LEADERSHIP: NOT THEORISING LEADERSHIP

In 1995, Karpin, as chair of a review into Australia’s management capability, found, in part, that whereas most managers show some leadership skills, most leaders find themselves managing most of the time. He identified particular areas in which many Australian managers need to improve skills, including people skills; strategic skills; adopting an international orientation and entrepreneurship (Karpin 1995). This report prompted a flurry of activity, out of which grew the Front-line Management Initiative (Australian National Training Authority 1996)—a competency-based training program that aims to address the shortfalls of middle managers and front-line supervisors identified by Karpin. The FMI has had little impact in the higher education sector, mainly I would suspect, because of academics’ tendency to disregard competency-based training (Burns 1995), but also because leadership was being reduced to a compilation of arbitrarily-determined competencies.

The higher education sector has not been without management or leadership training of its own, yet much of it is carried out on an ad hoc basis. For Ray, he expressed one of his concerns about the training in the following statement:

Probably the training programs, I suppose, are theorising about rather than the theory of leadership (Ray).
And he added to this in a follow-up e-mail:

… because academics are, in general, intelligent, that they are more inclined to believe that they don’t need leaders than is typically the case elsewhere in society. Hence, they are more likely to be sceptical about the worth of theories of leadership and of adherence to such theories (Ray: follow-up e-mail).

Conceivably, as a result of the *ad hoc* nature of management and an almost global approach to leadership training, various populist approaches have been introduced, not all of which are welcomed into our universities. Consider the following comments—first from Ian, then from Martin:

What kind of lunacy is this? I don’t give a fuck what kind of academic model they’ve brought from what American university. I don’t care. It doesn’t sit right (Ian);

I get these bullshit messages from HR, most of which I can’t understand, all in sort of managerial terminology which may mean something to an American Vice-President, but is meaningless [here] (Martin).

Tom is also critical about how various influential institutions cling to things foreign, naming Covey’s contribution by way of example, which I thought was interesting given my own predilection towards his ideas in *First Things First: to Live, to Love, to Leave a Legacy* (Covey *et al.* 1994):

I have to say however that, once you got hold of the kind of ontology of human structure and agency then there is no, there is nothing new in thinking about leadership or in the Stephen Covey stuff, something like that, which the Victorian education system fits with anyway, you know, the principals’, the
Victorian Principals’ Centre, or something, seemed to become infatuated with. I look at that and I see, it’s a kind of a one side of working out of human agency. One side, in the sense that it makes all of its assumptions about the impact of the leader on the worker. I think that’s my response to thinking about leadership. That I’m, that the recent texts on leadership haven’t contributed much to my thinking at all. In fact, I find them frustrating, because the answer that I read in some of the practical stuff anyway, which hints at democracy, that you know the democratic process of leadership really doesn’t go there and perhaps I’ve got a closed mind about it (Tom).

This dependence upon “foreign” intelligence raises issues for some of the men in relation to the leadership epistemologies. Discourses exist globally and locally around numerous cultural and social practices (Blackmore 1999), but as Tom attests in the following comment, he is troubled by the normative aspects of the discourses and the power that is then conveyed to particular individuals who subscribe to these ways of thinking:

[… the notion of leadership doesn’t sit comfortably with me …

it’s not denying there is such a thing as leadership, but I think investing, using leadership as a normative concept, leaders should, or leadership should I think, yeah, I think that’s dangerous. We’ve just had a Prime Minister win an election on the basis of he’s going to offer strong leadership, you know. About what? Who’s he going to lead? Leadership, against what? How did, these questions aren’t asked and, you know, it’s got to be very sensitive about the fact that you know there is a whole political movement which nearly destroyed the world, which is based solely on the notion of strong leadership. You’ve certainly got to be suspicious of the term. It’s not to deny that it,
leadership isn’t a social practice and that there can be democratic forms of leadership. If we identify leadership as a social practice, then we identify that even a person who is silent is offering leadership. Answer my call to following, but that is leadership as a social practice I think. Like the old saying, I’ll do what the loudest do in a meeting, is just as powerful, I think, a form of leadership as the person who’s the loudest. So I think people who are in, if you like, positions of bureaucratic authority have a responsibility to enable a human agency in their colleagues. And I think my Head of School is, whether she believes it or not, whether she understands it or not, is, behaves that way in most of her work. I find that really congenial, most of the time (Tom).

The following comment made by Martin, whilst indicating self-directed readings in relation to learning about leadership, also alludes to the lack of theoretical underpinning associated with leadership:

*The peripheral reading has been sort of things like sociology, you know, bits and pieces on sociology. I remember reading some of the case studies that, quite a lot when I first got this job, that were coming out. Anthropology more than sociology, or maybe even social anthropology. You know, things like Becker’s Boys In White and trying to understand institutions, and that was essentially there because, you know, you start, as I did … the lowest of the low on the lecturer’s scale, and five or six years later you’re the Head of the Department. You wake up in the middle of the night thinking, shit, perhaps I ought to find out what Heads of Department are about, or what people think they’re about or… So, yeah, it’s been a very uninformed approach to management, and I mean theoretically uninformed (Martin).*
There was no confusion in the men’s eyes between management and leadership, with one of the men, Ian, going so far as to differentiate between administration, management and leadership (in ascending order of complexity).

As it eventuates, however, it is not only the absence of theoretical perspectives on leadership or the sources of those perspectives that has made the men disinclined to participate in leadership training. The following section explores some of the additional considerations, but again, not all the men’s comments have been included; only a few that typify the sentiments conveyed to me.

**THE TROUBLE WITH TRAINING**

**Fascinating ... but Not Fantastic**

Almost all of the men were sceptical about current and past leadership training activities and were either disinclined towards, or outright hostile to, the prospect of participating in them. Charlie, however, was one who found value in some of the initial training in which he participated as a Head of Department, but as can be seen from his comments, he’s not sure whether it should be called ‘training in leadership’ or training for managers:

> I don’t think we’d call it training in leadership at all. There were a number of training days and a couple of days away … that were for Heads that I participated in, and the one in [another city] which was for all what they would think of as middle managers, heads of school and also a bunch of people from administration and so forth, turned into a lot of information sessions about how the university works which people who were
more experienced than me found very boring and a little bit insulting, but I found fascinating because I didn’t know all this stuff. And there were some quite good, more active, training sessions in which each person would be asked to sketch out some kind of initiative they were thinking of pursuing and put it down in rough summary form, and the other people in the group, who were widely scattered around the university, would give advice on how they would handle this and what they thought the factors were. This I found fascinating (Charlie).

Ray and James participated in some training programs, and significantly, came to regard training programs as being platitudinous and trite:

Perhaps the only decent one of the training programs we ever did was one that I think was inspired by John Cleese-style managerial videos but actually was done by some people at [another university]. It was certainly not fantastic, but it was a good deal better than quite a lot of the other much more expensive stuff where people were brought in as consultants for ten grand a week or whatever, with all expenses paid and very little to say beyond platitudes and some trite remarks (Ray);

I did attend a two-day management training session while I was Head of Department, but I found it a waste of time as it dealt with very obvious things and was carried out in a trite manner. In my discussions with colleagues since then, management training here is still not regarded as being much better. Academics are highly trained and qualified people and yet we’re treated as though we know nothing! (James).
**Been There, Done That**

Typical of the comments that the men made about training—where they had participated in it, that is—was that it lacked relevance:

> Well, I’ve been, look the formal training I’ve had, I haven’t done any formal courses. I’ve got no qualifications in leadership. I did, I’ve been to three, or maybe four short courses, two day courses, that are meant to be so-called leadership training and I’ve been to one five day course, run by the AV-CC on leadership. None of which had the slightest benefit or impact on me whatsoever. I guess that I’ve learnt, I’ve read books on leadership, some of which have been helpful in terms of clarifying ideas, but I guess that I’ve spent a lot of time talking to people who are clearly successful leaders about how they do it … (Steve).

For Steve, although he had been to a spattering of Australian Vice Chancellors Committee leadership courses, they had no impact on him and he considers himself unqualified in the area. He does say, however, that he’s learnt more by self-directed means, such as reading, or from talking with others whom he considers to be successful leaders.

**Never Have, Never Will**

A few of the men, however, have never participated in training programs, as the comment from Martin illustrates:

> Never done a management course in my life, no, which is quite an interesting thing that, when you get people like me in academe, which is actually a different stage of academe I suspect, you know, responsible for budgets, well the Graduate Scheme is
$6 million, $6-7 million a year and its Faculties $7 million a year. The School's got a budget of $2.5 million a year, you know, and you're responsible for the lives of large numbers of people, large amounts of tax payer's dollars. I have never, ever been trained either in any other, you know, chemistry, a PhD in bio-chemistry, you know. You don't, there's no great train ... I've never received any training either in people, or financial management or administrative training ever in my life (Martin).

This is a strident statement from Martin, in which he acknowledges his responsibilities for the lives of people and for the disbursement of public funds. Yet, it is not as though he hasn't had opportunities to participate in courses. For Martin, similar to the statements made by Steve (above), he prefers to learn what he needs to know from his peers:

No, the courses that have been offered to me, come to think of it, have all been academic, and I suppose if I've picked up anything about management, it's been through the professionals, like for example, the Australian Association for the Directors of Graduate Studies, Deans and Directors, that's DOGS it's called ... But I, I suppose I've picked up quite a lot listening to other people. But it's all been by osmosis, I've never been on a formal course of either leadership or management ... (Martin).

The notion of learning about management and leadership by osmosis resonates with research conducted with women in or aspiring to leadership positions in schools, universities and TAFEs, which drew attention to the fact that

... women continue to move into leadership in middle and executive management more through accident than design, by
proven rather than potential performance. It was based on their substantive professional expertise as educators and also upon their emotional management work as change agents (Blackmore & Sachs 2000, pp. 2-3).

For the men in the current study, it would seem that few had received any formal training and that therefore, their potential as leaders was based on other criteria—presumably their professional expertise as educators being high on the list, if not their contribution as change agents.

Martin, Daniel, Geoff and Ewan, indicated that they had never been on a training course for leadership or management but that they had learnt aspects of leadership in different ways and as the need/s arose. Excerpts from Martin and Geoff are included here:

   I basically have no interest in it. I mean I, the only management that I’m interested in doing is that which my academic background and experience has equipped me to do and that’s basically all that I would want (Geoff).

In addition to being able to find the information from other sources, there is also the notion that the training is perceived to be irrelevant to (at least) Geoff’s academic interests. Wayne, in the following exchange, makes the same point, but it only became apparent after drawing his attention to a seeming contradiction:

   W: I’ve been invited to and I’ve not wanted to do them and I’ve successfully avoided them until this stage. And I think probably will continue to do so. So the short answer, no.

   K: Any particular reason why you’ve avoided doing it?
W: I support other people to do them. I just, yeah, it’s too process-oriented, too much discussion on process. I mean I, it’d be like going to a, you know, to me it’s like going to, you know, hear someone do a book reading and talk about the editing of the book, you know. You know, and how the chapters were put together and all those types of things and I, you know, it’d be the same thing. It just leaves me cold, you know, and sort of, and I’m not saying there’s not a lot to learn. Jeez, I’d have a helluva lot to learn, but in my particular case it just doesn’t turn me on at all.

K: Sitting here, it sounds interesting, like avoid—wanting to avoid that sort of process—but yet you seem quite happy to be part of the process of a lengthy decision making within your staff.

W: There’s a conflict.

K: I don’t know whether there’s a conflict but it almost sounds like a contradiction.

W: Yeah, yes I think it has the potential to be in that sense but the, getting better at what you do, and I’m always open to that. I mean, this ain’t rocket science. The level at which I manage a $3 million organisation is not rocket science. It is people relationships, it’s having the right people in the right jobs and if you haven’t got that it’s getting the people who are in those jobs to do the best they can, and I think it’s really then a matter of, you know… I take that back. I suppose in some senses I have learnt about strategic planning and those types of issues you know that we’re now forced to deal with (inaudible) and quality
and all those things. And I think whilst you do those somewhat intuitively, you probably don’t do them in as structured a manner as you do them after a period of formal investigation of those things, you know. So I think, yeah, I’ve taken some of that stuff on board, but the way I’d like to do it is probably in a framework that, you know, I see is linked to the School. It’s not acontextual, or it’s not leadership per se (Wayne).

A perceived lack of relevance and contextualisation is again cited as a reason for not participating in leadership training, along with an implied criticism of the need to attend training that is delivered in a structured, pseudo-scientific manner.

**Ah, Psychology!**

Some of the men argued that existing leadership and managerial expertise in various sections of their universities was not called upon when it came to conducting training for other members of staff:

> I think you’d be better off hiring somebody from Education or somebody from Social Work or you know, or even Anthropology. Somebody from the Social Sciences for that kind of thing. But I think, again you know, that the people making the decisions … You know, you look at [Vice Chancellor and Deputy Vice Chancellor] … You know, they’re thinking, ‘Well, who should we be hiring?’ And they go the popular culture way: ‘Ah psychologists, they know!’ So, blah, blah, blah, blah. And I just think that’s a bad way to get out. But I haven’t, thank God, I haven’t been dragooned in to a leadership seminar or leadership short course, and I wouldn’t volunteer for such a thing. I’ve got
Ian’s point is not only that expertise from within his university is not used in professional development activities, but that there is a tendency at his university to place their faith in psychologists above all others. The purported rationalism—its a feature of masculinism—of psychological studies, is likely to have appeal to Ian’s managers (and others) because of the insights it is thought to offer into human nature. Although primarily of the ‘Win-Friends-and-Influence-People school’ psychology becomes ‘a handy tool for administrators’ (Waldo 1984, p. 27), with psychologists seen as technical problem solvers whose profession is underpinned by technical rationality (Schon 1991). By way of contrast—that is, the alternative to the major science-based professions:

... the minor professions suffer from shifting, ambiguous ends and from unstable institutional contexts of practice, and are therefore [original emphasis] unable to develop a base of systematic, scientific professional knowledge' (Schon 1991, p. 23).

---

33 The irony of reporting Ian’s comments about psychology have not escaped me, given my preference for partially relying on social psychology as a conceptual framework for this study. I took from Ian’s comments that he took exception to the use of psychology when it was used to the exclusion of all other disciplines, and therefore made it privileged.
The era of scientific management continues to occupy a strong place in at least some universities, although as far as Brotherton (1999) is concerned, social psychological research tends not to carry over to the human resource management field.

It is also worth dwelling on another of Ian’s comments about the use of psychologists in training courses, for in the following exchange he touches upon sexuality and the insights proffered by the psychologist who ran a training session he attended:

… I tend to avoid short courses because they’re run by psychologists. I’ve been unfortunately dragged in to short courses on Equal Opportunity where I’ve been lectured to by a psychologists about how cultures are very different and I remember this guy telling me, if I wanted to read and understand about gender studies, I could read Men Are From Mars and Women Are From Venus. He told us that some men touch other men’s legs and it’s not a sign of homosexuality and I just thought… It seems to me if you want some in-service training on social issues, particularly, cultural issues, you wouldn’t, just as an occupational issue, you wouldn’t hire a psychologist. But we consistently do that, and I think it’s an American thing, where psychologists know everything about everything (Ian).

**CHANGE, INSURGENCY AND RESPONDING CREATIVELY**

This chapter has been concerned with what the men said in relation to influences upon their leadership, and these comments ranged from statements about their growing up, the effect of having (or not) other men and/or women on whom to model their leadership,
as well as having an inclination towards reflecting upon, and theorising about, leadership. When it came to the influence of courses of training on their leadership, the men were largely scathing. Viewed from a social psychological perspective, the men, as evidenced by their comments, have formed particular attitudes to learning about being leaders. Their attitudes help them not only to voice their convictions, but they also affirm their significant relationships—to their colleagues and to their organisation—thereby performing a function that shores up their respective social identities (Smith & Mackie 1995).

Of the men who participated in courses, they described the courses as being patronising and trite, however the majority refused to participate in them for they saw such courses as not being relevant to them, or that the focus was reliant upon psychological novelties, which reflected a particular modernist—and masculinist—world view. The men’s concerns are reinforced when the current AV-CC offerings for 2003 are considered. From the AV-CC’s Staff Development and Training Programs on Academic Leadership, through to its Senior Leadership Program, the content is largely concerned with the discourses rejected by the men in this study as being irrelevant or concerned with various aspects of performance management, although only two of the seven facilitators are described as being psychologists (Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee 2003c; 2003e; 2003f; 2003d).

As part of its on-going study into occupational stress levels in Australian universities, the National Tertiary Education Union has declared that

There is clearly a mismatch between staff expectations of university leadership and the quality of leadership they perceive
is being provided. Effective leadership development is complex and first requires an understanding of what constitutes good leadership within each university, identifying the gaps between current and expected leadership practices, and then tailoring training and development to meet the identified needs. It is recommended that the processes guiding the selection, training and mentoring of academic staff for leadership positions be reviewed, along with the processes used for motivating, recognising, and rewarding good leadership practices (Winefield et al. 2002, p. 14).

This recommendation, if implemented, may well partly accommodate the reservations about leadership training expressed by the men. The recommendation characterises a bottom-up approach and in so doing, avoids the blind reproduction of the culture of leadership and management that sees a reliance on clinical psychology, foreign fads, and other compartmentalised facets of leadership. Given the criticisms about the lack of relevance and the shallowness of the training on offer, future leadership training could well benefit by focussing on the identified dimensions that comprise the teaching strategies known as Productive Pedagogies that have arisen from research conducted in Queensland (McCollow 2000), and which forms part of the New Basics Project. The four dimensions of Productive Pedagogies, are: Intellectual Quality, Relevance, Supportive Classroom Environment and Recognition of Difference (Gore, Griffiths & Ladwig 2002). If these were developed in conjunction with adult learning principles (after Knowles 1990), I would consider that much could be done to enhance leadership training in our universities.
For Fullan (1993), the fundamental dilemma faced by educational institutions in terms of change is the ever-expanding educational reform that occurs in settings that are fundamentally conservative. This, he says, results in a system that is more likely to retain the status quo than to change, for ‘when change is attempted under such circumstances it results in defensiveness, superficiality or at best short-lived pockets of success’ (p. 3). In situations in which change is only introduced in a top-down manner, power is utilised as the ultimate sanction. Employed in situations where quick responses and compliance are required, it has been observed in instances of curriculum change, for instance, that these power-coercive approaches are unlikely to change individuals’ perceptions, beliefs and practices (Print 1997). Another approach used in curriculum change is that of adopting re-educative strategies, which are underpinned by an assumption that people can be changed even though some resistance will be likely (Print 1997).

Fullan suggests that to understand and capitalise upon educational change, it is better and necessary to think of it as a series of overlapping and dynamically complex phenomena, rather than as a linear system. This new paradigm of change (Senge 1990 in Fullan 1993) involves, amongst other things, realising that the more complex the change, the less it can be forced, and that every person within the organisation should be viewed as a change agent as they participate in a combination of top-down and bottom-up strategies to bring about change.

One of the messages being conveyed by the universities to its more senior personnel, it seems, is that the knowledge of outsiders is more valued than the knowledge held by the personnel inside the
organisation. A combination of internal and external learning is considered one of the critical markers of success for a learning organisation (Senge 1990 in Fullan 1993), and therefore a reliance on externally-sourced expertise, particularly in a university environment bristling with expertise, is not only disempowering, it is also establishing externalised managerialist discourses as being the dominant discourses.

From the reactions of the men to the prospect of undertaking training, and again, this is only representing their truths, it would seem that universities are utilising a combination of re-educative and power-coercive strategies in the type and approach of management and leadership training offered. The men in the study are opposing the normative discourses, in the main, by refusing to participate in leadership and management training courses in their universities. This is one way of challenging cultural reproduction within their institutions.

The dominant leadership and management discourses, according to the comments made by some of the men, are seemingly related to an adherence to the values of scientific management embedded within a Human Resources Management (HRM) approach. Such an approach sees personnel trained to achieve the pursuits of the organisation and compartmentalises the tasks of managers, becoming ‘…the constraining and functionalist view of educational leadership, with its emphasis on administrative notions of

34 Cultural reproduction refers to the way social institutions perpetuate cultural norms—and their related social and economic inequalities, to the extent that such phenomena can be passed from one generation to the next (Giddens 1997).

Not only are these HRM approaches being enacted within universities, but also the masculinist foundations upon which scientific management is premised are offered as being hegemonic and normal. Questioning the normalised leadership practices by shunning leadership training means that the men are challenging the cultural reproduction of leadership and management in their institutions, along with all the inequalities that that entails. The men are using their respective individual positional power to introduce an insurgent discourse (Foucault 1974 in Foley 2000) that will influence the leadership of the universities. In essence, they are interrupting the legitimisation of power by questioning leadership practices and either introducing new leadership discourses or falling back upon more traditional ways of learning the craft of leadership. And it may just be, as Deem (1998) muses, that trying to change the performances and cultures of university managers may be an optimistic endeavour ‘… without also changing their gender and ethnic composition, selection procedures and training …’ (p. 67).

Notwithstanding the lessening of Commonwealth support for staff development (National Tertiary Education Union 2000), the way in which academics see themselves also has a bearing upon the type of training they will embrace. Academic identities, as suggested by McCollow and Lingard (1996) in their consideration of models of academic work, are being pressured towards becoming corporate professionals. The exclusionary academic *sui generis* role appears to have endured once more, for despite attempts to introduce what the men see as market-driven approaches to leadership, they have
opted to pursue curiosity-driven means to inform what it is that they think they need to know about being leaders in the current higher education environment.

But there does appear to be a difference in the expressions of contrariness described by the men. Whereas some of them oppose the managerialist approaches to leadership training in their institutions, by which I mean that they challenge the existing ground-rules; others actively resist the leadership discourse altogether, where resistance is taken to mean not only a rejection of the ground-rules, but an effort to alter the frameworks upon which ground rules have been established (Janks & Ivanic 1992 in Smyth 2001).

Viewed this way, the repressive nature of the training that the men have described includes its lack of relevance and the way it patronises the participants. Most of the men in this study have rejected this approach to training and have responded by pursuing creative modes of learning leadership. Watching other leaders, talking with them, pursuing literature of interest, and, as mentioned above, generating insurgent discourses are some of the creative ways that the men have responded.

This, then, leads to a consideration of the coping strategies that the men in the study use, which is the focus of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 8: COPING - WHEN IT DOESN’T ALWAYS LOOK LIKE IT

Up to this point, I have considered the influences upon the men, what it is that informs their leadership practices and how they say they enact being leaders. In this chapter I do two things: the first is to reflect upon the men’s comments about how they deal with being a leader, and these comments indicate the stresses that the men say they have experienced. The second thing is to consider these comments in relation to coping strategies. And perplexing as it can sometimes be, and therefore the title of this chapter, it is often the case that even though a person is coping, it doesn’t always appear to be so.

It has been revealed in an on-going study into the occupational stress amongst almost 9,000 Australian academics and general staff that they experience very high levels of strain in comparison with the general population (Winefield et al. 2002). Further, it was found that job satisfaction amongst academic staff was low, with more than half of the academics expressing dissatisfaction with particular aspects of their jobs, notably university management, hours of work, industrial relations, chance of promotion and rate of pay. Whereas more than half of the study’s participants reported feeling committed to their university, only a third reported a high level of involvement in their job, with most feeling pressured for time. Just over half of those surveyed reported a high level of conflict between work and home commitments, with Level D and E academics (which accounts for most of the men in this study) reporting doing an average of 55 to 56 hours of work per week. At most risk of high levels of strain and low levels of job satisfaction, however, were
academic staff involved in teaching, or research and teaching, middle-ranked academic staff, (that is, Level B and C academics), and academic staff from Humanities and Social Studies.

It was further reported in the NTEU study that the strongest predictors of psychological strain included job insecurity, work pressure, lower levels of autonomy and the demands of teaching and research, whilst the strongest predictors of job satisfaction included procedural fairness, trust in the Head of Department and higher levels of autonomy (Winefield et al. 2002). The strongest predictor of commitment to the university was trust in senior management. Academics at higher levels reported a greater commitment than those at lower levels, and it was speculated by the report’s authors that this may be a function of the relationship of commitment to reward structures and job satisfaction as well as higher levels of autonomy and a greater awareness of the functioning of their respective universities’ procedures. The implications arising from this study for the physical health of university staff include health symptoms, such as sleeping difficulties, headaches, viral and cold infections, as well as job performance issues.

**Coping as Leaders**

Numerous work-related events as named by the men, including activities arising from working performatively and dealing with intimidation, create stressful working environments, and reactions to the stresses can be manifested in many ways: physical, emotional, cognitive and/or behavioural.
During the discussions with the men, several of them, notably Ewan, Charlie, Tom, Martin and Wayne, told me how they had experienced periods of sleeplessness or of waking during the night during their most taxing periods as designated leader. James had this experience as well, combined with ‘heightened nervousness’ following a time when he went to the media with his concerns about how he and others at his university were being treated. Ray acknowledged that this was also a time when he felt depressed and that these were ‘probably times when I didn’t deal with it well’. Ian, too, told me about how he worried about things.

When individuals are in tune with their own emotions as well as being in tune with the emotions of others, this is thought of as demonstrating emotional intelligence (Giddens 1997), but when individuals are subject to environmental stresses such as those above, the events tax their resources, and have the potential to endanger their well-being (after Lazarus & Folkman 1984). Many of the symptoms of psychological stress described by the men, if left unmanaged, have the potential to have detrimental effects on physical health (Winefield et al. 2002).

**KEEPING THEMSELVES “TOGETHER”**

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) consider a variety of coping functions, that is, the purposes coping strategies serve, from a dynamic of problem-focused and emotion-focused forms of coping. These two parameters are not independent of each other, for it is possible that these functions can both impede and facilitate each other in the coping process. Whereas problem-focused coping strategies are likely to be employed when an individual considers that the
situation is amenable to change—problem-focused coping is also considered predictive of lower levels of occupational stress (Winefield et al. 2002). Emotion-focused coping strategies are more likely to be used when the individual considers that nothing can be done to modify harmful, threatening, or challenging environmental conditions (Lazarus & Folkman 1984). The availability of resources that may be harnessed, including the individual’s social supports, will affect the outcome of the coping strategies that are employed, thereby making coping very much socially determined.

I begin this section by considering a selection of comments that seem to typify problem-focused coping strategies that the men have named, before considering comments that typify emotion-focused coping strategies. Sometimes, individuals might try both types of coping at once (Smith & Mackie 1995) in what I have termed mixed-strategy coping, for several of the men articulated problem-focused strategies that they were using simultaneously to influence their, and others’, emotional responses. In the comments that the men made, there seemed to be a demarcation between those who were not conscious of the approaches they had taken, and those who said they had given it some thought—examples of the automatic fight or flight responses, versus considered responses, perhaps.

**TACKLING PROBLEMS**

As indicated previously, problem-focused coping is where an attempt is made to manage or alter the stressful environment. The following excerpts typify many of the things that the men said that they employed in order to better manage the stressors that they,
and their work colleagues, were experiencing. They have been broken into sub-sections, the first of which, ironically enough, is the relief several of the men expressed when able to do the job for which they were appointed—that is, teaching and research.

**Doing the Job**

The fact that academics have diminishing control over much of their own scholarship (see, for instance, Tierney 1998) combined with the increase in teaching-related activities at the expense of research and the need to attract more external funding (Winefield *et al*. 2002), means that many of their academic pursuits suffer because of the administrative requirements of being a designated leader. Charlie sums up this dilemma:

> The other thing that is, I think, relevant to this kind of situation for academics, you have to make personal decisions as to how much of your academic career you can continue. When I was Head I really put research on hold to a very undesirable degree. I couldn’t really cope with the administrative stuff, the teaching and turning my mind to some intellectual problems I was working on (Charlie).

In the following comments the tasks of teaching and research, when they are possible to do, variously become sources of relief and enjoyment—antidotes to stress. As Ewan intimates, though, it is not only enjoyable, but ‘it’s something worth doing’, a broadside against what he sees as the thankless time and labour-intensive tasks of administration and management.
I suppose the other thing is that teaching itself is in certain ways a relief from a lot of the administrative and other troubles (Charlie);

I learnt the hard way to manage time, which was a shame. I learnt the hard way to understand budgets, which was a shame, and the other side to the job, I actually enjoy teaching. I enjoy my PhD students. I actually enjoy the, and I’ve gotta give it, you know, I’ve given, I gave six lectures within the first semester. Eight lectures in the first semester. That was all the teaching I did, but it was lovely, I really enjoyed it. It was great fun and I hadn’t done that for years. So, yes, I actually enjoy the teaching side and I don’t find that stressful (Martin);

… I’ve always maintained a big teaching load … it’s one way of dealing with stress. I don’t find teaching stressful. I enjoy teaching and get a buzz out of it. It won’t make me tired, because it’s something worth doing […] I love doing research (Ewan).

In addition to making time or seizing the opportunity to undertake non-stressful tasks, one of the common responses made by the men when describing how they confronted the problems in their workplaces, was to outline how they prioritised the many competing demands before them. This, then, becomes the focus of the following section.
Prioritising

The typical expectation when events are prioritised is that all tasks will be considered and treated in some sort of hierarchical order in terms of a combination of urgency and importance (Covey et al. 1994). The majority of the men revealed, however, that this was not always the case, and that certain things were simply not possible to deal with; things that had to be let go of:

Um, well, it’s matter of sort of constant prioritising, various things, and there are some things that I’ve just let go, I mean, it’s just not possible to do everything when it has to be done. So, there are some things that I do let go (Geoff);

Right at the bottom of my list of things to do is fill the forms out right, because there are other people who do that better than I do. Plus I don’t give a shit, which doesn’t help! So, you see, I have my priorities as well (Martin).

Here, I’ve deliberately stayed away from all meetings, apart from meetings that I initiate which always tend to be over coffee or lunch, like very informal, more civilised, yes. That’s one thing. Deliberately, deliberate strategy (Daniel);

If it’s humanly impossible, I’ll just say I can’t do something and people have to live with that (Tom).

Whereas in this comment Tom indicates that there are some things that are impossible to complete and that other people will just ‘have to live with that’, and that Daniel has a choice about attendance at
meetings, this may reflect the privileges and the discretionary time associated with being at more senior academic levels.

For Tom though, he is troubled about the cost to human relationships that can occur as a consequence, as is shown in the following excerpt. And although Tom doesn’t like what happens to his interpersonal relationships, it is unclear of the outcome to his approach to problem-focused coping. It appears as though he is not free of internal turmoil, but he has to live with the situation:

*No, deadlines, deadlines cause a concentration on so many levels. You know, you’ve got to concentrate on what’s in your, you know, if you’ve got a task to complete it means you’ve got to exclude others, but I suppose that’s what concentration means, isn’t it? You’ve got to focus on one thing, exclude others, which could be personal relationships, other people’s needs. Yeah, those denials of personal interest and that’s all very hard. And I don’t like doing it any more (Tom).*

Tom’s dilemma is a good example of where a problem-focused coping strategy has been employed, but it hasn’t had the effect of removing the stressor for him. In a later section I consider the role of emotion-focused coping as a means of coping with the impact of his persistent stressors.

**E-mail Communication**

The ‘advent of serious e-mail’, as Charlie puts it, can be seen as both a stressor as well as being used as a means of coping. On one hand, the technology offers opportunities for discussion and quick dissemination of information; on the other, the volume of
information that people need to process can itself become stressful—not to mention the complex matters that can be unexpectedly transmitted via an e-mail.

Historically all this was coinciding with the advent of serious e-mail so we would be doing a lot of e-mailing, I as Head was sending out a lot of e-mails, saying this is what’s happened, these are the options that seem to be facing us now, you know. We’ll talk about this in a meeting but do you want to comment. And sometimes, almost twice a week, sending out something like an e-mail newsletter saying, what’s going on now. All that amounts to a more intense version of the consensus style … (Charlie);

… we actually talk a lot about things on the e-mail, and people start discussion there (Daniel).

The use of e-mail communication as a coping strategy is problematic, for even though it can give the appearance of being inclusive and provide opportunities for individuals to vent their points of view, it can mask limiting aspects such as technical prowess, mis-communication and a diminished sense of ownership of the tasks at hand (Tolmie & Boyle 2000; Tsui 2001; van Braak 2001).35

35 Issues associated with computer-mediated communication are dealt with more fully in Part D of this folio.
Crash or Crash Through

The final category of responses within the problem-focused strategies evidenced in the men’s comments is one that suggests that persistence will pay off, or as Smith and Mackie (1995) express it, attacking the threat head-on:

So, I really like, I really like to work hard to keep up with the work. So, for example, in a case like that, if I had a lot of work to do, I’d simply work Saturdays and Sundays and I always work about twelve hours a day anyway. I’d work Saturdays and Sundays until I got to the stage where I could live my life on an even keel (Steve);

But I think, boundary line, that’s a sporting metaphor isn’t it. Being able to say “No” I’m not there now, I’m here, this is what I’m doing. It’s not to say, you know, if I’ve got things on my mind, it pisses me off that I woke up at 3.30 in the morning and go ‘bing’ and be sitting there wide awake thinking, and I mean I just laugh at that, you know. I mean how marvellous this bloody thing is. I mean and what that creates an issue, get up and solve them now. Don’t frig around. If you don’t deal with it now, this is on your mind for a fortnight, you know. Get up and do it, and I do (Wayne);

Look, the way to survive in a modern university is to regard the working week as a minimum of fifty hours and you know in a reasonably you know, a week of little work, and to add time on as necessary. So, a typical working week is six days, typical, with many nights. So you just pop off television watching. That’s how you cope. In a practical sense, you get the job done … I cope by adding, by denying pleasure, for example.
That’s one way of coping with your work and hoping that the denial of pleasure now will lead at some stage to the pleasure of success later on. It frequently does! (Tom).

The three men whose comments have been used here have acknowledged the enormity of the tasks before them, but in order to cope with them, on this occasion at least, they tackle them squarely in the expectation that work done now will mean opportunities for ‘pleasure’, or a more normal existence, ‘an even keel’, later on. Of course, such linear thinking in the current university environment may be nothing more than a flight of fancy, as individuals adopting this approach find themselves lurching from one episode to the next. The concept of pleasure may be illusory.

**TACKLING EMOTIONS**

Emotion-focused coping is concerned with attempting to regulate emotional responses to perceived harmful, threatening, or challenging environmental conditions. I am calling upon the concept of emotional intelligence advanced by Salovey (1990 in Goleman 1995) along with the concepts of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence (Gardner 1993 in Giddens 1997) to further explore the men’s experiences of emotional coping.

---

36 Emotional intelligence means not only knowing and managing one’s own emotions, but being able to recognise emotions in others and to build relationships accordingly — akin to the emotional management work alluded to by Blackmore and Sachs (2000) in their study of women either in, or aspiring towards, leadership positions in educational settings.
Exercising Intrapersonal Intelligence

According to Gardner (1993 in Giddens 1997), intrapersonal intelligence is required to enable individuals to function effectively in life, and for this to happen, individuals need to be able to form accurate, truthful models of themselves, although, yet again, the matter of truth becomes problematic.

One of the ways in which the men in the study revealed that they utilised intrapersonal intelligence was their preparedness for self-reflection. In so doing they were potentially able to develop a sense of agency, that is, using their critical self-reflection to make a difference by discovering their inner feelings of power (Brookfield 1995) and then acting upon them. The following comments depict inner conflicts and rationalisations, yet several of them also convey a sense of determination:

… I would regard myself very badly if I were cowered in to saying nothing or doing nothing just because I thought other people wouldn’t be happy about my saying or doing something. If I believe that it’s right to do it, I’ll do it … Well, integrity matters to me (Ray);

You know, I know how I like to be treated, you know. I’m not unintelligent, I’m not without feeling. I have a bit of character. All I ask is that I’m treated like I’m not a criminal or that I’m mad. That’s all (Ian);

It really is a sense of when I go to work, when I’m at work, which is not always at work, often at home, that I’m working to the limits of my own personal understanding and certainly my physical abilities, to achieve things (Tom);
But I do reflect upon a lot of my experiences, you know, and I think maybe that is related, you know … So I honestly do believe that in my case as a sweep, you know, as a generalisation, it’s something that’s inwards and outwards and I have no conscious effort, other than trying to do the best I can in the circumstances I find myself you know (Wayne).

Avoidance and Withdrawal

Another suite of strategies used by the men in situations that did not seem to be able to be resolved by problem-focused coping strategies involved either avoiding the situation altogether, or withdrawing themselves from it. When an individual realises that achieving a particular goal is unattainable, adaptive coping is a recognised strategy for knowing when to stop trying (Lazarus & Folkman 1984):

The, I guess it was sort of, holding your breath and wait for it all to go away was the one way of coping (Ewan);

I think my mates, one of my students pointed this out to me actually is that my main strategy is one of withdrawal. If I think a manger’s a dickhead then I’ll withdraw from being involved with that person and if it means being withdrawn, being seen to be a horrible co-ordinator, then so be it … So I think my main strategy is one to withdraw, withdraw and the way that I rationalise that is, they’re missing out. I feel as if I’ve got a lot of skills and if they can’t appreciate those skills then it’s them that’s missing out, not me. Again, that might be seen by some as self-aggrandisement or being up myself, but that’s my preservation; that’s the way I think (Daniel);
I haven’t consciously, let me say I don’t consciously see myself as a leader and I don’t consciously think about self-care ... And I’ve survived, and I do that because there’s a sharp division between my work life and my home life. But, that’s easy for someone with an [Asian] background, because there’s always a sharp distinction between work and home. And as an Asian family I grew up with my, in my household, there was a sharp division between public life and private life (Ian).

**Humour**

An outstanding feature of most of the discussions I had with the men was that of the use of humour. In my reflective research journal, I made note of the humorous nature of several of the discussions of the men, particularly those with Ewan, Daniel, Charlie, Martin and Wayne. In Wayne’s instance, as a result of the humorous anecdotes he was sharing with me, I specifically asked him about his use of humour, to which he replied:

*I’m clever enough never to let it hinder! So I only use it when it can help I mean, you know, humour can be you know a bastion of abuse and a refuge for racism, and all types of isms, you know. But I mean I think it also has the capacity to get people to reflect. I mean I use it in a reflective way upon experiences and, you know, well this is what’s happened to me, you know. I’ve only seen it this way you know. To give a particular view that doesn’t diminish me or, and doesn’t diminish anyone else, but*

37 Ian’s ethnic background has been deliberately obscured here by the use of the word ‘Asian’, although I am aware of problems associated with the use of this generic term.
sort of sometimes sets a, puts it in a context, you know. And that’s the way I like to write as well and the poems I write and the stories I write about sport and that you know, I like to have in that context you know. So, that I think humour, as I said, I would never see it as a destructive, I only see it in a really constructive way and I only use it in a constructive way. But I do find humour comes through simply when I want it to you know. I’m not talking sort of joke humour, I’m talking, you know, situational humour (Wayne).

Wayne’s insistence that he only ever uses humour in a constructive manner, is one way in which he exercises interpersonal intelligence, yet some authors would question whether this is as straightforward as it seems. Skelton recounts the work of Kehily and Nayak (1997 in Skelton 2002) who argue that humour is a regulatory technique that structures the performance of masculine identities, ‘... making “humorous” comments consolidates heterosexual masculinities’38 (pp. 21-22). It is also speculated that on matters pertaining to gender when male teachers’ masculine identities are questioned—something that may result in feelings of anger, resentment or anxiety—a way of dealing with these feelings for some men is to subvert the serious and to “send up” the messages through the use of humour (Kenway 1995 in Skelton 2002).

38 On the basis of my own discussions with some gay men, I realise that they too will use humour and ‘put downs’ when matters such as gender are discussed. In this sense, I would therefore agree that humour can be seen as a means of consolidating masculine identities, but for homosexual and heterosexual men alike.
My sense of Wayne’s explanation of his use of humour is not that he is using it as a defensive strategy in relation to gender in this instance, but more as a way of dealing with sensitive matters in general (such as when dealing with the ‘isms’, as he calls them). A similar defensive phenomenon is observed with men in their grieving. Humour is sometimes used not only as a means of redirecting their grief, but also at a symbolic level to demonstrate to others (and themselves) that they are gaining mastery over a crisis (Doka & Martin 1998). In this sense, humour not only consolidates masculinity, but men’s sense of identity as well.

Fantasy

Of all the men in the study, Charlie was the only one to disclose elements of his sexual fantasies. Sinclair (1995) argues that theories of leadership have overlooked sexuality, which she says is surprising given that sexuality, because it combines conscious and unconscious elements of personal expression and identity, is pivotal to leadership. For Charlie, however, his violent sexual fantasies are a response to the real-life wrangling he has with others:

*I think it probably is a bit of an escape at times, yes. It’s an interesting question. I have a very active fantasy life and I often can observe, I could observe, in moments when you are tired and you’ve been in a situation of wrangling with people, where the fantasy comes in, just in the car on the way home. It would be quite violent; I mean violent words, violent actions you know, sometimes directed at some poor bugger who wasn’t driving fast enough. So, afterwards you think, my God, why am I thinking this? Well, that’s obvious. So those kinds of fantasies, violent sexual fantasies and so forth I think are almost like a calibration*
if someone could measure this stuff. They could see the ways in which you’re going (Charlie).

Although it is beyond the scope of this study to draw any conclusions on the basis of Charlie’s comment, it is noteworthy to include it, if for no other reason than to address Sinclair’s (2002) lament:

In leadership research there is rarely mention of sexualities or masculinities. How can people seriously research leadership without looking at desire and seduction? Leadership is romance and mystique, physical and visceral.

Judging by Charlie’s comment, it could also include symbolic violence.

**Exercising Interpersonal Intelligence**

Accompanying an individual’s ability to exercise intrapersonal intelligence, is the ability to exercise interpersonal intelligence, which Hatch and Gardner (1990 in Giddens 1997) consider entails being able to connect with the feelings and concerns of other people—sometimes considered to be collaboration. Whereas they speak of this being done with one’s work colleagues, I am mindful of Brookfield’s (1995) and Latemore and Callan’s (1998) suggestion that leaders learn much from other leaders, and to this end, I have selected some excerpts that show some of the men engaging interpersonally with their peers and their families.

*I appreciate the fact that they’re prepared to talk with me a lot. I get on very well with the other people who are in my position with other Schools … I get on very well with them, and if I was*
talking about stress associated with work I’d mainly use them as my sounding board (Steve);

I’ve got a couple of mates who work at other universities who are professorial and sometimes I will talk about some of my problems with them but they don’t know the staff involved … Yeah, they know the limit. They know the industry and the Unit, my work life and everything and they’ve been mates for over ten years, the two people in particular I’m thinking of. But I’ll only see them maybe once every sort of couple of months for lunch. We’ll deliberately target each other for lunch and then I’ll, it’s a two hour lunch where I can raise some of these concerns. Together we’ll come up with some idea of how I can deal with it (Ian).

The Family

One of the strong themes emerging from what the men disclosed to me was of the importance of their families to their well-being. In addition to things that they told me about the arrangements that they had come to with their partners for the running of their households, they made it very clear that their families played important roles, especially with regard to emotion-focused coping. From what the men told me, they claimed that they did not take their work problems home with them, which — somewhat surprisingly — would place them within the 5.9% of academics who report that they rarely or never take their work home with them (Winefield et al. 2002). Instead, they said, they looked to the family for problem-focused coping strategies, for it was nurturance and sharing of lives that they sought:
My wife and children are good for me—they acted as a corrective (James);

A funny one though isn’t it, cause there are these phases you’re going through in your family and home life, where the kids are growing up and doing the VCE or whatever, my wife’s had a number of changes of job and got out of teaching in to the private sector and so forth, so there’s a kind of involvement in the lives of the rest of the family where you come home and they’re going about whatever they’re going, and sometimes they’ve got an emergency and, you know, you’ve been, they’ve been telling you about that for half an hour before you even get in, what emergency you’ve got. And that can be very healthy, sometimes a little bit frustrating. You say, “What about me, I’m suffering, you know”. Then at other times, it takes you out of yourself a bit … that simple therapy of sort of tidying up a bit, that kind of thing, just making an elementary order in the place you live, that is important (Charlie);

I think the stress that I do have is when people do stress me out, but I make a point of reading at night for an hour, or spending an hour watching some idiocy on the television, or spending a bit of time with my kids. They’re thirty and twenty-nine now. But I think it’s all of those things that keep the balance that you need to do (Martin);

Well, I talk but I don’t tend to take all the problems of work home and talk about them. My wife is a high school teacher and she doesn’t want to hear about university politics all the time. We don’t talk about University politics much. If the issue is raised by someone she’ll talk about it. I don’t think it’s that
important to allow it to dominate the rest of one’s life … But, yeah surely, she’s got things that go on at school that are just as difficult to cope with as happen here (Ray);

No, I would tend to leave it at work. I sort of would never take my problems home, I don’t think, from work, you know. Maybe, I guess I would talk about what’s happening at work from the point of sharing our lives, but not from the point of sharing my difficulties (Steve).

Having family members as a sounding-board appears to be very important for the men, for the day-to-dayness of family life means that whilst their concerns could be acknowledged, they do not become a preoccupation. Sinclair (2002) argues that history, family and culture ought be acknowledged for their role in leaders’ strategic decision-making. From what the men revealed to me in our discussions about how they relied on their families, it is possible that there was an underlying gender symbolism associated with the type of support sought and provided. The nurturing provided by a female partner may be one of the ‘non-explicit meanings, unconscious fantasies and associations’ that contribute to gender symbolism (Alvesson & Billing 1997). The men’s families, whether consciously or not, appear to have helped the men normalise and reframe the events that they were experiencing by providing opportunities for emotional-focused coping strategies, and this, I would suggest, assisted the men in the study to pursue problem-focused coping strategies.

Problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping have a relationship with each other. Although I have concluded this section by suggesting that emotion-focused coping strategies
provided by the men’s families assisted them to develop problem-focused coping strategies, in the following sub-section I explore the converse of that situation; namely, where problem-focused strategies are used to develop emotion-focused strategies.

**TACKLING PROBLEMS AND EMOTIONS**

In recognition of the interaction of the problem and emotion-focused strategies I have introduced a third category, which I have called mixed-strategy coping. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) have indicated that problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies are not independent and it appears to me that for several of the men who were articulating problem-focused strategies, they were also using these strategies to influence their own (and others’) emotional responses. In the majority of the following excerpts it is possible to see how the men were attempting to establish strategies that would either buffer the impact of the stressors, and/or spread the emotional burden of negative impacts amongst work colleagues:

… you just ask people to do a bit more … But one thing I always say to people who complain about workloads – my answer is – I only accept complaints from people who’ve got a heavier load than me! I’ve always maintained a big teaching load (Ewan);

I’ve managed to go on leave after my couple of terms as Head of School came to an end. But that’s a good way to break … Then you have to turn a deaf ear to plaintive requests to consider going on committees when you come back (Ray);
If you make all the decisions, you’ll make the ones that please your bosses. If you come back to the staff and have a communal decision making process, they’ll make the decisions which services their lives and this School more, and bugger the consequences (Martin).

And an intentional lack of discretion seems to have been one way in which many of the men alerted their staff to decisions being made. This tactic also means that they become not the only ones making the decision:

And I suppose the other thing, Kim is, that we’ve talked about divided loyalties, but there’s an advantage in that because you can be saying, with some sincerity, “Look I’m only a messenger here. This is what these guys are gonna do to you and either we do it in some sort of way, or we make some sort of compromise, or they impose the whole bloody package on us”, and so on. “Don’t blame me for all this because it’s not actually coming from me and I think it’s a lot of rot too” (Charlie);

I probably don’t trust myself to my own judgement, so therefore I seek, I seek collaboration […] So, collaborative, yes by all means, as a protective mechanism for myself. And as this is the only way I could ever do anything, because it just doesn’t seem that you could move forward otherwise (Wayne).

One troubling aspect of some of these strategies is their potential for manipulation, and perhaps even exploitation. Collaborative decision making may be one way to share the burden of decision-making, just as it may be a genuine expression of democracy, but when information is ‘leaked’ to work colleagues, I suspect that this is one way in which other people can be used to assist in difficult
decision-making. But this tactic, along with the ‘don’t blame me I’m only the messenger’ tactic used by Charlie, seems to be one of a variety of mechanisms that some of the men have developed to protect themselves from criticism or anger coming from their work colleagues.

For some of the men, they created occasions at very stressful times for them and their staff to get together. These also acted as opportunities to establish and reinforce trusting relationships between staff members and also provided opportunities for enjoyable social interactions:

So that the e-mails and the committee meetings and the staff meeting were still the main formal ways of doing that, although kind of chatting with people, you know, it is important. And it’s difficult sometimes because you’re overworked and you can’t take lunch and things like that. I mean you’d have lunch at your desk so you’ve lost an opportunity to meet people. Or you think, ‘Shit I’ve been involved in this all day, I don’t want to go and meet my colleagues and get in to the mode of retelling it all to them’, you know. So it can be quite tough and I think for that reason you need to make a space like the ‘Happy Hour’ or, something that can lubricate your way into that sort of informal contact (Charlie);

But, of course, you mustn’t get into a situation where you’ve got your group of friends – which of course I have got, the guys I have lunch with that are separate from the others -and other people then feel left out. I mean, I think they probably did from time to time, but you’ve got to have some general way of communicating with everybody so that people don’t get this sense of, he’s got his little bunch of cronies, you know (Charlie);
I just bumped into people around the place and they would shoot the breeze (James);

… the culture of our common room; people still got together for morning tea, lunch and the like, and talked. They kept alive communication with each other, didn’t stay in their rooms. They were encouraged to do that and it was an effective way of maintaining good morale (Ray);

It wasn’t a point of camping out there, catching any passing traffic [in the common room]. Basically, I would deliberately have lunch at the same time as other people did so there was opportunity for them to find out what was going on. It was a good way of informally keeping people up to speed on what was happening in the University in addition to using the e-mail system within the School and regular School meetings to involve people in discussions and debate about what was happening (Ray);

I have staff meetings when I, about once every six weeks, where we formally talk about what’s going on. But anybody who is here, every day, we go to lunch together, so whoever is here…’You’re free?’ Yeah, we just go, we normally just go with each other so, I talk to my staff every day I’m here because we’re always lunching together (Ian).
BRINGING ABOUT CHANGE

Throughout this chapter I have been mindful of the question posed by Covey et al.—the irony of the words coming from authors criticised by one of the men not having escaped me:

How many people on their deathbed wish that they’d spent more time at the office? (Covey et al. 1994, p. 17)

In addition to its catchiness, the question surely poses a conundrum for many of the men in the study—not to mention the rest of us! Whereas some of the men, such as Martin, Daniel and Charlie, take the stance that you can only do what is humanly possible and that it is alright to let some things fall by the wayside, for others, notably Steve and Tom, there is a sense that hard work now will yield pleasure later on.

Considering the role of gender in the coping strategies adopted by the men, from what they told me, it appears that they use a variety of strategies, some of which contravene the ‘feeling rules’—the cultural norms that prescribe behaviour and feelings (described, for instance by Doka & Martin 1998; Staudacher 1991). Whereas their approaches to coping see them use some problem-focused strategies, strategies that could be seen as being rational responses to the stressors being experienced, they also created opportunities where it was possible to emote more openly, to express their anxieties and to expect and accept help from others. Talking with family members and talking with colleagues in other departments or at other universities at similar levels of seniority were ways in which some the men exercised emotional intelligence. In this regard they were utilising coping strategies that involved interaction—
characteristically seen as a feminine approach to coping (after Golden & Miller 1998)—other times, such as when they opted to try to work their way through the work, using action-oriented approaches that saw some of the men spending enormous amounts of time alone to do so. The fact that numerous strategies are employed by the men in the study supports the view that the men are using both masculine and feminine modes of coping (consistent with the views of Golden 1996; Golden & Miller 1998). Yet, it could also be seen by outsiders, such as Steve’s friend, that this way of functioning is what makes ‘academic wusses’.

The intra and interpersonal intelligences that the men practise, as well as their preparedness to utilise a range of coping strategies go beyond the ‘feeling rules’ that our society has established (Staudacher 1991). When individuals take the initiative and combine intrapersonal and interpersonal learning, this is seen as an integral strategy for system change (Fullan 1993). It would seem therefore that those men who are able to utilise both their intra and interpersonal intelligences—such as Ian, Charlie, Martin, Ray and Tom—are not only coping, but are well-placed to introduce agency into their workplaces by consciously challenging the status quo, utilising resistance, collaboration or transformation as strategies (Goode & Bagilhole 1998).

To say that each of us copes with different situations in different ways is something of an understatement. Yet, coping with stressful events by tackling problems alone does not appear to be the most likely way of exercising transformational leadership.
If male leaders are to make a difference in universities by challenging the discourses of masculinist politics, then those who are able to employ emotional intelligence in their interactions with others, as well as being able to incorporate gender into their own discourses, would seem well-placed to envisage and pursue socially-just outcomes—in other words, exercise agency.
CHAPTER 9: DRAWING THE STORYLINES TOGETHER

CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

What it is that some of the men say that they are doing has particular resonance to the concept of transformational leadership—or, at least, the interpretation proffered by Gurr (1996 in Collard 1997a). This interpretation has transformational leadership as a participative and collaborative enterprise in which both the leader and followers together take an active role in change processes and which is necessarily concerned with higher-order, intrinsic and moral motives (Sergiovanni 2000). The transformational leader in the current higher education climate is still able to provide interpersonal support, despite the challenges and difficulties posed by new managerialism. Transformational leaders are able to utilise their intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences together with their teams, which enables them to embark on processes of social action. Leadership, then, becomes much more than just a matter of style, technique or a set of tactics to manage change. It is, as Blackmore (1999) argues, an approach that values certain ways of working as well as the social relationships that underpin them.

Many of the insights that I gained from the men were predicted by and predicated upon the literature that I had consulted. Initially, I had thought that all of the men seemed to “fit” the criteria of collaboration that I had established, though on closer examination, I realised that some of the men, more obviously Steve and Wayne, seem to have been using collaboration as a means of justifying their
own actions rather than recognising the social relationships and input of others to bring about change. I did, however, see evidence that most of the men were practising alternative ways of being leaders by injecting an insurgent streak into the cultures of their organisations.

The men in this study come across as being a resilient lot. The life stories that they have told me include anecdotes about the difficulties and the joys that they experience in their jobs—dynamic jobs in response to the many changes happening in our universities. Some of these changes, as documented in the literature review of this dissertation, and attested by the men in the study, include a new managerialist culture and the material conditions of their work that brings with them commercial pressures and expectations of performativity.

But this has not been a singularly negative experience. As difficult as it has been for some of the men—to wit, the intimidation and ostracisation that some of them have experienced—the way in which new managerialism has swept through our universities has had the effect of interrupting comfortable old ways. Organisational cultures have been disturbed and many academics previously privileged have had the taken-for-granted nature of their privilege questioned, principally by feminist scholars who have been instrumental in critiquing the new managerialism experience.

The men have told of a distrust of senior management and have argued that leadership in their universities has suffered due to a shift in emphasis from scholarship to managerialism. The managerialist terminology that has accompanied this shift is largely
alien to the academics in this study, and although they realise that it is symptomatic of a shift to new managerialism and have developed ways to work within it, they see it as being meaningless and irrelevant.

What is particularly disturbing to some of the men in the study, and which has come about as a result of shifts in power from collegial models of decision-making to a managerialist approach, is the adoption of bullying, intimidation and harassment tactics. Whereas these tactics may have an historical precedent from the times of the god-professor, the fact that they persist is damning for universities that espouse socially just outcomes and promise workplaces free of harassment and discrimination. That bullying and intimidation continue to occur has implications for employers and employees alike, for both groups have responsibilities to ensure that breaches of occupational health and safety, such as is the case with bullying, are not permitted to continue. For their part, employers must work to ensure as far as practicable that bullying and workplace violence are reduced, and for employees, to take responsibility for their own health and safety as well as that of their work colleagues. By requiring senior management—occasionally the perpetrators—to increase awareness and to develop strategies to reduce bullying and intimidation in their organisations is one way in which the Victorian Government (WorkSafe Victoria 2003), as an example, is able to have management confront the issues.

Surviving in this sort of environment can come at a cost, especially when individuals find themselves sacrificing some of their own values for the sake of maintaining their job, the ‘modern madness’ phenomenon referred to by LaBier (1986). Individual identities are
challenged by such occurrences, and I have illustrated how several of the men in this study adopted socially active responses ‘to penetrate the object of their struggles’ (Smyth 2001). The men explained how they were socially active by creating and following sets of principles to guide their actions and by also utilising collaborative processes to do such things as disseminate information and to make decisions. This, however, is not always a straightforward process, nor is it a silver bullet, with a number of the men conceding that they sometimes used collaborative processes as means of protecting themselves. Achieving transformational leadership is more likely to occur if it is purposeful rather than prescribed and if it is motivated by more than ‘impression management’ (Grimmet 1990, p. 2).

There is also some evidence that feminism, whilst contributing significantly in increasing understandings about how power is used in our universities, is something about which several of the men are fearful. Drawing upon stereotypes of radical feminism, some of the men expressed a disinclination or inability to move beyond a theorising of what feminism might mean. Whereas several of the men indicated that they would side-step the issue, it is interesting to observe by way of contrast how it is that many women approach the situation in which stereotypical images of hegemonic masculinity are presented—they develop strategic approaches, not the avoidance strategies that some of the men seem to be adopting. Just as avoidance is one discourse, other discourses exist, especially in relation to gender. Not talking about gender, for instance, is one way in which social relationships within given contexts control the importance of the issue. Clearly, trying to include gender into the discourses of academics is unlikely to be an easy task.
The study provided an opportunity for me to ponder how it was that the men in the study learnt to become leaders. For a small number, they spoke of their families and their school experiences, yet for most, they were largely ignorant about what was involved in being a leader. The effect of modelling themselves on the positive characteristics that they saw in leaders they admired, as well as rejecting the things that they did not like in the same or different people, seems to have been a common strategy. Similarly, most of the men took advantage of opportunities to talk with other leaders—many of them women—and to pursue their own journeys of self-discovery through reading literature that they felt was pertinent to what they needed to know.

With only one or two exceptions, the men spoke unfavourably about the leadership training that had been made available to them, dismissing it as being trite, patronising and/or irrelevant. Particularly galling, it seems, were training activities that reflected scientific management approaches and which featured dubious claims of objectivity, research and ‘facts’—psychology was named as a case in point, which is something that I found ironic given my preparedness to better understand individuals’ social behaviour by drawing upon insights from the field of social psychology. The out-take of these activities however, is not entirely negative, for the men’s rejection of these activities has been replaced by different strategies, and a new and challenging discourse appears to be evolving that can be seen as an insurgent response to the questionable leadership discourses currently being canvassed. Scope exists, however, for more cogent approaches to leadership training. The four dimensions of the Productive Pedagogies framework could provide an accessible framework to achieve this,
most notably, by developing the dimensions of ‘Recognition of Difference’ and ‘Relevance’ in conjunction with academic leaders, and by ensuring that what they already know about leadership is acknowledged and built upon.

The stated preference for universities to bring in external expertise was particularly exasperating to most of the men, especially when this was combined with the above characteristics, that is, triteness, irrelevance and questionable ideology. At the core of this concern, it seems, is that leadership training becomes yet another way to undervalue the academic *sui generis*, supporting in its stead different ways of being an academic, such as the market-driven or corporate versions (McCollow & Lingard 1996).

The second-last chapter of the dissertation has concerned itself with the coping strategies that the men said they used. The men did not particularly dwell on the various self-care activities in which they engaged, but they were much more expansive about how they coped. Three groupings of coping strategies were used to discuss the approaches the men took, which saw different combinations of problem-focused coping, such as doing the job they were employed to do, prioritising events or crashing through; and emotion-focused coping, which included instances of utilising intrapersonal intelligence and interpersonal intelligence. The third category was that of mixed-strategy coping, which I saw as methods used by the men to use a problem-focused strategy to lead to an emotion-focused strategy.
The men said they used a variety of approaches to deal with the stressors that their environments created for them, and it appears that these approaches challenged many of the so-called rules that are meant to govern masculine behaviour patterns. This challenging of the rules—or agency—I suggest, is enhanced and enabled by the men who are able to integrate both their intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences in a way that fosters learning for everyone in their team. Others, then, are able to become change agents ‘capable of working on their own sense of purpose, through inquiry, competence building, and collaboration’ (Fullan 1993, p. 127).

The men, not unsurprisingly, expressed a number of ways of being male. The masculinities that they were expressing were portrayed by the men as being their usual ways of behaving—not them being “different” as I had initially contemplated. In some instances this involved concentrating on relationship-building with their work colleagues, at other times it saw the men working alone. By being able to function in different ways in different situations reflected a strategic approach to their leadership practices, something that Blackmore (1999) refers to as strategic masculinity. I am left wondering whether women would have access to the same range of behaviours, or whether it is related to discretionary privilege, which most males are able to access. While the men in the study might have been able to challenge the malestream, they can still benefit from being male. They are therefore able to be strategic by employing their male privilege to bring about change.
One of the areas for alliance building that could occur between men such as those with whom I spoke, and others concerned with social change in our universities, is in the area of developing common discourses of social action. Yet, it is important that men such as the transformational leaders in the study do not colonise the territory, but that they work alongside feminists to ensure that socially just change results. Feminists have made progress in their critiques of organisational cultures, and most of the men in this study seem to be concerned with the same pursuit, although not always consciously engaging in feminist discourse/s to do so. But while men are fearful or ignorant of stereotypical discourses of feminism(s) and feminists, such as seemed to be the case with several of the men in this study, any alliance will founder because of a lack of moral cohesion and trust. An implication of this observation is that it will take a particular form of alliance before change might occur: feminists may need to recast their messages in a way that is clearly different to the anti-male messages of the past, and socially concerned men will need to be more open to receiving these messages.

Several years ago Blackmore (1999) suggested that one way for feminists to move forward with profeminist men would be to help these men see what could be gained by adopting feminist principles. Another way she suggested would be for feminists to gain a better understanding of men’s resistance to change. What this current research can add to these suggestions is that it is much more than repackaging old messages, for if men are fearful of feminism then it is unlikely that they would be readily convinced to adopt feminists’ concerns and philosophies. And it appears that it is a fear of feminism(s) itself that is at the heart of the issue—the
uncertainties about what a shift in power and privilege might mean for men, complicated by feelings of guilt for things they do not totally understand.

The idea of alliance-building is not a new one (see for instance Connell 1995), but using the insights gained from this research, it would seem that it could well be possible to harness pre-existing associations between academics and, in so doing, reframe the approach to leadership in Australian universities. Alliances already exist, for what this research has shown is that most of the men have strong professional relationships with women—most of whom are regarded as feminists—despite the fact that the men do not always feel comfortable with various feminisms.

In addition to broader policy implications for the development of leadership and management development in Australian universities, consideration could be given by the National Tertiary Education Union and the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee to jointly sponsor the development of Leadership Colloquia—either ‘real’ or ‘virtual’—in, and across, universities. This could be seen as an enhancement of the existing roles of the NTEU and the AV-CC. The NTEU already sponsors several interest groups, such as the Women’s Action Committee, a National Indigenous Caucus and Queer Unionists in Tertiary Education (National Tertiary Education Union 2003d), so (co)sponsoring a Leadership Colloquia could be one way for the Union to demonstrate its commitment to improving the quality and recognition of leaders in Australian universities. For its part, the AV-CC could expand its view of what is required of its universities’ leaders. Rather than a managerialist discourse being the sole discourse that appears to be supported by
the organisation (reflected in Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee 2003c; 2003e; 2003f; 2003d), a number of currently disenfranchised leaders who do not relate to this discourse of leadership could have their efforts recognised by the AV-CC acknowledging that there are a variety of ways in which academic work and academic leadership can be expressed.

Leadership Colloquia could achieve several things, amongst them recognition that there are different models of academic work and that academics’ identities can include versions that are not necessarily motivated by market-driven approaches (after McCollow & Lingard 1996). It could also provide opportunities for existing, experienced leaders to name their leadership practices and to begin a process by which ‘home-grown’ (that is, Australian) initiatives could be explored. The suggestion also incorporates the desirability of providing space for academics to critically reflect upon their leadership; to consider and to critique their own and others’ practices, thereby extending the emotional intelligence of the participants. And capitalising upon the way in which the men in the study said they learnt about leadership, Leadership Colloquia would provide opportunities for academics to act as mentors, which would be one way of enacting the NTEU recommendation that suggests improvements in the means by which leaders are selected, trained, mentored and rewarded (Winefield et al. 2002). Leadership Colloquia could also provide opportunities for feminists to reframe their messages in a way that assists male academics who are otherwise anxious about feminism(s) to include gendered discourses into their academic identities.
PART C

ELECTIVE 1: INTERVIEW WITH COMMENTARY

FEASIBILITY STUDY: MEN WHO ARE LEADERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION
PREAMBLE

In August 2000, I met with the principal, whom I will call Jeffrey, of an inner-city secondary school. Although I had developed some discussion prompts, I had gone into the conversation with an open mind about what I might be told. It became quickly apparent that Jeffrey was going to provide me with insights about his experiences as a man challenging hegemonic masculinity in an educational bureaucracy.

A point of reflection subsequent to the discussion with Jeffrey has been the realisation that educational workplaces, such as schools and universities, may well be the arenas for contestation, but they can also be nurturing places. He, for instance, cited his school community as a place that enabled him to continue the work he is doing. It was not only the staff of the school, however, for it also included the broader community in which the school was located. An implication for my major piece of research, therefore, is that the educational communities might be both the cause of tension and places for restoration.

I have also been reflecting on Jeffrey's insights into the various networks (to use his term) that exist in Australia in relation to gender in education. Notwithstanding Jeffrey's use of the word 'networks' to describe the different belief systems held by different groups of people in a variety of institutions across Australia, the image I conjured up was much more tribal.

The following account is made up of three sections. The first section deals with a description of the project and outlines the research
method used. The second section is a narrative, which encapsulates comments made by Jeffrey as well as some of my own musings. In the final section I discuss the research findings and the implications of these on further related research that I shall undertake.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

As a feasibility study, this particular project had three aims:

- To provide me with an initial experience in interviewing an articulate emancipatory leader who challenges hegemonic masculinity;
- To gain some insights into the sorts of questions I would need to ask in my main research project, and
- To generate some ‘leads’ on potential respondents for the main research project and how I might find them.

The particular objectives of this research project were:

- To apply understandings gained from coursework elements of the EdD program that inform the research methodology;
- To develop a written report of this research that will form part of a final portfolio of work suitable for submission for examination in the EdD, and
- To gain experience in understanding the approval processes for the conduct of research at Deakin University.
RESEARCH METHOD

After ethics approval to proceed was gained from the Deakin University Ethics Committee, Jeffrey, as I have called him, was contacted via a letter that outlined the proposed study and which invited his participation in an in-depth, semi-structured interview. Jeffrey responded to this letter, completed the consent form and a subsequent tape-recorded interview took place at his workplace, lasting for approximately two hours.

Six substantive questions or discussion prompts were taken into the interview:

1. The respondent's involvement in research about leadership in higher education.
2. The respondent's research involving men in leadership in higher education.
3. Thoughts on men's possible reactions to being approached to talk about leadership experiences.
4. Suggestions for making the initial approach.
5. Possible reactions to repeated e-mail interviews rather than face-to-face interviews.
6. Thoughts about what the men might raise as leadership issues.

During the course of the interview, an outline of Jeffrey’s comments was recorded via a mindmap. This provided a schema of the interview, and when used with the transcript of the recorded interview, means that the data is relatively easy to access manually.
A DISCUSSION WITH JEFFREY

The bell marking the end of recess was ringing for the second time. Or was it the third? Jeffrey and I had been engaged in conversation for almost two hours, yet I had no real sense that we’d been talking for so long. Prior to this conversation, Jeffrey was nothing but a name that my supervisor had given me. On the basis of a brief comment he had made in an e-mail he had sent to me prior to our meeting, I thought that maybe he might be able to shed some light on how I might go about gathering my data for the big research project, scheduled for sometime in the future.

It had quickly dawned on me, however, that I was speaking with a man who had been around the social justice and equity field for many years, challenging beliefs about sexual harassment, bullying and boys’ education. It’s a bit odd I haven’t come across Jeffrey’s name before this, but as Jeffrey pulls out various pieces of 'show and tell' items - things such as the No Fear curriculum package and copies of various reports in which he has participated over the years—I realise it is my lack of knowledge that's really the point here.

Jeffrey’s manner is relaxed, despite the many things probably going through his head as the principal of a secondary school that I will call Kingston Secondary College, located in an inner-city suburb. He talks with ease about issues associated with boy's education, feminism and the various meanings attributed to the concept of masculinity, with many of his responses being very long; almost rambling, something that I took as reflecting his familiarity with the issues. His fifteen or so years of working as a classroom teacher and
then as a principal dealing with these issues and conducting professional development activities clearly shows. He has strong links to the networks that existed with the former equal opportunity officers in schools, something which afforded him some safety in the past.

One of the interesting developments in the boys' education movement, Jeffrey explains, is that there is a perception that it has to be a male who is the spokesperson on the issue. And when there are only a few men who are speaking out, being the singular voice has its consequences:

… the likes of a Bettina Arndt will ring up. They'll ring the Department and say 'I want to speak to somebody who can speak in an informed way around gender in schools' and there's this immediate and continual and unfortunate, misguided notion that therefore the only person that can talk about boys in schools has got to be a bloke. So, in a sense, I have fulfilled, I have fulfilled very wearingly and I'd also say, probably without any great passion for doing it, I've performed that kind of a role. It's fair to say I've performed that role for about two or three years.

Jeffrey is seemingly both troubled and driven by the mismatch that he sees in the culture in which boys and girls find themselves. When he considers the current situation for the boys and girls in his school, Jeffrey is left wondering about what the experience is like for them when they are told by the school about the nature of work and life, yet whose experiences at home seem to be much more limited, and possibly even limiting:

I really think we are increasingly defining generations of young boys… increasingly mismatched to almost all of the cultural,
economic and social contexts of the world in which they live. And that's a recipe for some form of malaise, if not disaster, into our future. So that's why I still do it because I feel very passionately that something has to change there and I see the daily cost of it amongst kids. So that's the drive, I guess. I've been tempted on occasions to sort of give up my day job, so to speak, and you know, write about the field as another way of getting...some of those ideas out there. In a sense I think, not the uniqueness but the peculiarity of my position would tell me that that's not the best thing for me to do, that there are better people to do that...

Jeffrey explains that although the boys know through their own observations of the work and living habits of their own families that there are many masculinities, they play out a fantasy—a fantasy that involves a compulsory heterosexuality and which dictates that there is only one way of being a male.

The fire in Jeffrey’s belly is obvious. Something has kept him going, even when the men in the professional development sessions he conducts bristle and react at the very ideas he proposes and even when he is a lone, man in an equal opportunity network that is comprised mainly of women. This is an intriguing point, so I pursue it. For Jeffrey, being part of an equal opportunity network saw him in something of a compromised position and he talks of the attributes of status, authority and influence that he is aware he brought to the network as a male and as a principal of a secondary college. Pragmatics won, he explains, as the network decided that the message being delivered was the important thing, not the gender of the person delivering the message:

... people for whom that was their job, some EO consultants,
who could’ve stood up and done exactly the same stuff that I was doing and have exactly the same messages and be saying the same things, but they weren’t principals and generally, they weren’t male and they used to find that it excluded them in some sense from being listened to, so quite unashamedly I’ve made myself available because they would say ‘Look, you can come along and talk to a staff and you’ll get a different reaction simply on the basis of who you are.’ And … it’s a compromised position, particularly around masculinity. Part of what I would do is actually draw people’s attention to that … Well, why is it that you’re prepared to, you know, listen, or place more credence on something being said by a man in a suit, than you might be from the people doing the front line work in the field? The medium of that message is probably something that you need to be pragmatic about.

This notion of being an ‘insider’ and the weight that this carries when talking to groups of teachers cannot be overlooked:

… if you get an outside academic or an outside consultant in there’s going to be a degree of immediate gains made of that, saying ‘No, what would they actually know about the way in which schools or the world work?’ And that’s true, regardless, I think, of what the issue or the question is. So there is some strategic advantage of somebody being able to speak about those things who also has credibility. I think that’s what in the end about more-so than authority. It’s that credibility.

I cannot help also to wonder at the impact of fifteen years of social justice activities. Has it changed anything? For Jeffrey, an overriding passion for the area is his driving force. Around this, other activities are pursued, although for Jeffrey, the sorts of social
justice activities in which he has been involved have become something of a second job. Having more than one person prepared to express different views about masculinity is Jeffrey's attempt to ameliorate this:

... I think it is vitally important that there are men who are expressing a variety and difference of views about ... masculinity, but I guess to some extent I've despaired rather than tired, that is, that I can't either professionally afford for it to be as I've described, to be a second job and I've tried in a number of ways and a number of means and avenues to make sure that there are many, many more voices.

In spite of working within—but also against—the dominant belief system, Jeffrey has continued on, and I wonder how it is that he has managed to do this. He does it, he says, because he feels very passionately about it. In the professional development activities in which he is involved, Jeffrey is able to challenge many personal and professional issues on the part of the participants—and indeed, in relation to himself. He has observed a lessening of hostility from men in his professional development groups over the years and has found this to be comforting, but it is nevertheless a point of despair when he can see that many men are clinging to various myths of what it is to be a man. This can be played out by expressions of hyper-masculinity, such as increasing the level of homophobia and so forth:

I guess that's where most of my work has been in challenging teachers about the assumptions they make about what their own experiences have actually been. I'm finding, it's interesting, I think there's been a bit of a, sort of a gradual, almost imperceptible shift in the current with that for men. If I was to go and address a staff in a school, probably even five years ago, I
could feel the bristling from a majority of the men in that staff as I started to say some of those uncomfortable things. That seems to happen less now …

There are some people—men—who encounter that with considerable despair. I mean it underpicks for them the foundations upon which their view of the world was built and it’s threatening and yes, there are ones whose reaction to that is very much a hostile reaction: ‘That’s not what I want. I want things to go back.’ And they look around for who they are going to blame …

The word 'despair' has been used a couple of times in the discussion, so I wonder aloud as to how Jeffrey sustains himself in the situation of being both an insider and an outsider, causing me to momentarily ponder where this question of mine comes from. Jeffrey explains how he has been part of the Kingston school community for many years and that the school has had a long tradition of fostering an environment of inclusivity. His safety default, though, is not restricted to the school community and has come about incidentally as he has several webs of support, including a couple of key men involved with MASA (Men Against Sexual Assault), although Jeffrey acknowledges that sometimes the group can adopt a 'self-lacerating approach' to pro-feminism:

'It's something I might say I've found happening by default rather than by my own intention or design. In the ways in which work in this field, I guess, has always happened, there are sort of webs of interconnection, if you like, and webs of support that come from that. So I found myself, again largely by default, because it was the only area that I was finding these issues being discussed and debated in a very peripheral way for about the
last, at least decade, longer than that probably, I've had some involvement with MASA, which is Men Against Sexual Assault, and have worked fairly closely with people from within that organisation that were interested in working in schools. So they're chief education-focussed people which is [mentions peoples' names], people that I've worked with. And with Steven it's as much of a personal friendship as it is professional liaison, so to speak. So that's often been a good sort of both personal and professional forum, more-so than a network of support.

The Equal Opportunity networks from Jeffrey's past and the network of academics involved in women's studies with which he has established relationships, provide Jeffrey with a group of people who know the terrain and who are able to provide support. Jeffrey speculates that in academia, there is likely to be a similar situation:

… because you'll find for most of those men, their sources of support, I'm thinking it's particularly true for academics, their sources of support within their own institutions, may in fact be a couple of men, but are largely probably going to be women.

We are near the end of our time. How quickly it seems to have gone. I tell Jeffrey of my grand plan for my larger research project and describe the two options that I might explore for gathering data. One involves having repeated conversations via e-mails with other men. A second option could be to establish a mailing list or forum on the Internet where opinions and issues could be canvassed and discussed.
Jeffrey enthuses about the time being right for some sort of network to be established, but both of us are aware that this, in itself, could be seen as being a masculinist enterprise:

I'd applaud anything of either of those two strands that you're proposing. I mean, I'd say that in the end there's an absence, there's a crying need for that sort of network that you've described and there's a number of us that've talked about it without necessarily the where-with-all or the impetus to do it, any number of times. I can come up almost immediately with a string of about a dozen-plus people who would leap at the opportunity and I think they'd leap at the opportunity to do either.

Jeffrey provides me with the names of men with whom I might like to involve and begins to talk about the beliefs to which not only each of the men and their supporters subscribe. It almost begins to sound tribal, with members of each 'tribe' defending their intellectual territory: an institution in City A subscribes to a particular view about the contribution of narrative therapy; a university in City B advances a Jungian perspective; a couple of universities in State C are primarily concerned with the need for equity of outcomes in a largely feminised teaching force and 'the [University D] contingent', who Jeffrey sees as 'probably the best in terms of a "think tank" around gender and education'.

I begin to feel inwardly uneasy and uncertain whether I would wish to play the role of a mediator, arbitrator or peace-keeper for something that Jeffrey describes as being 'an inherently fraught dilemma'—not only because of the different perspectives taken by individual men and their networks—but also because of perceptions of boundary-setting and exclusivity:
Is creating ... a male domain of discussion, a community of itself, really a contradiction in terms of tackling a sort of hegemony of patriarchy?

Whereas I had thought of men like Jeffrey swimming against the tide of feminists who do not like men and of men who do not like profeminist men, I hadn't considered the additional tide of men like Jeffrey having to swim against the tide of other informed men—or tribes of men! The option of interviewing men via repeated e-mails immediately begins to look safer and I find myself inwardly questioning my need to feel in control of the proceedings.

The discussion with Jeffrey draws to a close, and as we've been talking, notes have been slid under the door and through the louvre blind, I can see outlines of people waiting outside Jeffrey's office. The time of a principal is indeed precious, and I feel honoured to have been given so much of it—not only to discuss with another man, matters about which we are both so passionately drawn, but also to become fired-up about the prospect of conducting my own major piece of research on gender-related issues.

I leave the school and walk past groups of men going about their jobs—one group of men painting a house; another group doing roadwork. I cannot help but wonder what the issues in their lives are and whether they give a toss about the things of which Jeffrey and I have spent the past two hours speaking.
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Little was known about Jeffrey prior to the interview, apart from the fact that he was a principal of a secondary school and that he had had some prior experience in the area of gender research. It was necessary, therefore, to explore Jeffrey’s background and to clarify the nature of the research in which he had been, and still remains, engaged. Jeffrey provided substantial detail about his past and present professional roles and it was possible to elicit significant information in relation to the demands of the various roles through the use of a combination of short questions and statements on my part.

Being an articulate person, Jeffrey provided mostly lengthy, and occasionally rambling, replies to the various questions or prompts that I used. In some instances, the replies were grounded in practice; in other instances, the replies were abstract musings, perhaps even pontifications, about considerations such as the nature of hegemonic masculinity.

As the interview progressed, it became more of a conversation, with Jeffrey anticipating my questions and statements and occasionally finishing them off for me. An example of this occurred when we talked about recent media coverage pertinent to expressions of masculinity and of boys in education. Just as the conversation had mostly serious moments, humour was used on several occasions.

The interview concluded, not because we had exhausted the topics under discussion, but because I was mindful of the amount of Jeffrey’s time I had already consumed, particularly as I could see other people outside the principal’s office wanting to talk to him.
Recapitulating, as a feasibility study, this study had three aims:

1. To provide me with an initial experience in interviewing an articulate emancipatory leader who challenges hegemonic masculinity;
2. To gain some insights into the sorts of questions I would need to ask in my main research project, and
3. To generate some ‘leads’ on potential respondents for the main research project and how I might find them.

Being able to interview Jeffrey certainly provided me with an opportunity to interview an emancipatory leader and to practise, as it eventuated, articulating many concepts in relation to hegemonic masculinity that I had only previously read about. As a result, I have been able to more precisely identify questions that I would wish to ask in the major research project, as well as the reasons for wanting to ask them. One example that comes to mind relates to questions about the men’s coping strategies. As for the third aim, this was also achieved, as I now have a list of male academics’ names and contact addresses who could be potential respondents for the major research project.

The three objectives of this study were concerned with the developmental and logistical aspects of conducting this research project. Each of the objectives was achieved.

The interview provided me with a number of insights, such as:

- An opportunity to talk with an informed man about the concepts that up until that point of time, I had largely only read about;
A realisation that there are men in higher education settings who could comprise a sample for further investigation;

An awareness that the men I might want to speak to would not be singularly occupied with thoughts about masculinity, and that this would be expressed in a variety of ways and from a variety of realities, creating the potential for tension and contestation;

An affirmation that the focus of my proposed major piece of research would be considered interesting and potentially valuable to a number of people in educational administration;

The complexities of using computer-mediated communication, and

My own positioning as a researcher, and particularly, the extent to which I might want to control the research process.

**Implications for Further Research**

Given these insights, the interview has helped me to identify and clarify some directions for the proposed major piece of research, which I list here:

A need to better clarify the type of person I want to study, so that the sample comprises men who do leadership differently (as considered by others), rather than comprising men who talk about masculinity and gender, that is, a concern for the 'doing' rather than the rhetoric of what ought or should be done;

An expansion of the focus of the study so that it includes consideration of men's coping strategies when they undertake issues differently to the hegemony;
A An interest in exploring the advantages and limitations of computer-mediated communication as a means of eliciting responses from respondents, and

o Confirmation that using narrative in conjunction with a more formalised reporting genre is worth exploring further.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the interview with Jeffrey from Kingston Secondary College was of great value to me. Perhaps the greatest realisation from the interview is that people who are the subjects of research have their own realities and are not singularly concerned about the issue that is paramount in the researcher's mind. This raises consequent questions about the nature of information that is represented in any reporting of interactions with respondents as well as how that information is represented.

Certainly in this instance, a combination of narrative and a description of the research and its findings, written in a subjective and semi-formal voice, suit both my own sense-making as well as my concern to inform an unknown audience about a small piece of research I have undertaken. I have a sense that this is the way that I shall proceed in the reporting of the proposed major piece of research, so that the opportunity to practise writing using these genres, as I have done here, has satisfied a multiplicity of my personal needs. Hopefully too, this report has provided the reader with my interpretation of what transpired in a conversation with a man committed to challenging and improving the educational and societal outcomes for young men and women.
PART D

ELECTIVE 2: REFEREEED CONFERENCE PAPER
(KEAMY 2001)

THE EFFICACY OF USING E-MAIL WHEN
RESEARCHING INCLUSIVE TEACHING PRACTICES
USED BY MALE ACADEMICS
INTRODUCTION

Australian universities are increasingly transforming themselves into entrepreneurial agencies in order to equip themselves for increasing numbers and types of students, whilst maintaining an expectation that our universities will prepare graduates for highly specialised occupations and that the parallel expectation that more will be done for a lower cost (Clark 1998). One consequence of this is that ‘most academics’ lives have at least been “touched” by the forces of the market’ (McCollow & Lingard 1996, p. 15). Demands are placed upon the time academics have and these demands—the effect of being ‘touched’—are typically represented by concerns with quality assurance, performance management, productivity agreements, technological literacy and other accountability devices, despite recent literature on leadership, change and best management practice that acknowledges recognition and respect for cultural diversity and about the valuing of democratic relationships and caring environments (Ball 1999; Blackmore 1995a; Blackmore & Sachs 2000; Kissane 2000).

The increase in the number and type of students attracted by our entrepreneurial universities places particular demands on the academics who teach in them. In addition to students from the mainstream, funding is provided to higher education institutions to improve the access and participation of students from non-English speaking backgrounds, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, economically and socially disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, students from rural and isolated areas and women in postgraduate courses and non-traditional areas of study. Added to these groups of students, there are 'second chance'
students, including those who are granted entry to postgraduate courses on the basis of their previous trade qualifications and work experience, overseas students studying in Australia and overseas students for whom Australian universities provide courses in their home countries. The diversity amongst the student population becomes increasingly broad (King, Hill & Hemmings 2000).

The cultural diversity of our university students, however, is not only limited to these groups, for it includes ‘… ethnic background, class, gender, socio-economic status, regional differences, religious beliefs, sexual orientation and age’ (Kalantzis & Cope 2000). The challenge for academics is to embrace the ever-changing cultural diversity amongst students (and staff), along with the many different understandings and experiences of education and what is considered to be valid knowledge and ways of knowing. In so doing, the intention is to ensure the inclusiveness of our teaching and of our curricula, such that:

Inclusiveness necessitates treating the knowledge and experiences of people from all groups in society as valid and relevant.
Teaching, learning and assessment cater for a variety of styles and values (Kalantzis & Cope 2000, p. 36).

This pursuit is problematical, however, because of the dilemma that is created by saying that all knowledge and behaviour should be validated, when clearly the actions of bigots, homophobes and racists, for instance, deny other (and particular) people their basic human rights.

My own perspective on inclusivity in teaching comes from my concern about the ‘Othering’ that exists in our society and the need to reverse this if a recognition of diversity is to occur in our
Australian universities. ‘Othering’ here is taken to mean the exclusionary practices levelled at an individual or any group that is considered different or outside of the majority population (Riggins 1997) on the basis of their characteristics (or presumed characteristics). My concerns for social justice arise because certain groups or individuals experience unfair treatment that damages them and society. Further, aiming for a socially just society is in keeping with Australia’s international human rights obligations, namely, the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* that asserts the rights of all peoples to include:

- Their own language, culture and religion;
- Participation in public affairs;
- Freedom of expression, movement, association and assembly;
- Liberty and security of person;
- Equal treatment under the law (Chambers & Pettman 1986, p. 26).

Academics are, notionally at least, well placed to work towards a socially just society and to ensure that individuals or groups are not ‘Othered’ and rendered invisible or marginalised by the way they teach. At the teaching and learning level, academics are able to ensure that issues of gender, sexuality, language, culture, rurality, religiosity, disability and a broad range of diverse cultures are a visible part of their curricula, although experience suggests that this does not always happen.

My purpose in this paper then, in light of the current demands of the entrepreneurial university, is to reflect on the inclusive teaching practices that a small group of male academics report using. The study relates to a much larger project that concentrates on male academics and their inclusive leadership practices—and thus, the focus on a group of males in this particular study.
Whereas there is literature in which arguments for inclusive teaching practices are expressed (such as Dadzie 1993; Kalantzis & Cope 2000; Leach & Moss 1993; University of Western Australia 1999), I wanted to learn more about the teaching strategies that academics actually employ in the university courses that they teach. Compared with knowing what could or should be done to ensure inclusivity, I wanted to know how academics convey the messages to their students.

The means by which the data were gathered involved a trial of using e-mail communication, a form of computer-mediated communication (CMC). This paper discusses the efficacy of using e-mail communication for this type of study as well as considering what the male academics said about their inclusive teaching practices. Although the initial focus of the study was on pedagogical issues around inclusion, it has subsequently evolved into a critique of the efficacy of using e-mail communication to gather this information.

**Making Contact**

Approval to proceed with the study was obtained from the Deakin University Ethics Committee (DUEC). In addition to identified actions to protect the participants’ identities, DUEC was also concerned about the potential for e-mail communication potentially being accessed by third parties. This concern was duly included in the Plain Language Statement circulated to each participant. The Plain Language Statement also indicated my own teaching areas at La Trobe University, as I felt that this was important for any free exchange of information. A password-protected Hotmail account
for the dispatch and receipt of e-mails was subsequently established.

Having received the appropriate ethics clearance to proceed, the intention was to make—and sustain—e-mail contact with five male academics who were known to have a profile in social justice teaching or writing in an Australian university. Their profiles related to their publications or to their known teaching expertise. In short, these would be men who were considered to be leaders in their fields.

The academics were invited to participate in up to three e-mail conversations. This type of interview has been referred to as a ‘pseudo-interview’ because they are conducted via e-mail, rather than face-to-face (Forgasz, Leder & Lynch 1996). I was hoping to see whether it was possible to move away from a one-off interview and instead, have conversations with these men using CMC, yet I was mindful of Oakley’s (1981) criticisms about the artificiality of this stance, given that the interviewer is always manipulating the direction of the interview—and indeed, of the conversation.

39 It is important to note that it is not possible to identify here the particular fields from which the sample was drawn. The Australian university sector is not so vast as to ensure total anonymity! In the interests of confidentiality and maintaining anonymity therefore, the generic descriptor ‘social justice area’ will be used as a shorthand that includes the following, sometimes overlapping, groups of people: Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, people from non-English speaking backgrounds, gay men and lesbians, and people with disabilities. Unfortunately, this means that the areas in which the men work are rendered invisible by this representation.
The first e-mail conversation with each respondent was intended to invite the men to outline their main purpose/s in teaching inclusivity and to describe the teaching strategies they believed they used when working with groups—specifically, groups of mainstream students. The intention of the second e-mail was to respond and react to the first response, but to go on to elicit comments from the men about how they respond in their teaching, when the interests of individuals or people from social justice groups were being challenged. The final e-mail was intended to do two things: to clarify previous points made by the participants and to provide the participants with a summary of the method/s they have described and which they might wish to amend.

Once I had identified the academics drawn from different Australian universities whom I would like to contact on the basis of their profiles, it was easy to obtain their work e-mail addresses. Three men were contacted via e-mail in early to mid-December, 2000, one of whom responded immediately; the other, almost a month later. The reason that I did not approach all five men at the same time was that I was concerned that I might not be able to keep track of five conversations simultaneously.

The first person to respond, although interested in the study, felt unable to participate, as he was about to leave his university. He did offer to pass on my invitation to another person, and in hindsight, this may have been an appropriate course of action, although at the time I had concerns that the questions would be passed on to unknown others, thereby raising issues about how confidentiality could be maintained and participation in the project limited. I was mindful of the caution expressed by Forgasz et al.
about the use of CMC in research, and how, even in a closed distribution list, the questions could easily be forwarded beyond the men initially targeted. My attempt to encourage the original person to participate nevertheless was thwarted when my communication system was knocked out in a storm, but apart from an acknowledgment that my final e-mail had been received, nothing further was heard from him.

The second person to respond did so early in the New Year, citing pressures of work in the lead-up to Christmas that caused the delay. This person declined to proceed further, on the basis that he did not believe he taught ‘around the concept of inclusion’. This provided an interesting insight, however, for I was aware of articles with social action themes that this man had written. It may have been the deliberate open-endedness of my use of the term ‘inclusive’ that had caused him to make this decision, but it might also have had something to do with the difference between the rhetoric of social action compared with its practice. (Interestingly, it is this perception of academics not practising what they preach, that was raised by one of the eventual participants.) The third person contacted prior to Christmas did not respond at all, nor did he respond to a second attempt in mid-January.

At this point, mid-January 2001, I needed to reconsider how to proceed, as the timeliness of making contact was clearly an issue. Choosing a time most suitable for academics was problematic, so I decided that I would act immediately, hoping that I might be able to engage several of the men before the academic year got under way. Similarly, I decided to try to maintain the sample size at five, so I generated the names of some other men who were also known
to teach and/or publish in various areas of social justice. Early in February 2001, I made e-mail contact with four men new to the study. Although I have had no response from one of the men, conversations occurred with the other three.

In total, therefore, I initiated e-mail contact with seven men and had e-mail conversations with three of them. Throughout this paper I shall refer to them as Rob, Tim and Sam. The following sections of the paper deal with an outline of the logistical aspects of the contact followed by some excerpts from the conversations that I had with the three men. This is then followed with a discussion about inclusive teaching practices in light of what the academics said and finally, some closing comments in relation to the efficacy of using e-mail correspondence for this, and future, research.

**WHAT HAPPENED**

**Rob**

Before agreeing to participate, Rob simply asked two questions: ‘How do you define inclusivity and why only male academics?’ Once I had explained to Rob that this research was a related component to a broader study that would examine male academics who were undertaking leadership differently to the mainstream and what I meant by the term ‘inclusivity’, he invited me to talk further, saying he was happy to answer my questions. The questions I asked Rob were principally aimed at trying to ascertain the general nature of his teaching responsibilities and the specific ways in which he approached the teaching of his particular social justice area. I also described a situation that sometimes arises in
lectures and tutorials and invited Rob to say how he would respond to this situation. The situation I described was where a student/s might say something that is sexist or racist or homophobic and which may offend others in the class, yet in the interests of free speech and wanting to create an environment where students can feel comfortable to express and hear different points of view, there can be tension.

Two days later, Rob had responded, his subject line reading ‘yr questions’, which by the use of this shorthand, suggested that Rob had a familiarity with the medium being used. The first part of his message said, ‘a quick response--for longer answers you should arrange a time to interview me’. Rob went on to indicate his mainstream area of teaching and to stress that he does, seemingly reluctantly, a little teaching in the social justice area, stating ‘I am not very convinced of the need for such a ghettoisation of knowledge’. He reinforced this later in his e-mail, making it clear that he reached this conclusion on the basis of some overseas teaching he did in the social justice studies area in question. In relation to how he might deal with sexist/racist/homophobic comments, Rob revealed that he had encountered ‘… more trouble with overtly anti-Semitic comments in tuts’. Rob concluded with the following: ‘I believe strongly in the need to integrate discussion of [social justice area] and difference into undergrad teaching …’ Rob also indicated that he did not draw his students’ attention to the fact that he was a member of the social justice group under discussion, but remarked, ‘if they do the reading they are assigned it would be pretty apparent’.
Mindful that Rob had prefaced his preceding e-mail with a stated preference for a face-to-face meeting; I attempted to acknowledge this and decided not to ask any more questions, although I was uncertain how I could subtly remind Rob that it was the intention of the research to use e-mail communication only. In hindsight, it would have been more appropriate to exercise some discretion and at least lift the phone and talk to Rob directly.

Instead, I decided to make some statements by way of response to some of the things that Rob had said, hoping that he might make a final comment about my responses. I decided to use this approach based on my own experiences of communicating with Aboriginal people: sometimes the asking of a direct question is inappropriate and deemed intrusive, whereas statement-making provides the listener with the opportunity to agree, disagree, clarify or expand upon certain ideas.

To this I promptly received a succinct e-mail from Rob that said, ‘I am happy to have a follow-up interview but not to engage in a protracted discussion by e-mail.’ This did not surprise me, as Rob had made it clear in the preceding e-mail that he would prefer a face-to-face interview where he could expand on things. Upon reflection, his style of writing—a preference for non-capitalisation and the use of abbreviated words—also suggested that a more matter-of-fact approach might have been more appropriate than the conversational approach that I opted for. Clearly, according to the ethics consent form, Rob was entitled to terminate his participation at any stage so I thought it prudent not to ask any further questions and e-mailed Rob to acknowledge receipt of his message and to thank him for his participation.
Sam

Unlike Rob, Sam was someone who was known to me and in the past, we had had reasons to communicate via e-mail, which were usually enjoyable experiences as they were frequently humorous, literary pieces. In his initial response to the questions that I had asked of him, Sam indicated that he would think about them and then provide a written response when things quietened down a little. Sam also made the following suggestion:

*Have you thought of having your respondents get together to compare experiences later in the research process? It can be a wonderful experience for all concerned, with lots of interesting material for you that normally doesn't come out of dialogues between researcher and researched.*

Sam’s response was much more conversational, but whilst he was appreciative of being asked, he doubted whether he was suitable, citing his ‘… lack of experience in teaching in some areas of inclusivity. For example. Is the implied focus on gender and sexuality issues or on ethnicity, culture, language etc? I'm not much help on teaching the gender and sexuality issues.’

My first e-mail contact with Sam was towards the end of January, after which Sam e-mailed me on a few occasions apologising for not getting back to me. By the end of March, I was beginning to become anxious that the formality of the questions asked, as well as asking for written responses, might have been overly threatening for Sam, so I put my concerns to him. A few days later, Sam responded, saying he was ‘very happy’ to use e-mails, adding ‘In fact, I would prefer this way because writing will provide me the opportunity to get some order into my responses.’ It was, Sam made clear, a matter
of finding the time: ‘So just keep prodding me to do it!’ was his instruction. Further prodding was not necessary, as in mid-April Sam provided a lengthy response to my questions—seven pages of it! ‘In fact,’ he said, ‘I have to say that this is the first occasion I have taken time out to think about these things. Dreadful isn’t it!!!’

**Tim**

I sent my first e-mail to Tim in mid-February and a few days later Tim responded, saying he was interested in ‘talking some more’. I communicated again with Tim, but heard nothing, so in mid-March I e-mailed him again, letting him know that I was still prepared to listen if he was prepared to continue. Tim responded, and from his response it was clear that I would have no option but to communicate with him by phone before I could proceed any further.

I rang Tim to discuss the research, and as it transpired, he wanted to know something about me before he was prepared to go further. As I noted at the time: ‘Tim is not comfortable about doing this sort of interview without knowing any background about me or where I’m coming from. He gets many requests because of his expertise [in his field], so routinely checks out the background information of inquirers.’ Tim, I sensed, was also reluctant about committing his comments to print, but he left the decision about whether and how to proceed up to me. After a few days thinking about it, I e-mailed Tim and asked if he would mind making some written comments about a topic he raised in our telephone discussion—the existence of exclusionary practices within social justice groups.
This contact was towards the end of March and when I had not received any e-mail from Tim by the end of April, I had decided that I would ask very gently one last time. Co-incidentally, however, we found ourselves at a meeting together and had a brief chat about my research. Tim apologised for taking so long to respond yet made it clear that he still was not comfortable communicating via e-mails. I did not want to push the matter further, so suggested that he should feel free not to continue, and nothing further has been heard from Tim at the time of writing.

**DISCUSSION**

**Teaching Interactions**

Part of Rob’s teaching involves seminars and tutorials that utilise discussions around appropriate videos and readings. In Sam’s e-mails, he outlined some specific strategies he uses for ascertaining students’ needs and interests, cautioning that his responses in the classroom are determined by the context and his intuition:

*I try to start with students describing their interests, needs and motivations. I provide material to draw out opinions and experiences. Then we follow various routes to clarification of knowledge, assumptions, values and interpersonal communication skills. I try to mirror and model in my teaching the processes of cultural learning. I am very oriented to process. Hard to fit what I do into measurable outcomes.*
Sam’s main model for handling diverse perspectives is to encourage students to distinguish between description, evaluation and feeling and develops with students some basic operating rules in class that incorporate the options of ‘imposition, compromise and timeshare’.

**Influences that Led to Teaching in Social Justice Areas**

Sam was the only person to provide a specific response to questions that sought to explore how the academics found themselves teaching in or about social justice areas. In so doing, Sam traced some of his experiences as a child growing up in the country and these included the modelling demonstrated by his mother, ‘a collector of stray people and causes’, and his own subsequent dealings with friends from other countries. At secondary school, he was ‘seduced by the infinite variety of European culture’ that he was able to access through literature, languages and history.

Sam considers that although this looks like ‘an inevitable progression towards scholarship and practice’, it was not really like that. ‘My engagement with diversity came from a struggle for self-knowledge rather than through books or academic role models’. It seems that Sam became engaged in his social justice area despite his initial academic course of study, or perhaps even as a reaction to it:

> In fact, I came to despise academics during my university study. They inverted my world. I had been brought up to believe in what a man did, not what he said he would do. I had been schooled in the world of practicality. If the water tank leaked, you fixed it or ran out of water. If a sheep got flyblown you cleaned it up or shot it. If you criticised your mates you were a bludging bastard etc. There were dreadful shortcomings in this
culture of my parents and peers -- homophobia, sexism and an intolerance of all things emotional. But the culture of the academics was, it seemed to me, also lacking. Professors and lecturers sneered at each other and at the students, ridiculing us for our ignorance and callowness. They upended the values of my world without providing a viable alternative. To them what you said was more important than what you did. In fact they didn't do anything that seemed worthy to me. And apparently couldn't. They made a virtue of not knowing how to repair a puncture or replace a broken light bulb. They complained about rain and held us up to ridicule for playing football. They questioned our right to be at University if we couldn't imitate their accent or lived in the wrong suburbs.

As a result of this, Sam determined to seek a 'more practical application of knowledge', concluding that his involvement in diversity education:

… came from imaginative involvement in the exotic, parental role modelling for assisting the culturally different to adapt, a secular humanistic vision of what good citizenship in a plural democracy involves at the personal level, a personal antipathy to intellectual elitism and neglect of real life issues, and a dislike of social inequality. My role is more of an interpreter than a leader.

Nature of Teaching: Social Justice Areas and/or Mainstream

All three men indicated the breadth of their teaching workloads, which involved teaching at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Rob does only a small amount of teaching in his social justice area, saying:
I do very little teaching in [the social justice area] nor would I want to - I am not very convinced of the need for such ghettoisation of knowledge…I believe strongly in the need to integrate discussion of [social justice area] and difference into undergrad teaching, and my experience of [the social justice area] in the US has left me unconvinced it’s particularly useful.

Similarly, Tim’s work entails working with people from a social justice group, but in a mainstream program, which suggests that a critical mass of people from the social justice group has been developed to warrant such a program. In the phone discussion with Tim, he described how this approach requires the use of appropriate pedagogy and organisational arrangements and stressed that ‘inclusivity remains problematic even teaching students [from the social justice area]’.

For Sam, he laments the demise of specific teaching sessions in his social justice area, describing part of his current role as providing ‘fillers’ in some courses. As well as responding to students’ interests, Sam actively introduces diversity issues in many of the courses he teaches. In two postgraduate subjects, however, he is specifically able to explore issues of cultural diversity:

These tend to focus on diversity issues relating to ethnicity, language, nationality, religion and gender, but occasionally will focus on equality and human rights issues involved in organisational discrimination around diversity (expressed in racism, homophobia, disregard of disabled people’s needs, and class conflict). Global issues relating to poverty, war, colonialism and development often emerge as foci if classes are keen on them.
**Trouble-shooting**

But teaching about ‘the Other’ does not always proceed smoothly and situations arise in which students (and staff) might be offended by racist, homophobic, sexist or generally insensitive statements, something that could be considered trouble-shooting, or which Sam described as ‘dealing with sticky situations’. Whereas Rob revealed that he had ‘had more trouble with overtly anti-Semitic comments in tuts’, he did not provide any comments about how he dealt with them. Sam, however, was more expansive, saying:

> I generally allow the students to progress through various stages of learning about diversity and develop their own perspectives. I hurry some along if they are making life difficult for the others. I use a lot of peer teaching, small groups and personal interactions to provide an experiential base. Attitudinal change preceding behavioural change seems to be the usual route in the classroom learning I am involved with. But limited behavioural change is also possible in the classes and I use it deliberately, especially with the Asian students, always trying to provide a lot of support based on developing a supportive environment beforehand … In university teaching the expression of prejudice is usually implicit and indirect, therefore easier to manage in a teaching situation and much harder to get at and out into the open. In schools it is usually more brutal. But in my experience a similar range of strategies is open to teachers at all levels. I use a combination of affective and instrumental strategies. Of the affective I prefer guilt rather than shame – it lasts longer. Of the instrumental I prefer co-operation to achieve superordinate goals. Satisfies my preference for pluralistic democracy.
A Reflection on the Literature

In some Australian universities, issues pertaining to social justice groups appear as Women’s Studies, Disability Studies, Gay/Queer Studies, Aboriginal Studies and so on, although this is not always the case, for some universities opt for a mainstream, or core curriculum, approach. A limitation of a core curriculum approach is that the diversity of minority groups remains invisible (Ogbu 1992), although it is one way in which performance expectations and standards are not compromised for the sake of minority students (McDaniel & Flowers 2000). When it comes to curricula that specifically focus on studies of social justice groups, it can have the effect of helping students, including students from minority groups, to develop insights into cultural differences and to reduce prejudice and stereotyping (Ogbru 1992; Williams & Green 1994). Conversely, this can have the effect of treating minority students or students from social justice groups as ‘Other’ (Frith 1998; Riggins 1997; Zhang 1997), or as Rob commented, lead to the ‘ghettoisation of knowledge’.

Teacher-writers who are members of minority groups (such as Callie 1994; Newell 1999) describe the difficulties associated with the frequently formidable task associated with challenging the dominant beliefs and value systems in our societies. Appropriately, it should not only be group members involved in this, and this small project would indicate that this is the case—at least at the level of rhetoric, if not practice. This task of ensuring inclusion in the process of teaching and learning, along with the broader recognition of differences amongst students, is increasingly being embraced by our universities in Australia (for instance University of South Australia 2001; University of Western Australia 1999,
Deakin University). The male academics in this particular study are cognisant of the sensitivities involved and would appear to have been long-time advocates of such movements.

Different approaches to increase inclusive teaching practices are used and the discussion here is far from exhaustive. One such approach at an unidentified Australian university was to introduce final year non-Indigenous teacher education students to a subject known as Aboriginal Studies, the purpose of which was to develop attitudes to effect a change in the education of Aboriginal children (Reynolds 1998). This, reports Reynolds, would be achieved through ‘the description and analysis of culture and cultural change as well as teaching for social justice, teaching for reconciliation and teaching for truth’ (p. 18). This sociological or discipline-focussed approach differs from the checklist approach adopted by some authors (for example Dadzie 1993; Leach & Moss 1993) and which could have the effect of limiting inclusive teaching practices to a competency-based approach. Whilst checklist questions of the type generated by Leach and Moss are well-intentioned, they do not necessarily engender the commitment to inclusive teaching practices or a deeper understanding of what exclusion can mean; rather they are concerned with the superficialities, as can be seen in the following examples:

Are teaching and reference materials free from stereotypical images, language and bias?
Does the style of teaching and methods used encourage participation, self-awareness and confidence-building?
Are staff confident about handling difficult situations in the classroom, especially involving incidents of sexism or racism or those involving students with disabilities? (Leach & Moss 1993, p. 32).
Awareness may be heightened, but not necessarily understanding—something that is typified in the following quotation:

'White people do not see themselves as white' (Katz 1982: 13). Because whites are not being discriminated against because they are white, they are inclined not to notice it, and therefore to ignore the role that white plays in their personal and social identity, in their everyday lives, in their access to social goods... But white is part of what whites are, and it has real consequences for them (Chambers & Pettman 1986, p. 24).

**Discussion of Methodology**

When Forgasz *et al.* (1996) considered the use of CMC in mathematics education, they acknowledged the potential of the Internet and of e-mails in educational research, but not without some cautions. They noted that the ease and speed of communicating via e-mail could mean that it is possible to follow-up any incomplete responses (to questionnaires) immediately and the openness afforded by e-mails compared with hard copy questionnaires, meant that respondents provided substantial amounts of information. A further advantage that they noted is that the data does not require transcription (Forgasz *et al.* 1996, p. 206). It had been considered for a relatively long time that e-mail dialogue is a social construction as well as a political process, as argued by Evans and Newell (1993, p. 92):

CMC does not, of itself, make [original emphasis] dialogue or independent learning and researching. It is the people who use CMC and construct its forms of educational technology that do so.

Much more recently, this argument has been re-iterated in a
comprehensive review of the literature conducted by Tsui (2001), and although her writings are in the context of computer mediated communication involving a discussion site rather than the use of e-mails, her observation is that there is a ‘complex interplay of the socio-cultural and psychological factors which mediate interactions’. The argument advanced by some CMC participants that lack of time prevents participation, may mask other factors such as technical concerns about using the medium, the attitude toward the use of computers for such tasks, accessibility of hardware and software, the characteristics of the group of users and the relationship/s between its members, the purpose of the exchanges and the ownership of the tasks (Tolmie & Boyle 2000; van Braak 2001). Indeed, the extent to which there is a shared purpose in the CMC activity appears to influence an individual’s continued participation in the activity (Tolmie & Boyle 2000).

Tellingly, participants in on-line groups were much less apprehensive about who was reading their messages once they had enough confidence to post messages in which they felt they had something to offer and that they considered others wanted to read (Selinger 1998, p. 26). In an earlier study, Wells (1997, p. 13) deduced that initial on-line participation could be influenced by a reluctance to contribute ‘because of a fear of appearing unintelligent or exposing vulnerabilities’, plus concerns associated with the maintenance of a transcript of the exchange/s. Effectively too, the text a person writes becomes their signature whereby the existence of typographical and other errors—the appearance of their text—is perceived as ‘a detraction from one’s image’ (Harasim 1990, p. 50). Teachers, Tsui (2001) observes, are keen to present themselves as competent professionals. The absence of social and
visual face-to-face contact in CMC, despite conflicting arguments about the value of such interaction, has lead ‘more and more researchers … to believe that CMC should be complemented or supplemented by FFC [face-to-face contact] (Tsui 2001). Either face-to-face or telephone contact with Rob (in this current study) would probably have allowed for a more accurate reading of his meanings rather than a reliance on written e-mail messages in which it was difficult to guess at his tolerance for an on-going conversation.

On the basis of Tsui’s (2001) expansive review of the literature in relation to teaching using CMC, it is possible to advance some thoughts about why the use of e-mail communication in this current study was not particularly successful. The absence of initial face-to-face contact, with its inherent valuable relationship and rapport building, meant that the participants did not have enough contextualising cues, but they were also taking large personal and professional risks by committing their ‘signatures’ to print and to an unknown audience. (Even though the participants would have been conversing with me, there may have been a sense of uncertainty about how far I could be trusted in terms of keeping their comments—and their professional integrity—to myself.) Tim’s response to the prospect of conducting e-mail conversations, in particular, is an example of this reluctance, whereas by way of contrast, Sam’s voluminous response may have been a reflection of our pre-existing relationship.
Further to these considerations, and with the value of hindsight, the use of a Hotmail account may have diminished the perceived importance or status of the messages, thus reducing the responses. I would have been wiser to have used my Deakin University e-mail account.

**Personal Reflections**

In addition to the limiting factors identified in the literature, other influences raised in discussions with colleagues might also be considered. The first of these deals with the demands that academics face, a point previously made in the introduction to this paper. Put simply, for academics who are regularly confronted with a massive daily list of e-mails that require attention, a request for more of their time may not be their highest priority, and for some, might even be regarded as harassment. A second influence—and one that, in hindsight, was not explored enough in the ethics approval process—relates to the sensitive nature of this research project. Participants were not merely being asked to discuss inclusive teaching practices, but were being asked—perhaps even confronted—to disclose specific instances of their teaching practice. Indeed, this line of inquiry was asking the men to put themselves professionally 'on the line'—obviously a very different task to completing a questionnaire or providing a response to a print media extracts (for example, Forgasz et al. 1996). The fact that this was to a largely unknown person could have made the request that much more daunting.
CONCLUSION

For me, this exercise has been an incredibly valuable one. On one hand, I did learn things about other male academics’ inclusive teaching practices, and when considered alongside a review of the literature, have had affirmed the importance of ensuring inclusiveness and social justice in my teaching. For instance, the approach taken by Reynolds (1999), in which various sociological perspectives (such as functionalist and conflict perspectives on schooling and issues of culture and identity formation and schooling) are reportedly used to increase student-teachers’ understandings of what is occurring for Aboriginal students, their families and communities, has been valuable. Added to this, the contribution of the available literature, particularly that written by people from social justice groups (such as Callie 1994; McDaniel & Flowers 2000; Newell 1999), as well as the materials of other writers (including Chambers & Pettman 1986; Ogbu 1992; Williams & Green 1994) provide me with rationales for action. These, in turn, will enable me to develop better-informed and insightful experiences upon which to develop my own inclusive teaching practices. The contributions that the male academics in this study have made for my own practice revolve around issues of confidence-building. The men in this study, well known for their stances on social justice issues, themselves grapple with, and have doubts about, their inclusive teaching practices. That this is the case is not only reassuring, but also telling, in that there is potentially much to be learnt from each other.

On the other hand, I believe I learnt much more about the use of computer mediated communication. Whereas it appeared as a seductive opportunity for someone like me who is located in a rural
area to conduct research, it proved to be far from efficacious. The
time taken to gather a relatively small amount of data made it a
questionable research technique, but more importantly, the
complexities it poses in terms of risk-taking and personal-
professional face-saving creates too many dilemmas and raises
ethical issues. Accordingly, it would have been satisfying to test
these thoughts with the participants, but because of the reasons
outlined, it would have been a useless exercise. I could hardly
expect the male academics to expose more of their personal selves
by putting a response in writing in an e-mail to this line of inquiry!

Although I have no difficulty with the idea of having on-going
conversations with participants, there are particular concerns that I
have for relying on e-mail communication for this type of research
project I have just described, amongst them the following:

First, the power relations involved in asking participants to respond
to an unknown and unassessable researcher raises serious issues of
not only power and control, but also of ethics. Further, it raises
methodological issues about participation in studies and caution
when responding. Whereas face-to-face contact exposes the
researcher, while still giving the researcher ‘the upper hand’, it does
enable the participant to assess trustworthiness, to probe on their
part, and to make informed decisions therefore on how much to
disclose—if anything.

Second, because professional reputations can be perceived to be at
stake, the respondent may decide to not participate or to mask
difficulties they might be experiencing with things such as the
technology, the software or giving responses to questions by
providing excuses such as not having the time. Ethically, it is inappropriate to put the respondent in a position in which they might be experiencing personal distress, particularly since the medium of e-mails does not easily, if at all, allow for probing questions that would otherwise enable the researcher to be aware of this and to then do something about it.\footnote{Although untested, there may also be links here with expectations of masculinity such as not wanting to admit to difficulties, perseverance in the face of difficulty and an unwillingness to ask for and accept help from others. Perhaps some evidence for this might become apparent in the larger research project that will consider male academics as leaders and how they cope with doing leadership—and masculinity—differently.}

Third, a reliance on the surface meanings of written e-mail messages at the expense of the nuances and deeper meanings intended or alluded to by the writer, can have the effect of stultifying the communication process between the sender and the receiver. Devoid of instantaneous feedback and important paralinguistic cues such as head nodding and hand gestures, the exchanges are linear and almost clinical, which is far from good interpersonal communication.

Fourth, the participant is entitled to expect that the information he or she is giving is going to be gathered in the manner that is easiest for them. This necessarily means flexibility needing to be built into the design of the data gathering phases of the research and recognises the respect that researchers need to exercise and that their role as researcher is not the paramount issue.
In summary, to the extent that this small research project informs the larger research task of the Doctor of Education program, I am pleased that I initiated and persevered with the study, albeit having to modify my data gathering approach mid-stream. I have had solidly reinforced my understanding and appreciation of the value of the interpersonal relationships that are built up by face-to-face interactions. After I have met with the participants face-to-face and they have had an opportunity to assess me, computer mediated communication will have a valuable role as a supplementary data gathering tactic.

As the primary means of data gathering for research that involves the asking of personal and professionally sensitive information, however, I conclude from this study that it is not appropriate. Said Mason and Kaye (1990):

> CMC should probably not be seen as a substitute for such face-to-face events, but rather as a means of continuing to serve a number of the above functions (i.e. tutorial discussion, seminars, counseling, socializing, etc.) conveniently and effectively in between occasional meetings. A group of learners who have already met each other in person, in the presence of a tutor/animateur, are more likely to be able to communicate effectively on-line because the personal meeting has provided a number of contextualizing cues that would otherwise be absent from discussions held exclusively within the framework of a computer conference (p. 20).

The same, I believe, could also be said for the conduct of educational research that has the potential to delve into certain aspects of the personal-professional actions of educational practitioners.
PART E

ELECTIVE 3: REFEREED CONFERENCE PAPER (KEAMY 2002)

IAN’S STORY: THE COMPLEX INTERACTION OF ETHNICITY, CLASS AND MASCULINITIES
INTRODUCTION

It is only relatively recently that attention has turned to the relationship between masculinities and race (Whitehead 2000b), although feminist scholars have, for some time, explored and critiqued relationships between gender and ethnicity, which is evident in the work of Tsolidis (2001). The complex interconnectedness of social divisions around class, gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, disability and age are acknowledged by several authors, amongst them Mac an Ghaill (1994) and Connell (1995), and it is important from the outset to appreciate that masculinity takes a variety of forms:

It is different for the working class and the upper class; for heterosexuals, gay men, and bisexuals ... Male masculinities are bound up with the complex weaving of race, sexuality, class, and other social distinctions used for domination and exploitation (Chua & Fujino 1999).

Masculinity is not one way of being, and adopting a social relations of gender framework, the term masculinity(ies) is used to depict the differences between different ways of being (Alvesson & Billing 1997; Collinson & Hearn 1996).

In my own thinking and writing, I had been beginning to explore my own sense of ethnic identity. I was born in Australia—a second generation Australian—with Lebanese-Irish/English grandparents, but all links with my Lebanese past have been broken. Talking with a fellow academic whom I shall call Ian, a man who identifies himself as Eurasian, provided me with insights into his experiences as a first generation Australian. I was particularly interested to
better understand the relationship between ethnicity, class and masculinity; given that Ian is a high-level academic from working class roots. The awareness I have as a gay man of being a member of a marginalised group gave us an added layer of common experience.

**Asian + Anglo = Other**

In Australia, there are said to be strong demarcations between Asian-Australians, Aborigines, and White Australians, and that the demarcations serve as a reminder of the significance of class when considering minority knowledges (Lo, Khoo & Gilbert 2000). The use of the hyphen itself in the word ‘Asian-Australians’ suggests an ‘inbetweeness’ that many Asian-Australians are said to feel. “Asian-Australian” is a portmanteau term that unites peoples of various “Asian” ethnicities, enabling a degree of political solidarity and critical purchase’ (Lo et al. 2000). The term ‘Asian-Australian’ tends to be used synonymously with Chinese-Australian, partly because of the predomination of the Chinese in Australian cultural production and also because of their being the largest 'racial' group to reside in Australia since White settlement. 'As a loose and homogenising description, "Asian" is a problematic term: like "Oriental", it is a Western construct with antecedents in eighteenth-century European imperialism' (Lo et al. 2000). (See also Smith’s (1999) discussion on the subjugation of ‘Others’ as a form of colonialism.) The label, 'Asians in Australia', is also sometimes used, but this tends to signify the foreign-born, as opposed to Australian-born and has become a politically loaded phrase linked with the contentious issue of immigration (Lo et al. 2000).
It is sometimes argued that the behavioural, cognitive and moral qualities of non-Europeans are considered 'less than', 'inferior to' or ‘Other’, compared with white European characteristics and qualities (Luke & Carrington 2000). Markers of race, Luke and Carrington say, influence the way in which people perceive and interact with others, and that this, in turn, affects the way that ‘racialized’ persons construct and negotiate their identities in everyday life, as well as the extent to which status is determined and the extent to which access to goods and resources is accessed. And significantly, there is a view that different forms of ‘Otherness’ can be mutually reinforcing, rather than mutually exclusive (Ficaratto 1990 in Plummer 1999, p. 82). Being ‘Other’ is about being identified as unnatural, with outsiders tending to perceive ‘Others’ as a homogeneous category. Furthermore,

Others may be practically invisible if they conform outwardly and rebel inwardly. Others can assimilate in whole or in part. Others may be devalued but the same time eroticised and envied. Others may suppress their differences and accept a devalued status—'colonise themselves', so to speak (Riggins 1997).

There are many stereotypes of Asians in Australian discourses, with one of the more supposedly ‘positive’ stereotype of Asians being that of the ‘model minority’ (Lo et al. 2000). The authors explain that this is a term used, sometimes by Asian-Australians themselves, to describe Asian communities in Western nations because of the perceived non-confrontational attitudes and quiet business. Despite some concerns about the preoccupation with ‘the new-found identity-thing-ness obsession which stalks our talk, research and thinking’ (Matthews 2001), some writers feel the sense of in-betweeness articulated by Lo et al. In her own experiences as an Anglo-Asian educational researcher, for instance, Matthews claims
she is commonly regarded as too Asian to be Anglo and too Anglo to be Asian. For Ang (1993),

… if I am inescapably Chinese by descent, I am only sometimes Chinese by consent [original emphases]. When and how is a matter of politics (p. 14).

**Representations of the Masculinity(ies) of Asian Men in Western Countries**

The emphasis on the diversity of masculinities is captured in the following statements:

Within the one school, or workplace, or ethnic group, there will be different ways of enacting manhood, different ways of learning to be a man, different conceptions of the self and different ways of using a male body (Connell 2000, p. 10).

Recognising differences in masculinities is not enough, for it is important to be able to understand the relationships between them (Connell 1995).

Western discursive representations of Asian men have been historically limited to images of ‘the egghead/ wimp, or … the kung fu master/ ninja/ samurai’ … Ironically, the aggressive (and therefore threatening) stereotypes exist alongside equally hostile representations of Asian men as ‘feminised’ Others. Such ‘feminisation’ leads to conceptions of Asian men as embodying exotic and ‘freakish’ maleness (Lo et al. 2000).

As suggested in this quotation, stereotyping exists, in this case, of Asian-American males as being wimpy, feminised and desexualised (Fong-Torres 1995 and Fung 1996 in Messner 1997) highly intelligent, yet unscrupulous, untrustworthy and over-
achieving (Mac an Ghaill 1994). Studies in the United States have found that US-born and immigrant Asian men viewed their masculinity differently from White hegemonic masculinity. 'Unlike White men, Asian-American men did not view their masculinity in opposition to their femininity' (Chua & Fujino 1999). Historically, White American manhood has had, at its base, exclusion of others and in particular, exclusion of Blacks, women, immigrants and homosexuals. Women and racial ethnic minorities in the workforce 'have been a threat to White men's sense of their masculinity', particularly when people from minorities move into the work sphere (Wade 2001). Wade also suggests, however, that there might be a similar dynamic of race and gender exclusion in the construction of male identities and masculinities among racial ethnic minority men, such as the differences between Asian-American and African American men.

For Asian-American men

...the masculinity issue is about who one is and how one relates to family and relatives, loved ones, emotional partners, close friends, and acquaintances. It is also related to the ways one presents oneself to the world at the workplace, at school, in leisure situations, and other public gatherings (Chua & Fujino 1999).

Despite this claim, the authors report that as of 1999, there had been no quantitative studies that examined how Asian-American men view their own masculinity, nor how masculinity relates to men's racial attitudes (Wade 2001). Chua and Fujino suggest, on the basis of their own study, that 'Asian-American masculinity is socially constructed around "model minority" maleness and not in terms of the dominant construction of masculinity.' They found that Asian-American men of college age construct their masculinity in unique
ways: they conceive, engage and argue about themselves as a group and differentiate their masculinity from that of White hegemonic masculinity. Most White men, the authors contend, consider masculinity as a highly important component of who they are, whereas this is not as so for American-born Asian men—itself a reflection of racialized masculinity (Chua & Fujino 1999).

Chua and Fujino went on to explain that American-born Asian men view their masculinity as not being in opposition to their femininity, exhibiting certain caring characteristics such as being polite and obedient, and willing to do domestic tasks (although to me, this latter point appears to reflect a somewhat traditionalist view of what ‘femininity’ might be about). 'Asian-American men hold the view that maleness can contain elements of masculinity and femininity ... a new formation, a more flexible masculinity.' The authors also exposed an opposing strategy, that being that Asian-American men continue to construct a hegemonic masculinity:

Asian-American men hold male privilege at the same time they are racially subordinated. Because of their subordinated position, some Asian-American men try to counter the effeminate image of Asian-American men by emulating hegemonic masculinities, which include dominance over women. Though they can engage in patriarchy and obtain male privileges, they find that racism eventually prevents them from fully copying White hegemonic masculinity (Chua & Fujino 1999).

In a parallel with statements made by Chug and Fujino (1999) and Wade (2001)—that is, that Asian-American masculinities are a neglected area of research—a similar situation exists in Australia. It is claimed that gender and race critiques in Australia tend not to directly address the positioning of Asian men or the issue of Asian
masculinity (Lo et al. 2000). This is exemplified in a text entitled *Masculinities and Identities*, in which Australian, David Buchbinder (1994), specifically excludes the issue of ethnic or racial difference in the construction of masculinity from his writing, his concern being 'the White Anglo (mostly middle-class) man' (p. x). Buchbinder rationalises this, saying:

This model of masculinity is the one held up persistently and powerfully in most English-speaking countries, in the distribution of social and political power as well as in the media, particularly in advertising. It is, therefore, likely to be familiar to others of whatever ethnic or racial background, and, precisely because of its pervasiveness and its power, deserves to be examined carefully and critically. How masculinity may be constructed according to ideologies of race or ethnicity and how masculinity is constructed in other cultures are important issues, but they are not dealt with here ... (p. x).

Despite Buchbinder’s assurances about the importance of race and ethnicity in the construction of masculinity, they are clearly not as important as that of ‘the White Anglo (mostly middle-class) man’. The masculinity of men from non-European backgrounds is being considered as ‘Other’; the existence of a racialized masculinity is clear.

The notable scarcity of literature in relation to Asian-Australian men—apart from important studies of the experiences of school-age students by people such as Connell (2000) and Plummer (1999)—suggests that more research needs to be done in order to better understand the complex inter-connectedness. Being able to listen to men who tell of their experiences and who share their truths, is an important step to unravelling some of the links. And in this task, I
share Ward’s (1996) sentiments: ‘… what I do want to hear is those real stories, what life has really [original emphasis] been like for men—and I feel privileged when I do’ (p. 203).

**CREATING A STORIED ACCOUNT**

The research itself was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, and as part of a larger research project considering male academics and their leadership practices, I came across Ian. He was referred to me via a snowball sampling method as being an appropriate person with whom to talk, and I came to realise that Ian was the only male in my sample that had a background other than Anglo. With his further permission, I then had a second discussion with him, but on this second occasion, it was not tape-recorded. I wanted to engage more directly with him and to speak as equals, the point in common being that we both come from ethnic backgrounds and we both work as academics.

The majority of the narrative is expressed in Ian's own words, which were recorded at the initial interview and expanded upon in the second discussion with him. Only a small section of the narrative represents paraphrasing, or my own crafting, to ensure the flow of the piece. Nevertheless, as faithful as I might try to be to Ian, two issues still remain: the narrative is an expression of his truths—truths not necessarily shared by others in the account, and the narrative is my representation of these truths—I have selected certain pieces of information and ignored others to put into this account.
Some Moments in Ian’s Life Story

We discover as we talk over our coffee, that we are of the same generation—born in the same year, in fact. He is a professor and head of a well-regarded and well-funded centre for professional development; I am a doctoral student and a lecturer on a small, rural campus. I’m very much in awe of this man: his reputation, his publications … him.

We are both a long way from our university campuses, and have taken advantage of a lull in the conference proceedings to have a talk. The initial meeting plus a few subsequent exchanges of e-mails had left me wondering about Ian’s life. I want to get to know this man a bit more, particularly how he saw the link between his ethnicity and his masculinity…

Here, then, is part of Ian’s life story…

‘You’re so bloody arrogant!’

These words rang in my ears as I bolted from the school detention room. Mr. Evans had turned his back at just the right time. Another couple of minutes and I would’ve been too late to catch the train back home. Trouble was, I didn’t know what ‘arrogant’ meant!

When I did get home, I told mum what had happened. Although she had sent me to the school on the advice of a priest—‘So that he can get some direction from the male teachers,’ he had said—she didn’t always understand what was going on. So it was with the word ‘arrogant’. In time, she consulted the Asian-English dictionary, and after flicking the pages for a while announced: ‘It’s OK. It’s something good!’ I suppose in the light of my Asian ancestry—being proud of who I am and so forth—it was a good thing. It certainly wasn’t such a good thing when I got back to
school the next morning!

Although mum was my sole parent, she taught me about how the men in my family would behave. She’d give me examples of the sorts of values they had. People like my uncles. I reckon I’d have made it in their eyes. I think I’ve probably lived out the Asian script—my family, my job, my position ... my car!

But school for me was just a huge waste of time. I mean, the school had such low expectations of me. The principal and the careers adviser, and all the others, told me I’d be wasting my time going to university. This was in my second-last year of school and I kept failing the exams. But somehow, I got into uni. You should’ve seen the looks on their faces! I went off and did an Arts degree. Really wished that I’d done sciences, but I’d done all the wrong subjects. Life was a lot of fun, after all. It wasn’t part of the working-class scene to put effort into scholarly pursuits.

School was about thirty minutes from home and although there was a convent school closer, the Catholic school lacked male teachers. This was back in the mid-sixties when I went to this school. I had some good mates from there, but they didn’t mix, or rather, I didn’t let them mix with my other mates, my Chinese-Australian friends. There would’ve been a huge punch-up! I just made sure that my Chinese friends didn’t hang out with my Australian friends. They were different and we had Asian functions which we went to which were not shared or overlapped with the Anglo ones. I did feel a bit in-between my two lots of friends, but by mixing with different groups, I picked up extra skills.

I was fairly isolated at home and part of the reason for that had to do with it was just my mother and myself. I’m Eurasian, you see. But the only jobs she could get where her English wasn’t a problem, was as a housekeeper at this huge place. We lived in a converted stable on this place with three acres of land. We had this kind of alienation from the Anglo community because we were an Asian family. We didn’t see that many people. And another reason why I didn’t ask people home was, you know, it was too much of a shock for most people. The manor house, it was huge and it had botanical gardens. So, my unusual circumstances meant that I spent a lot of time at home, so I used to devote myself to what was around, which was gardening and things like that. I used to grow my own vegetables and do all that sort of, that was a big thing in my childhood anyway. Until I hit teenage, then I joined a rock band and my life changed. Being in a rock band was just something that
working class boys did. Yeah. So, I think I chased my interests from those days.

I really can’t say which males had an influence on me as I grew up. I know there were a couple of priests who mattered a bit. You know, this is a question that my partner has asked me a few times, but I’m no closer to being able to provide an answer. I grew up in the 50s and 60s when Australia thought it didn’t have anybody but Anglo. Just sort of white-washed, literally white-washed everyone, you know. In the 50s the Aborigines were part of the Fauna and Flora Act, they weren’t even human beings. Asians were the yellow peril and they ran Chinese restaurants or market gardens and were hidden.

I now head a small centre of seven full and part-time staff. I always thought if I was ever in a position of power I would always make sure that the people I employed reflected the diversity of the city I was in. You know, I couldn’t believe it when this other person from the university once asked, “Why is it that all your secretaries have Asian names?” “It’s a mystery,” I said. “Maybe if we work out why your secretaries all have European names, we could perhaps work this out.” It seems to me, if we’re such a damn multicultural society, why am I being asked those types of questions? I can play and relate comfortably in the Anglo stream or discussion and be like them but at the end of the day, when it comes to my own areas, I do it my way.

Australia is a multicultural country, yet the middle class and the petit bourgeoisie—the PB—are more into the commodification of diversity, rather than treating it as a cultural issue. I always find the social sciences, you know, the traditional social sciences in Australia, are essentially left wing. They love to champion the working class. They won’t work with them—but they like to champion them. They don’t mind them running the student body, but it’s a different thing to work with people from the working class.

I was in my former department for six years, where just about everybody was White. There were thirty-two sociologists and I could not understand why everybody was largely White and largely Protestant. It didn’t seem reasonable to me. But I got to understand that in this city there is a certain culture among academics that lent themselves very easily to cultural reproduction. That’s not my own background. I’m from another city, where I think there is a much more, ironically much more, respect for
diversity, de facto—not deliberately—de facto because they’re much more achievement oriented. They really care about what you’ve done. In this city, the networks here take themselves awfully seriously and achievement would be a nice thing to have, it seems to me.

So, all of those things, you know, I find difficult, but I don’t have this problem in my own Unit because I control the parameters. I can play and relate comfortably in the Anglo stream or discussion and be like them but at the end of the day, when it comes to my own areas, I do it my way. And my way has to include a consideration about diversity. Has to. But I don’t mind if you don’t think about diversity. I have lived with that, for that attitude is so widespread, so common, you know. If I took umbrage at your narrowness, I wouldn’t be able to leave the house everyday. I only do what I do, you know. This is my area. In my area we all take this into account.

At the heart of the problem is an unwillingness for academics to challenge the reproduction of middle class and PB culture. I don’t think my colleagues elsewhere in the university are racist, but I do think that cultural reproduction is something that’s largely unexamined by a lot of people in the day-to-day management sense, except when it comes before them, when the government asks them to think about it, and they’ll think about it, you know.

I mean, the other day I was at a committee and we were talking about diversity issues, talking about problems international students have and you know, people suggesting maybe we ought to have a set of seminars and get the international students to come and talk about some of the problems that they encounter. And, I said “No, I don’t want to listen to fucking international students bag on about racism. What I want to hear is, I want to hear, bring the White students in. I want to hear the White students tell me how they’re not, how they’re dealing with the whole problem of unconsciously reproducing their own values and friendships and networks and excluding people who are not like them. I want to know how they’re dealing with that.” I would rather invite the university cricket team here than the international students. If we keep dividing the colours, it’s always ‘blame the victim’ stuff. We’ll keep concentrating on the victim. I don’t want to see any international students. I want to see the Whites; the problem is the fucking Whites! We don’t have to, you know, ask a band of Aborigines here to find out what the problem is. The problems are ours. Let’s look at what we’re doing. It’s just about critical self-reflection.
There’s great tension isn’t there between giving recognition, the important recognition of diversity by appointing somebody to be in charge of it. But by doing that you don’t have to worry about it, so in a way you’re ghettoizing it. A problem. On the other hand, if you mainstream it, perhaps you don’t give it the time and resources it needs, so there’s always that paradox it seems to me. And I don’t know what the answer is … I think you have to bear in mind that the senior management see themselves as corporate leaders. They’ve got a helluva lot on their agenda and they’re not particularly internal focused. So, if these are not things which they think about. If they’re going to think about it they create positions for someone to think about it … If I felt for a moment that they had a problem relating to anybody who is not Anglo, I would be estranged. I would not have a working relationship because I would withdraw. But, I don’t feel that way about the senior management.

I don’t see myself as an advocate either. I’m playing the national script. Either you believe the national script or you don’t. I’m so happy about Australian multicultural policy after living though the 50s and 60s, that I’m in it. I’m in to this and so anything I do, if it’s wrong in any way, or sits funny, then I think you’ve got a problem with national policy. Because I’m not doing anything that the government of the day, at state or federal level, isn’t endorsing.

A lot of my senior colleagues that I’m friends with are actually women. Some of my problem trying to think of other men is that you know, I’ve got male colleagues who are really collegial to me, senior to me, genuine and really collegial to me, but I know from friends who tell me about interactions when they relate to junior staff, that they relate differently.

I think the whole issue of cultural reproduction is a problem for academics, generally. You see this in the kind of long history of gender problems that the institution has, but that’s the tip of the iceberg. I mean that is literally the tip of the iceberg. I’d rather be a woman than anything else, you know, when it comes to this issue. As far as race relations are concerned, we’re nowhere near where the feminists think that women are, nowhere near.

I don’t talk this way to my academic colleagues or senior management. But what I think you’ve got to understand, that the key issue with the senior management, is a substantial number of them come from working class backgrounds, and so do I. And that’s where we have a connection in a cultural sense, but they’re
Anglo and they’re basically men, so beyond that … when you’re from a working class background and you’re a man and you’re Anglo, the race relations stuff and the gender stuff is the stuff you understand least, or have the least interest in, it seems to me. And I don’t talk this way with my academic colleagues outside of my unit, because they don’t have the ability to thrash around the ideas. They take it personally and would probably target me because of it.

I haven’t really written about gender. Haven’t thought a great deal about it, but when it comes to masculinity, I think it’s as much to do with class as with ethnicity. The middle class use a lot of words to say a little, but the working class say a few words to mean a lot.

And I’ve survived, and I do that because there’s a sharp division between my work life and my home life. But, that’s easy for someone with my Asian background, because there’s always a sharp distinction between work and home. And as an Asian family I grew up with my, in my household, there was a sharp division between public life and private life. The public life was the Anglo world and the private life was really an Asian world.

**DISCUSSION**

This narrative—a brief glimpse into a time in Ian’s life—raises pertinent issues, amongst them the following:

- The role of his mother in teaching him about how males behave;
- Alienation from the Anglo community, yet an ability to engage with it;
- Personal access to power;
- Challenging cultural reproduction;
In considering these issues, I will utilise a ‘soft’ feminist poststructuralist perspective (Alvesson & Billing 1997). Rather than interpreting Ian’s narrative from a detailed analysis of Ian’s discourse—remembering that it is partly my own construction—I will be considering the imprecise relationships between his language and social reality.

High amongst these issues is the relationship between Ian and his mother. Whereas it is not extraordinary for working class boys to be close to their mothers—Mac an Ghaill (1994), for instance, reveals a number of disclosures made to him by some of the working class boys about their emotional closeness to their mothers—Ian was not only reliant on his mother to help him with his schooling, but also for providing guidance on the masculine ways of men in his family. This task presumably falls to many mothers, whether parenting alone or with a male partner, and in this sense, Ian’s mother adopted a strategic role in the development of his understandings of gender roles (Blackmore 1993b). Her task would have been quite complex, I imagine, for she needed to rely on her recollections of the males in her family—Ian’s uncles—whilst in an Anglo environment surrounded by priests. That she appears able to teach Ian about his ethnic masculinity, whilst in an environment surrounded by potentially colonising influences, did much, it seems, to provide her son with an ability to engage separately with his Chinese-Australian friends and his ‘Anglo ones’.
Whereas this contributed to Ian’s feelings of in-betweeness, a feeling also articulated by Lo (2000) it appears to have set him up well for his interactions with the hard-nosed masculinities evident in the senior management of his universities. The version of hegemonic masculinity within the senior management enclave is different to the version of hegemonic masculinity (Collinson & Hearn 1996; Hearn 1996) that exists within Ian’s own Unit. It seems that it is less of a matter of being suppressed because of his ‘Otherness’ (Moodley 1999), but more of an ability to respond differently in different contexts; there is sameness, yet there is difference:

On the one hand, men often seem to collaborate, cooperate and identify with one another in ways that reinforce a shared unity between them; but on the other hand, these same masculinities can also be characterized simultaneously by conflict, competition and self-differentiation in ways that highlight and intensify the differences and divisions between men (Collinson & Hearn 1996, p. 72).

Ian can play by their rules when he needs to ‘… but at the end of the day, when it comes to my own areas, I do it my way’.

Doing it his own way has become a priority for Ian, as he reveals in the way he talks about the Unit of which he is head. He has been able to live out his desire that if he ‘was ever in a position of power’, there are certain things he would do, such as employing what he sees as a truly diverse group of people, one that is representative of the city in which he lives. To do this, Ian employs several strategies: he calls on the ‘national script’ of multiculturalism to support his employment strategies; he challenges the cultural reproduction emanating from a White, Protestant
hegemony that he sees being responsible for the commodification of
diversity, and if all else fails, uses his position of power and
influence (because of all the funds he attracts) within his
university’s hierarchy to declare: ‘I control the parameters … I do it
my way … This is my area.’ Ian’s awareness of his worth to his
university and his insights as a fellow ‘working-class boy’ into the
ways that his senior managers operate (and the simple language
that he says they understand), means that he is able to act
strategically when it suits him. This ‘strategic masculinity’, as
Blackmore (1999) has termed it, suggests that Ian is capable of a
range of masculine behaviours, yet he remains able to access
various gender-based power relations. Further, Ian is not afraid of
being ostracised, for he was brought up with ‘a kind of alienation
from the Anglo community’.

It is noteworthy that although Ian attended a school with male
teachers and had both Anglo and Chinese male friends, he says he
did not have a conscious relationship with any of these males as
providing a psychological reference point for him (consider here
Wade 2001). His comment that he learnt to socialise with lots of
different people as a result, causes me to consider that he did have
some level of connection, and it is worth at least reflecting that this
might characterise the ‘sense of commonality … connectedness, and
identification with various types or images of males’ (Wade 2001).
And because Wade sees such men as not being dependent on a
male reference group, he considers that they are flexible in their
gender role self-concept. Evidence that Ian draws on different
expressions of masculinities in his life—such as relying on his
mother to assist his understanding of his world; his various modes
of being with his childhood mates; mixing with the males (of
working class background) in his university’s senior management; his forceful challenging of cultural reproduction at the committee level and his assertive approach to ensuring diversity in his workplace—suggests that he is able to ‘tap into’ different ways of being a male, which is consistent with Wade’s description of Reference Group Non-dependent males. For men who are not dependent on a reference group for the development of their male identity ‘[this] allows for an acceptance and possibly an appreciation of differences, in particular with regard to race, gender, and gender roles’ (Wade 2001).

Ian’s experience of school seems to have been uninspired, yet it was a period that he recalls was lots of fun. The complex combination of what happens in specific school contexts, such as the staffroom, classrooms, and play-grounds, writes Mac an Ghaill (1994), contributes to the development of what he calls a school masculinity, and Ian would have been subject to the various power plays taking place at school. Consider, for instance, the way he felt he was being viewed when he dared to apply for university entry. The school was functioning as a 'masculinity-making device' (Connell 2000), in which messages were being conveyed about the value of scholarly activity. And Ian had received these messages loud and clear: ‘It wasn’t part of the working-class scene to put effort into scholarly pursuits.’

Being part of a rock band was something of a rite of passage for the working class Ian, and this could be viewed as an expression of ‘protest masculinity’ (Connell 1995). The genesis of protest masculinity, writes Connell, arises from …the childhood experience of powerlessness, and resulting in an exaggerated claim to the potency that European culture attaches to
masculinity … Through interaction in this milieu, the growing boy puts together a tense, freaky facade, making a claim to power where there are no real resources for power. There is a lot of concern with face, a lot of work put into keeping up a front (p. 111).

Ian’s concern with face, evident in his comment about having ‘lived out the Asian script’ because of how he had ‘made it in their eyes’, attests to Ian seeing his masculinity as a form of protest.

In his current professional life, Ian expresses an ease in his relationships with the men in senior management (perhaps because of the fact that he identifies with their working class roots), as well as a preparedness to take issue on matters that he sees as being important. Ian provides an insight into why it is that his senior managers unquestioningly reproduce middle class cultures. Says Ian, ‘… when you’re a man and you’re Anglo, the race relations stuff and the gender stuff is the stuff you understand least, or have the least interest in …’. This observation is supported by Yeatman (1993)—these may be attempts to uphold the fratriarchal social order.

It is difficult to know the extent to which Ian is able to effect change within his institution. Klinck and Allard (1994) held out hope that the group of male academics with whom they worked would be able to change what they saw as the masculinist culture of their university, but after exposure to literature and discussions in a training program, their group of men saw themselves neither as agents for change, nor in need of change. Ian, however, seems well placed to at least challenge the thinking: he is valuable to the organisation, he understands the issues of diversity, he has access
to senior management, and he knows that ‘the working class say a few words to mean a lot’. He knows, too, there is need for change, but whether he is a change agent remains a moot point. He might be a ‘core marginal’ (Yeatman 1993), but Ian seems disinclined to address these concerns outside of his unit for fear of becoming a target: ‘I don’t talk this way to my academic colleagues or senior management’. He does, however rail hard about the issue on one of the committees of which he is a member, and which is concerned with diversity issues. Ian, here, is on safe territory—he is amongst others who are also concerned about diversity (albeit with a different emphasis, perhaps), but these people are thinking about the issues, unlike his senior managers. A feminist approach to gaining equity through change, argues Blackmore (1995a),

Would require developing alliances based on substantive education and social justice issues with those groups of men equally excluded and marginalised by dominant forms of masculinity (pp. 53-54).

Ian being on ‘safe territory’ may be one explanation for him choosing when to raise the issue of race, although this explanation has a colonialist air about it: why don’t the minorities speak up? It may well be, as Moreton-Robinson (2000) argues, that Ian’s senior managers are able to position race as being extraneous, thereby removing it from their discourse. In this way, Ian is forced to suppress (his) race to become ‘one of the guys’, as it were; he is able to identify with their working class roots and their maleness, but race is removed as a marker of difference.

Although Ian may be unable to have race feature in his dealings with senior management, he is being an active member of an alliance, and in this way, has the potential to affect a small amount
of change—at least, this is how it seems! Ian, when specifically addressing the issue of gender and ethnicity, points out that whereas feminists have advanced the situation for women in universities, race is largely unchartered territory. His comment that he’d ‘rather be a woman than anything else, you know, when it comes to this issue’ is profound. To Ian, it seems that whereas women have been able to benefit from the insights into power relations based on gender as a result of feminist scholarship, the same cannot be said for insights into race. This concern is further compounded when one considers Ian’s privileged position—one in which he has been able to move beyond his working class roots. It is indeed a complex dynamic of race, gender and class (Connell 1989; 1995; Wade 2001).

CONCLUSION

In this analysis of Ian’s Story, it is possible to make links with some of the literature that exists in relation to masculinities as well as ethnicity and race. I suspect that ‘the romanticism of white male academics’ one-dimensional representations of white working-class masculinities’ as Mac an Ghaill (1994) expresses it, has been challenged in the telling of Ian’s story, but as Mac an Ghaill also cautioned several years ago, care needs to be taken so as not to compartmentalise, or separate out, different masculinities. Although Mac an Ghaill was speaking of oppression in the following quotation, his advice could easily be applied to attempts to understand the links between ethnicity and masculinities:

In a decompartmentalized policy approach, there has been a tendency to conceptualise gender as something to do with women, sexuality as something to do with lesbians and gays, and ‘race’ as
having something to do with black people ... Rather, we need to think of complex sets of oppression in terms of how they operate, within specific institutional arenas, in terms of the ‘politics of difference’ located within relations of dominance and subordination (Mac an Ghaill 1994).

Connell (1995), too, cautions against over-simplification of any discussion of masculinities. There are multiple masculinities, he says:

… black as well as white, working-class as well as middle-class … It is easy in this framework to think that there is a [original emphasis] black masculinity or a working-class masculinity. To recognize more than one kind of masculinity is only a first step. We have to examine the relations between them. Further, we have to unpack the milieux of class and race and scrutinize the gender relations operating within them (Connell 1995).

As Ian himself said, ‘when it comes to masculinity, I think it’s as much to do with class as with ethnicity’. He claims he may have not thought much about it, (though his comment that his partner occasionally asks him questions about it would indicate otherwise), but Ian’s perspective resonates with the theorising that has occurred to date; that is, that a complex interaction exists around class, gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, disability and age.

Ian’s story has been a pertinent example that highlights the complexity of these linkages and the tensions that exist and are consistent with Riggins’ (1997) observations of ‘Others’: ‘practically invisible if they conform outwardly and rebel inwardly’ (pp. 5-6). He is a man who is in a powerful and influential position, yet he is strategic in the way he operates, for he operates differently in some
settings than he does in others. He has access to male privilege—and exercises this privilege—though he is racially subordinate (Chua & Fujino 1999), and he is able to have multiple identities in his private and public lives.

To try to deconstruct the different aspects of Ian’s life would not necessarily assist in better understanding the complex interrelationships between masculinity, class and gender, and it may have the effect, as Hearn (1996) cautions, of reducing his masculinity to some sort of popular ideology, which might then be used to evaluate its appropriateness or otherwise. Moving instead, as I have done here, to provide a narrative that tells of one man and his actions, is a means of acknowledging ‘men’s practices’ and ‘men’s social relations’ (Hearn 1996). Ian’s story, not unlike everyone’s story, is complex. Trying to understand how it all pieces together could lead, in this instance, to speculation about the respective roles of class, ethnicity and gender. Regardless of the interaction of these issues, and for that matter, the story that Ian told and the way that I have represented it, when it is all said and done, Ian is Ian …
PART F

EPILOGUE
**PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE OF EDUCATION**

The Professional Doctorate of Education is ‘primarily oriented to investigating, developing and extending educational practice’ (Faculty of Education Research and Graduate Studies 1999), and is comprised of studies that extend and supplement candidates’ existing levels of professional expertise. The content of the EdD is a balance of structured research tasks and supervised research and there is an emphasis on the working practices of research, such as lodging applications for ethics approval, making conference presentations that use referees, and submitting papers to academic and professional journals.

The chronology of my candidature in the EdD is as follows:

- **February 2000:** Commencement of studies;
- **February 2001:** Submission of proposal and oral colloquium;
- **March 2001:** Completion of first elective;
- **July 2001:** Presentation at postgraduate students’ seminar at La Trobe University detailing EdD work-in-progress;
- **December 2001:** Completion of second elective and conference presentation;
- **December 2002:** Completion of third elective and conference presentation, and
- **June 2003:** Submission of folio for examination.
In this, the final section of the thesis, my intention is to conclude by doing two things. The first of these is to reflect upon the various research projects that I have initiated and to then consider the personal implications of the research in light of my own professional practice.

**CONTEMPLATING THE RESEARCH**

Initiated by my interest in the relationships between gender and leadership, during the course of the EdD I have undertaken four related research projects. They have all largely been curiosity-driven, though at the outset I had no conscious intention of pursuing narrative research as the method for gathering and representing data.

A further unexpected outcome was the engagement with multiple bodies of knowledge. Collectively, I have become immersed in literatures that relate to higher education, leadership and management, gender, self and identity, coping and self-care, ethnicity, social justice and computer-mediated communication.

The research tasks evolved as I explored the broader topic of gender and leadership, but having my supervisors—Dr Jill Blackmore and Dr Cherry Collins—prompt me and suggest potential areas of inquiry has been a useful process. Becoming preoccupied with a single, large piece of research would have potentially limited my ability to see the interconnectedness between various issues, so being forced to research related areas has certainly been a valuable exercise for me.
Whereas at the outset of my candidature I felt neither confident nor literate in the conduct of research, I feel as though I have been able to substantially reframe the way I consider research and my role in it. No longer does it seem to be an artificial hurdle that has to be crossed in an academic’s life. Rather, I now consider it an integral process in the life of an academic, and something that adds to the development of scholarly identity formation.

Understanding how I can make a contribution to the academic community, and by ensuring my own well-being in the process, has become the driving force behind the various elements in this folio.

I consider that I have found at least some answers to each of the questions that I posed for myself. The lingering concern that I have is in relation to the subjectivity of the concept of masculinity(ies) and the possibilities of how this could be researched more thoroughly. Perhaps a way for me to pursue it further in the future might be to consider in much more detail the relationships between language, masculinity(ies) and male power as Whitehead (1999) suggests and to explore this through the discourses of academics’—males and females—practices. By concentrating on male academics as I have, I better realise the complexity of gender relationships that exist and feel much more informed about how little sense it actually makes to consider males in isolation.
**Implications for My Professional Practice**

The journey through the research projects, including engagement with the various literatures mentioned above, has enabled me to investigate areas of professional interest. The journey has also informed my teaching practice, but more significantly, I have had an opportunity to critically reflect on my own practice.

As well as becoming much more literate about the subtleties of research and the rigour required to be able to interpret it, the study continues to inform my professional practice. And I use the word ‘continues’ quite deliberately, for I know whilst I was developing the literature review for this dissertation and for the two conference papers I delivered that form part of the folio, I was able to incorporate various insights into my own university teaching. I know too, that the men’s comments in relation to the lack of relevance of training in leadership and management will influence my on-going teaching, to the extent that I shall persevere to find different—and perhaps insurgent—ways of facilitating my students’ learning.

One of the most profound aspects that I have reflected upon particularly during the latter part of the dissertation has been my role in the generation of discourses around gender. Rather than either avoiding the topic or broaching it in very tentative terms with my colleagues and students, I feel that I now have an additional dimension to my “voice” due to my increased understanding of how gender works in organisations. Although I do not envisage that I will adopt an evangelical approach, I am now more mindful of discourses and the explicit and subtle controlling
devices inherent in them. It is time, I think, to acknowledge the
impact of my “voice”.

A further insight that I have gained into our universities is being
able to see them as sites that are not only gendered, but which
support cultural reproduction, rather than challenging it. The
dissertation and the research electives have enabled me to hear
accounts of men’s experiences within these sites and to learn
something about how they challenge the cultural reproduction that
occurs. Alas, for some it is merely rhetoric and their academic
identity is shaped more by what they say than what they actually
do.

My personal challenge, therefore, is to ensure that not only do I
speak with my new-found voice, but that I also act.
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