LEADERS IN GENDER AND EDUCATION

LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Volume 4

Series Editor:

Leonard J. Waks
Temple University, Philadelphia, USA

Scope:

Leaders in Educational Studies provides a comprehensive account of the transformation of educational knowledge since 1960, based on rich, first-person accounts of the process by its acknowledged leaders.

The series provides unique insights into the formation of the knowledge base in education, as well as a birds-eye view of contemporary educational scholarship.

The initial volume, *Leaders in Philosophy of Education: Intellectual Self Portraits*, contains personal essays by 24 leading philosophers of education from North America and the United Kingdom. The second volume, *Leaders in Curriculum Studies: Intellectual Self-Portraits,* contains similar essays by 18 leading curriculum scholars. The volume on historians of American education contains essays by 25 leaders in this field. The current volume on gender and education has essays from 16 leaders from the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia. Volumes on other fields of educational scholarship are now being prepared.

Until the 1950s school teachers were trained for the most part in normal schools or teacher training colleges. The instructors were drawn from the teacher corps; they were not professional scholars. Those offering classes in so-called 'foundational disciplines' in education were not trained in these disciplines. Educational scholarship was generally weak and cut off from contemporary work in the so-called 'parent' disciplines. Professors relied on textbooks featuring out-of-date, dumbed-down knowledge.

In the late 1950s plans were made to bring a higher level of professionalism to school teaching. In the United States, the remaining normal schools initially became state colleges, and eventually state universities. In the United Kingdom, the training colleges were initially brought under the supervision of university institutes; eventually teaching was transformed into an all-graduate profession.

Commentators on both sides of the Atlantic argued that if education was to become a proper field of university study, educational scholarship itself would have to be transformed. Scholars were recruited into educational studies from social sciences and humanities disciplines to contribute to teacher education and to train a new generation of educational scholars in contemporary research methods.

Under their influence the knowledge base for education has been completely transformed. In addition to major accomplishments in philosophy, history, sociology and economics of education, interdisciplinary work in educational studies has flourished. The series documents this transformation.

Leaders in Gender and Education

Intellectual Self-Portraits

Edited by

Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower
University of North Dakota, USA

and

Christine Skelton
University of Birmingham, UK

SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM / BOSTON / TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-94-6209-303-4 (paperback)
ISBN 978-94-6209-304-1 (hardback)
ISBN 978-94-6209-305-8 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, The Netherlands
https://www.sensepublishers.com/

Cover illustration by Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower

Printed on acid-free paper

For Harrison and Evelyn Weaver-Hightower, with the hope
that they will see the fruits of these scholars' work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SERIES EDITOR'S PREFACE

The aim of the LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES series is to document the rise of educational scholarship in the years after 1960, a period of astonishing growth and accomplishment, as seen through the eyes of its leading practitioners.

A few words about the build up to this period are in order. Before the mid-twentieth century school teaching, especially at the primary level, was as much a trade as a profession. Schoolteachers were trained primarily in normal schools or teachers colleges, only rarely in universities. But in the 1940s American normal schools were converted into teachers colleges, and in the 1960s these were converted into state universities. At the same time school teaching was being transformed into an all-graduate profession in both the United Kingdom and Canada. For the first time, school teachers required a proper university education.

Something had to be done, then, about what was widely regarded as the deplorable state of educational scholarship. James Conant, in his final years as president at Harvard in the early 1950s, envisioned a new kind of university-based school of education, drawing scholars from mainstream academic disciplines such as history, sociology psychology and philosophy, to teach prospective teachers, conduct educational research, and train future educational scholars. One of the first two professors hired to fulfil this vision was Israel Scheffler, a young philosopher of science and language who had earned a Ph.D. in philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. Scheffler joined Harvard's education faculty in 1952. The other was Bernard Bailyn, who joined the Harvard faculty in 1953 after earning his Ph.D. there, and who re-energized the study of American educational history with the publication of *Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study* (University of North Carolina Press, 1960). The series has been exceptionally fortunate that Scheffler provided a foreword to the volume on philosophy of education, and that Bernard Bailyn provided a foreword for the volume on the history of American education.

The LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES continues to document the growing and changing literature in educational studies. Studies conducted within the established academic disciplines of history, philosophy, and sociology comprised the dominant trend throughout the 1960s and 1970s. By the 1980s educational studies diversified considerably, in terms of both new sub-disciplines within these established disciplines and new interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary fields. Curriculum studies drew extensively from work in philosophy, history and sociology of education, as is demonstrated by the chapters in the volume *Leaders in Curriculum Studies* that Edmund Short and I edited for the series. Work in these disciplines, and also in anthropology and cultural studies among others, also stimulated new perspectives on race, class and gender.

This volume brings together 16 personal essays by established leaders in gender studies, the field interrogating forms of masculinity and femininity and their presentation in schools and society. All of the authors write from explicitly

feminist or pre-feminist positions, as (in the words of Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower and Christine Skelton, the co-editors) "gender and education as a field owes its very existence to feminist activism and struggle." It would be a gross understatement to say that serious academic studies of gender in education were under-developed prior to the 1970s. The authors, many founders of the field, detail early life experiences, first encounters with academic work and gender studies, periods of formative study and early professional work, emergence as leaders, development of mature work, and reflections on the current challenges and opportunities in the field.

Previous volumes in the series have featured leaders primarily from North America and the United Kingdom. This volume includes more authors from Australia than elsewhere, both because that country has produced stimulating work in this field and because the co-editors had greater success in obtaining chapters from leaders there. As usual, I do not make any claim as general editor that the volume presents *the* leaders in the field, but only a selection of acknowledged leaders, from whose lives and works readers can obtain a bottom-up view of its development.

Subsequent volumes in the series will attend to other emerging sub-disciplines and inter-disciplines as well as to fields of curriculum, instruction and teacher education that have been influenced by the 'new educational scholarship' emerging after 1960.

Leonard J. Waks
Temple University
General Editor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book represents the hard work of many people. These include the authors of the chapters, of course, who gave generously of their time and efforts, sometimes under the most extraordinary circumstances. Behind the scenes, though, many others deserve much thanks. Leonard Waks, the series editor, has been both generous and patient with this book's creation, and he deserves thanks for inventing the series, as well, which has provided insight into the foundations of education in the latter half of the 20th and first part of the 21st centuries. Peter de Liefde, the founder and owner of Sense Publishers, has been similarly kind in the creation of the book. Marcus' doctoral student, Yuliya Kartoshkina, deserves much thanks for her research assistance throughout the project, finding articles, proofing chapters, and more. Marcus also thanks his wife, Rebecca, for her steadfast patience and her invariably diplomatic, wise advice; without her, none of this would be possible.

MARCUS B. WEAVER-HIGHTOWER & CHRISTINE SKELTON

GENDER AND EDUCATION: AN INTRODUCTION TO SOME LEADERS IN THE FIELD

The personal is political. It is a slogan that came to define feminist thought in the latter half of the 20th Century. Its provenance is not clear; Carol Hanisch is often given credit based on her 1970 article of that name, but even she says someone else said it first (Hanisch, 2006). Even so, the phrase "the personal is political" wonderfully summarizes an approach to feminist thought that relies on personal experience to problematize the workings of power and domination. The personal serves as a starting point for exploring the workings of power, a means of provoking activism in those who have experienced gendered oppression. For Hanisch and others, the phrase was used as a defense of women's consciousness raising groups of the 1960s and 70s, a rebuttal of the dismissive claim that these were simply "therapy." Others, like Canadian sociologist Dorothy E. Smith (e.g., 1987; Griffith & Smith, 2005), expanded that mantra to a basis for research methods, focusing on the lived experience of women—in Smith's case the "everyday world" of mothers who do much of the (unpaid) work of schooling children—as an entry into the social and structural problematics that shape and constrain women's lives.

"The personal is political" also defines the chief contribution of this book, *Leaders in Gender and Education: Intellectual Self-Portraits*. In this collection are the personal stories that underpin the political and intellectual lives of the scholars that both have defined (and *will* define) the study of gender in education around much of the world since the 1960s. Here these feminist and pro-feminist scholars tell the stories of how they became who they are, and they show how their intellectual and political stances have been shaped through their lives.[1]

We believe, as editors, that such personal stories are crucial to understanding the political nature of what we know and understand about gender and its impacts on education. If we take seriously the position that knowledge is socially constructed (e.g., Gergen, 1999) and that it is shot through with discourses and power relations (e.g., Foucault, 1972), then we must attend to the lived experiences—both of agency and of structures—of those who have constructed the scholarly fields we inhabit. Bob Lingard, in his essay for this volume, puts the point nicely:

> Recognising the nature of the sociological will help me overcome my own tentativeness about why anyone would be interested in my specific intellectual journey and positioning in respect of gender issues, specifically gender equity issues in education. The only interest I can imagine that readers might have in this narrative is my attempt to locate my educational and intellectual biography against changing structures and the effluxion of time.

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 1–13.

In this book, then, are the *intellectual self-portraits*—series editor Leonard Waks's far finer and more fitting name than the prosaic term "autobiography"—penned by 16 scholars who have had significant impact on gender and education research. All of the authors were tasked to describe the field of gender and education as they entered it, explore their own bodies of work and key ideas in the context of their changing professional lives, and posit the main intellectual and institutional issues facing the field today. In doing so the contributors have given readers an unparalleled view on the field's history, their own personal journeys in- and outside of the academy, and a sense of what may be next for future generations of scholars—the unfinished business of our field.

NOTES ON SELECTION

Because this book seeks, on one hand, to assert one possible vision of the field of gender and education, and, on the other hand, to fete those who have made an impact on a field of knowledge, divulging how we selected contributors seems appropriate. We come with full awareness that had we chosen differently we might dramatically change how the field is presented to readers. All scholarly endeavors must set up boundaries, though, and here is how we did it.

Most importantly, the scholars in this book all work from (pro)feminist perspectives, representing many forms of feminisms (Skelton & Francis, 2009; Weiner, 1994). Many academics and non-academics alike publish on gender, certainly, but not all can be counted as feminist or pro-feminist. We have not, for example, sought contributions from antifeminist or masculinist writers, many of whom have authored widely read and highly lucrative "backlash blockbusters" (Mills, 2003), particularly since the explosion of interest in boys' education starting in the 1990s (Weaver-Hightower, 2003). These backlash authors are certainly part of the landscape of gender studies in education—many with tremendous influence on both policy and practice (Weaver-Hightower, 2008)—but relatively few have chosen to publish in peer-reviewed journals and other scholarly forums as have our contributors. More than this, though, we eschew non-feminist scholars because gender and education as a field owes its very existence to feminist activism and struggle—the struggle to obtain degrees, to get hired, to publish, to teach, to serve communities, to get tenure, to develop academic programs, to create journals, to hold conferences, to forge a coherent field, all within male-dominated institutions—and that feminist history we both honor and seek to learn from in this volume.

Secondly, we wanted to equally represent scholars working from three regions: the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States, and Australia; these are the countries from which the vast majority of scholarship on gender issues written in English has been produced. We are aware, though, that much wonderful theoretical and practical research has been produced by scholars in and from other countries (see Connell, 2008)—indeed, some of the scholars herein originally hail from these countries and moved to our three focal regions. Moreover, many of the scholars

herein have worked, lived and researched outside of their country of origin, making them interconnected in ways that eschew the political boundaries of country.

Third, we wanted representation from scholars in different stages of their careers. While this illuminates something about faculty development and career stages, a more important historical understanding might be gained from this. As Yates (2008, p. 474) provocatively argues, "Becoming a feminist in the 1970s was different from becoming a feminist in the 1990s." The experiences shared by our contributors support this point.

Fourth, we purposely chose scholars who were working at varied levels of education, including primary, secondary, higher, and adult education, whether within or beyond formal schooling. Primary and secondary school researchers are perhaps better represented in these pages, partly due to the more recent start of the sociology of higher education (Gumport, 2007) and partly due to our own personal backgrounds as editors. We believe, however, that looking to scholars across the sectors of schooling illuminates important dynamics of gender that change according to individuals' developmental and institutional differences. Furthermore, scholars working on different sectors are privy to different conversations among their peers, and hearing about those insights can be illuminating to all readers.

Similarly, we sought scholars who explore differing aspects of gender and education, as well as those from differing theoretical, methodological, and rhetorical orientations. Within the collection are those who have at various times focused on femininity, masculinity, sexuality, social class, race, ethnicity, religion, high performers, low performers, teachers and professors, learners, administrators, policy, curriculum, pedagogy, special education, sports, romantic relationships, and on and on. Further, these scholars started in and/or inhabit sociology, anthropology, history, comparative and international education, educational policy studies, curriculum and instruction, research methods, and more. They use the theories and methods of qualitative research, quantitative research, discourse analysis, single-subject designs, longitudinal designs, postmodern theory, poststructural theory, neo-Marxism, critical theory, queer theory, critical race theory, and many more. The writing styles evident in the collection mirror the practices and fashions of these many disciplines and methods. We believe that these intellectual and disciplinary diversities have been an integral part of the strength and successes of gender and education as a field, and we worked hard to maintain a balance of these.

Putting together a collection like this also presents personal and political challenges, fraught as it is with the dangers of exclusion. As a number of the contributors confess, many (pro)feminist theorists flinch at the practice of foregrounding leaders and at leaving out allies; it goes against the egalitarian underpinnings of much feminist thought. Thus, we want to stress that we do not in any way suggest that these are the *only* or even *most* influential gender and education researchers. This is not an attempt to create a canon, and we certainly see gaps ourselves. Many will look at the table of contents and wonder why they or (if they are charitable) their friend or favorite theorist was not included. Many will also see that certain intersectional identities are not well represented. We ourselves are most disappointed that Black feminisms are not directly presented—though

issues of race, postcoloniality, and other key issues brought into our scholarly conversations by Black feminisms arise throughout. To readers concerned about these admittedly crucial issues, we should point out that many more scholars were asked to contribute than could. Some could not fit it into their schedules or the exigencies of their personal lives; some felt they were not worthy of inclusion; some never answered our invitation. Some of those who were never formally invited may have actually made the short list but were decided against because we were trying to balance the criteria listed above. We hope all who were unjustly left out will pardon us.

CHARTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER AND EDUCATION

For us editors, constructing a volume like this conjures fascinating "data" about the development of gender and education in Anglophone countries over the past half century. These 16 essays are like a collection of autoethnographies (Ellis & Bochner, 2003) more so than autobiographies, for all the contributors submit their personal backgrounds for scrutiny using the same social science and humanities lenses that they use in their research. The collation of these individual portraits, then, builds a larger ethnography of a group of scholars, advocates, and activists. By looking across the contributors' individual stories—narratives of family, schooling, struggle, research, collaboration, protest, policymaking, teaching, politics, administration, and learning—readers discover the larger collective histories of feminisms that have shaped the foundational studies of education since the 1960s.

We can hardly even *partially* tell the histories of multiple countries over half a century given the limitations of this short introduction (for fuller views see, e.g., Skelton & Francis, 2009; Weiler & David, 2008). And, naturally, the development of feminism (and, later, pro-feminism) in education research has both obvious and subtle differences across the countries surveyed. Context matters a great deal, as the contributors illustrate through their own intellectual, political, and personal trajectories. Yet there are similarities in gender and education research across the world, so some general outlines of the history of the field might aid readers' understanding of the essays to come.

The formal study of gender and education—that is, the development of courses, certificates and degrees, departments, programs, journals and conferences—got its start in the early 1970s. Yet concern about gender in education had been going on for well over two centuries by then, spawned early in the European Enlightenment as education became imbricated with the hopes of democratic citizenship (Freedman, 2002, Chapter 3). Early debates were on the suitability of females to be formally educated—usually questioning their physical abilities—and, later, on whether they could be educated in the same classrooms as males. While such debates happened in all the countries represented in this volume, the American physician Edward Clarke perhaps best illustrates the 19th century view. His *Sex in Education, or, A Fair Chance for Girls* (1873) worried that girls' "catamenial functions" (their reproductive capabilities) would be harmed by being put on the

same educational schedule as boys, a "persistent" model. Girls, he opined, should instead practice a schedule of "periodicity" that would see them learning—separately from males, of course—for only three weeks a month (see also Spender, 1987). Despite such arguments, coeducation and the general participation of girls in basic schooling and in higher education continued to steadily increase—as often for logistical and economic reasons as for equity's sake—across the century following.

Increasing enrollment and coeducation, of course, do not mean that education was becoming equitable for males and females (and even less so when racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic intersectionalities are considered). By the advent of second-wave feminist examination of education in the 1960s and 70s, schools still presented very different experiences to males and females. Explicit segregation defined formal schooling, in both curricular offerings (e.g., shop class *vs.* home economics; general *vs.* advanced math; segregated physical education) and in extracurricular activities. The "hidden curriculum" (Jackson, 1968; Lobban, 1975) of gender, too—from what and who were left out of lessons, who was called on in class and how, who was disciplined and how, and even how students interacted in the lunchroom or the playground (e.g., Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Thorne, 1993)—structured the realities and possibilities of schooling for students and educators.

As the new field of women's studies grew alongside second-wave feminist movements around the world in the late 1960s and early 1970s (e.g., Boxer, 1998), educational inequalities received increasing attention. Feminist thinking on education grew rapidly in the 1970s and cross-pollinated globally with the publication of pioneering books and reports uncovering sexism in schools. In Australia there was the commonwealth government report *Girls, Schools and Society* (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1975), which led to a series of policies for girls' schooling (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, pp. 45-52). In England, Byrne (1978) and Deem (1978) wrote influentially about the issues women faced in education. And in the United States, Sadker and Frazier (1973) illuminated what sexism was doing to girls in the nation's schools, while others had begun to show how textbooks presented girls with limiting sex roles (e.g., Women on Words and Images, 1972).

The early years of the academic study of gender and education were characterized by struggle for acceptance of gender as a legitimate field, striving for policy and practice impact through women's movement activism, and efforts to establish the field's empirical and theoretical foundations. Indeed, these features make gender and education strikingly different from many other foundations of education (apart from multicultural and race studies); the history of education, curriculum studies, and others, by contrast, had a longer record, a more established reputation, and a deeper empirical basis on which to draw.

By the 1980s, feminist education studies as a field was hitting a stride. Books and journal articles were appearing at an impressive pace, and the topic of women and girls in education was represented in the formal curriculum of higher education. In schools across North America and the British Commonwealth, formal policy and informal teacher activism were taking on the sexism and patriarchal

structuring of schools and universities. "Difference feminism"—typified by works like Carol Gilligan's *In a Different Voice* (1982), which laid out arguments for the difference rather than inferiority of women's moral and intellectual development—began to vie for theoretical purchase and practical application with more dominant liberal feminist notions of equality of opportunity. That is, liberal feminist-inspired programs for girls in schools might present as role models women who were taking up traditionally male occupations; difference feminism, on the other hand, encouraged the formation of interventions like girls' science clubs, where "girls' ways" (in an essentialized sense) of doing science could be validated.

Yet more evidence of gender and education's growing cohesion and legitimacy as a field arrived in 1989 with the first issue of *Gender and Education*, the field's signal journal, founded by editor June Purvis, now Emeritus Professor at the University of Plymouth. While many other venues have published gender and education research (and continue to), the appearance and reputation of this journal, along with the formal creation of the Gender and Education Association in 2002, has given form and at least some direction to the field. Some evidence can be seen in the fact that several contributors and one of the editors of this volume either have been or now are editors of the journal: Skelton, Francis, Epstein, and McLeod.

The early 1990s saw a tremendous resurgence of interest in gender and education, particularly in the United States. Starting with 1992's publication and media frenzy around the American Association of University Women's report *How Schools Shortchange Girls,* academic attention and practitioner efforts refocused on the continuing problems of girls' educational outcomes, their curricular representation, and—the newest moral panic—their self-esteem. A slew of popular books captured the imaginations of the general public and professionals throughout the nation (e.g., Orenstein, 1994; Pipher, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1994), leading eventually to a renewed federal policymaking focus on girls, especially the Women's Educational Equity Act renewal in 1994.

For the rest of the world, especially in England and Australia, the mid- to late-1990s, and stretching into the 2000s, is perhaps most characterized by the rise of debates about *boys'* education. Public concern about boys' poorer literacy, grave social ills, more frequent dropping out of school, more frequent disciplining, higher rates of special education, and more, captured much media and policymaker time as well as government and school resources. In the United States, much of this was driven by popular press books on boys as endangered, diametrically different from girls, or as victims of feminism (e.g, Gurian, 1998, 2001; Pollack, 1998; Sommers, 2000; Tyre, 2008; from Australia, see Biddulph, 1998). In Australia, there was even a national inquiry that resulted in a report, *Boys: Getting It Right* (Australian House of Representatives, 2002), which laid out a conservative, recuperative masculinity politics (Lingard & Douglas, 1999) that would guide the use of millions of dollars of new funds for boys' education (Weaver-Hightower, 2008). While other countries might not have invested so heavily (see essays from Martino, Kehler, & Weaver-Hightower, 2009), clearly boys issues have dominated the last fifteen years of attention in gender and education, leading to a "boy turn" in

research and practice (Weaver-Hightower, 2003) as (pro)feminists have been forced to answer crisis rhetorics about boys. Masculinity studies across the disciplines rose, in part, from this heightened interest in boys, and educational scholars have been major contributors to masculinity studies writ large (e.g., Connell, 1995, 2000; Kimmel, 2008; see also Adams & Savran, 2002).

When viewed as (an admittedly cartoonish) summary, gender and education might seem more coherent and inevitable as a field than one might reasonably claim. Yet gender and education has been marked from the beginning by both internal and external challenges.

From early on, critiques originating from within have helped to shape the feminist educational project's theoretical, empirical, and methodological progress. Marxist and neo-Marxist feminists insisted that capitalism be foregrounded as a primary source of women's oppression, for capitalism animated patriarchy in fundamental ways (Barrett, 1980). These scholars drew attention to the unique difficulties faced by working-class girls as they moved through the educational pipeline (e.g., McRobbie, 1978). Black feminism—what Alice Walker (1983) called "womanist" thought—also challenged the largely white, middle-class bias of most feminist philosophy and activism. Pointing out the white supremacist underpinnings of patriarchal relations and critiquing the separatist impulse of some radical feminists, Black feminism has pushed for increased attention on the oppressions of girls of color and those in postcolonial contexts (e.g., Amos & Parmar, 1984; Carby, 1982). Later focus on Black boys and men (e.g., Cuyjet & associates, 2006; Davis, 2005; Fashola, 2005; Ferguson, 2000; Noguera, 2008; Sewell, 1997) is similarly indebted to Black feminist work. Queer theory, finally—a later-given name for longstanding work on sexuality and gay, lesbian, and transgender issues—has had a profound impact on gender and education research. Using the work of Butler (1990, 1993, 2004), Halberstam (1998) and many others, queer theory has challenged the very categories scholars use—"gender," "male," "female," and all the categories of "sexual orientation"—as well as their normative implications. The homophobia, heterosexism, and transphobia that underpin schooling were brought to light with the benefit of such theoretical and empirical work (e.g., Epstein & Johnson, 1998; Friend, 1993; Jennings, 1994; Kissen, 1996; Loutzenheiser, 1996; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; Pascoe, 2007).

Other significant challenges to feminism in education have remained or emerged in recent years. This is certainly not a complete list, but a few points are particularly worth mentioning. The boys' education debates have been a significant challenge, again taking significant attention and resources, and often in ways that promote a backlash against girls rather than a nuanced examination of the neediest boys (e.g., Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Arnot, David, & Weiner, 1999; Epstein, Elwood, Hey, & Maw, 1998; Francis, 2000; Lingard, Mills, & Weaver-Hightower, 2012; Martino et al., 2009; Mills, 2003; Titus, 2004). While a challenge, boys' education issues have not completely stopped work on girls' continuing concerns. Science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), particularly, still garners much research and many grants, as girls continue to have lower participation and

worse outcomes in these fields (Ceci & Williams, 2010; U.S. Department of Education Gender Equity Expert Panel, 2001). Even more, though, a look at the tables of contents of major journals in the sociology of education and other foundational fields reassures one that diverse focuses on girls continues apace.

Shifts in theorizing gender have also created tensions, particularly poststructuralist and postmodern turns in gender theories beginning in the mid-1980s and continuing today. The questioning of categories inherent in these epistemological standpoints has, for instance, created rifts between feminists engaging in policy creation (an intrinsically normative activity) and those "post-" positions deeply skeptical of engagement with policy and the state (see also Yates, this volume). In return, earlier feminists lament the withdrawal from activism and engagement with schools represented in mainly theoretical projects.

Feminist educationalists have also struggled both theoretically and materially with the ascendancy of *neoliberalism*—the ideology "that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey, 2005, Introduction, para. 3). The state in neoliberal ideology must stay out of the way except to protect markets or to create private markets out of currently state-regulated institutions and resources. Thus schools and universities have come under the threat of market forces (league tables, vouchers, and the creation of academies in England or charter schools in the United States), and the state has scaled back funding and regulation to supposedly allow for the "entrepreneurial impulses" of local actors to innovate educational reform.

Neoliberalism has posed two major challenges to (pro)feminist work in education. First, often the regulation removed from local schools includes progressive reforms like gender equity; conservative views of gender are thus sometimes installed in schools under the cover of "local control." In Australia, for instance, the recasting of the national gender equity framework following the boys' education inquiry sought significant leniency for schools to create their own policies "in collaboration with their communities," leaving it up to chance whether local communities would create equity-focused policies (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, pp. 113-123). The second challenge arising from neoliberalism's rise involves its identity politics, for neoliberalism asks individuals to internalize personal responsibility (as *homo economicus*) for all successes and failures, stripping away notions of social contracts and state responsibility for the welfare of citizens. As Francis (2006) has argued, such positioning puts the blame for underachievement and lack of educational outcomes on individual boys and girls not being "worthy" of the investments made in them, so the continued failures and social ills of the working class and students of color prompt funding to get withdrawn or increasingly tied to accountability measures. For those working to improve the education of various genders and sexualities, this presents clear and present resource and rhetorical challenges. Though it wasn't part of their prompt, nearly all the contributors to this volume take up neoliberalism's challenges in their essays.

LOOKING FORWARD

Despite the many challenges that (pro)feminism in education faces, many reasons for hope remain. As one of us has pointed out elsewhere (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, Coda), there is hope to be found in the facts of the case in gender and education: there are progressive potentials in some boys' education reforms; much work continues on girls; gender concerns grow and recede (witness the early 1990s in the United States); and a base of political support still exists for gender equity in all the included countries. Yet there are even more reasons for hope to be found in the pages that follow.

As part of their prompt, the authors of this collection were asked to look forward for the field. In many essays, a cautious optimism shows through. Yet the reason to pay attention to these voices is not their positivity; these voices are *leaders* perhaps primarily because they are not afraid to critique the status quo or the revered tales of the past. Each, in her or his own way, challenges feminisms to change, to think more deeply, to better explain themselves, and to be more active in the worlds outside of the academy. It is Kenway's sense of being "naughty." It is Francis' refusal of "nice." It is Lather taking on a new topic to "work against myself" and to "bring some complication to my more critical, feminist eye." It is McLeod's suspicion of the essentializing force of gender inclusivity. The leaders in the foundations of our discipline force us to grapple with the unknown, the unpopular, the inconvenient, and the heretical. As Yates puts it in her essay, though, "It is not comfortable to write about negative side effects of agendas one supports…. But I see it as … the necessary situatedness of work in this area, and that taking up issues of gender in the context of schooling is an ongoing 'conversation' rather than a search for a single model or skeleton key." For us editors, then, hope resides in the critiques made herein, for constructive criticism betrays a love of purpose and confidence in what can be.

Hope also shines through the looking backward in the essays—the historical perspective they give—for things have indeed changed tremendously from when many of the contributors began their own schooling, entered teaching, or started training educators. One cannot but marvel, from this vantage point, at the value and efficacy of (pro)feminist work. It has been profoundly impactful on how education is practiced at all levels, from early childhood to adult education. From the language teachers use ("man" and "he" as universal are disappearing) to their curriculum materials, from enrollment figures to bachelor's degrees awarded, from sports opportunities to career opportunities, few other social justice movements in education have been as successful as second-wave feminism. This progress might not have seemed so evident at the time, but these backward glances—a periodic stocktaking—inspire confidence that the field can adapt to changed circumstances and make more progress in the future.

NOTE

[1] Though not unproblematic to do so (Carr, 2000), throughout this book we make a distinction between *feminist* and *pro-feminist* by sex. *Feminist* we reserve for women and *pro-feminist* for men.

For the sake of economy, when referring to both we will use *(pro)feminist*. Conceptually, however, one should avoid collapsing feminism and pro-feminism. As Lingard and Douglas (1999) show, *pro-feminism* (sans the parentheticals; see Lingard's essay, this volume) has the following characteristics:

> Pro-feminism sees the need to change men and masculinities, as well as masculinist social structures, while recognizing the hidden injuries of gender for many men and boys. Pro-feminists also support feminist reform agendas in education and more broadly, and at the same time recognize the structural inequalities of the current societal gender order, and of the gender regime within educational systems. Thus a relational conception of gender is assumed and the notion that a focus on boys in schooling of necessity requires a turning away from a concern with the education of girls is vehemently rejected. (p. 4)

While many feminists have increasingly come to share these perspectives, we believe it to be politically important to distinguish women as more oppressed by the larger gender order and therefore more invested in its reform.

REFERENCES

Adams, R., & Savran, D. (Eds.). (2002). *The masculinity studies reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ailwood, J., & Lingard, R. (2001). The endgame for national girls' schooling policies in Australia? *Australian Journal of Education, 45*(1), 9-22.

American Association of University Women. (1992). *How schools shortchange girls.* New York: Marlowe & Company.

Amos, V. & Parmar, P. (1984). Challenging imperial feminism, *Feminist Review*, *17*(1), 3-19.

Arnot, M., David, M., & Weiner, G. (1999). *Closing the gender gap: Postwar education and social change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Australian House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Training. (2002). *Boys: Getting it right. Report on the inquiry into the education of boys.* Canberra, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/edt/eofb/index.htm

Barrett, M. (1980). *Women's oppression today: Problems in Marxist feminist analysis*. London: Verso.

Biddulph, S. (1998). *Raising boys: Why boys are different—And how to help them become happy and well-balanced men*. Sydney, Australia: Finch Publishing.

Boxer, M. J. (1998). *When women ask the questions: Creating women's studies in America*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York, NY: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.

Byrne, E. (1978). *Women and education*. London: Tavistock.

Carby, H. (1982) White woman listen! Black feminism and the boundaries of sisterhood. In Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The empire strikes back* (pp. 212-235). Hutchinson: London.

Carr, B. (2000). Same as it never was: Masculinity and identification in feminism. In N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at school* (pp. 323-342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ceci, S. J., & Williams, W. M. (2010). *The mathematics of sex: How biology and society conspire to limit talented women and girls*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, E. H. (1873). *Sex in education, or, A fair chance for girls* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Commonwealth Schools Commission. (1975). *Girls, school & society: Report by a study group to the Schools Commission*. Canberra, Australia.

Connell, R. (2008). *Southern theory: Social science and the global dynamics of knowledge*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cuyjet, M. J., & associates (Eds.). (2006). *African American men in college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, J. E. (2005). Early schooling and academic achievement of African American males. In O. S. Fashola (Ed.), *Educating African American males: Voices from the field* (pp. 129-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Deem, R. (1978). *Women and schooling*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2003). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2nd ed., pp. 199-258). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V., & Maw, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Failing boys?: Issues in gender and achievement*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling sexualities*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Fashola, O. S. (Ed.). (2005). *Educating African American males: Voices from the field*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of Black masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Francis, B. (2000). *Boys, girls, and achievement: Addressing the classroom issues*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Francis, B. (2006). Heroes or zeroes? The discursive positioning of "underachieving boys" in English neo-liberal education policy. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(2), 187-200.

Frazier, N., & Sadker, M. (1973). *Sexism in school and society*. New York: Harper & Row.

Freedman, E. B. (2002). *No turning back: The history of feminism and the future of women*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Friend, R. A. (1993). Choices, not closets: Heterosexism and homophobia in schools. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools* (pp. 209-235). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gergen, K. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. London: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Griffith, A. I., & Smith, D. E. (2005). *Mothering for schooling*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Gumport, P. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gurian, M. (1998). *A fine young man: What parents, mentors, and educators can do to shape adolescent boys into exceptional men*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Gurian, M. (2001). *Boys and girls learn differently! A guide for teachers and parents*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hanisch, C. (2006). The personal is political. Retrieved October 1, 2012, from http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PersonalisPol.pdf.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt.

Jennings, K. (1994). *One teacher in 10: Gay and lesbian educators tell their stories*. Boston, MA: Alison.

Kimmel, M. S. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: Harper.

Kissen, R. M. (1996). *The last closet: The real lives of lesbian and gay teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lingard, B., & Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging feminisms: Pro-feminism, backlashes, and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Lingard, B., Mills, M., & Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2012). Interrogating recuperative masculinity politics in schooling. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(4), 407-421.

Lobban, G. (1975). Sex roles in reading schemes, *Educational Review*, *27*(3): 202-10.

Loutzenheiser, L. W. (1996). How schools play "Smear the Queer." *Feminist Teacher, 10*(2), 59-64.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities, and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Martino, W., Kehler, M., & Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (Eds.). (2009). *The problem with boys' education: Beyond the backlash*. New York: Routledge.

Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). *So what's a boy? Addressing issues of masculinity and schooling*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

McRobbie, A. (1978). Working class girls and the culture of femininity. In Women's Studies Group (Ed.), *Women take issue: Aspects of women's subordination* (pp. 96-108). London: Hutchinson & Co.

Mills, M. (2003). Shaping the boys' agenda: The backlash blockbusters. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 7*(1), 57-73.

Noguera, P. A. (2008). *The trouble with Black boys: And other reflections on race, equity, and the future of public education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Orenstein, P. (1994). *School girls: Young women, self-esteem, and the confidence gap*. New York: Anchor Books.

Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls*. New York: Grosset/Putnam.

Pollack, W. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York: Random House.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls*. New York: Touchstone.

Sewell, T. (1997). *Black masculinities and schooling: How Black boys survive modern schooling*. Staffordshire, England: Trentham Books.

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2009). *Feminism and "the schooling scandal."* London, England: Routledge.

Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Sommers, C. H. (2000). *The war against boys: How misguided feminism is harming our young men*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Spender, D. (Ed.). (1987). *The education papers: Women's quest for equality in Britain 1850-1912*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Titus, J. J. (2004). Boy trouble: Rhetorical framing of boys' underachievement. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 25*(2), 145-169.

Tyre, P. (2008). *The trouble with boys: A surprising report card on our sons, their problems at school, and what parents and educators must do*. New York: Crown Publishers.

U. S. Department of Education Gender Equity Expert Panel. (2001). *Exemplary and promising gender equity programs* (Report No. ORAD 2001-1000). Jessup, Maryland.

Walker, A. (1983). *In search of our mothers' gardens: Womanist prose*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(4), 471-498.

Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2008). *The politics of policy in boys' education: Getting boys "right."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weiler, K., & David, M. (Eds.). (2008). The personal and the political: Second-wave feminism and educational research [Special issue]. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(4).

Weiner, G. (1994). *Feminisms in education: An introduction*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Women on Words and Images. (1972). *Dick and Jane as victims: Sex stereotyping in children's readers*. Princeton, NJ: Women on Words and Images.

Yates, L. (2008). Revisiting feminism and Australian education: Who speaks? What questions? What contexts? What impact? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(4), 471-481.

Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower
Associate Professor, Educational Foundations and Research
University of North Dakota

Christine Skelton
Professor of Gender Equality in Education
University of Birmingham

JILL BLACKMORE

FOREVER TROUBLING

Feminist Theoretical Work in Education

My life and intellectual history are closely connected to the late 20th Century rise of the second wave women's, student and civil rights movements. These decades also witnessed the professionalization of women's traditional fields of work—teaching and nursing—with their introduction into the academy. But as all feminists know, and my intellectual and personal history illustrates, there is no gradual progress towards the betterment of all or a fairer redistribution of power, and there is no safe discourse of equality. Any restructuring of the social relations of gender arising from local, national or global social, economic and political shifts often reasserts masculine privilege.

EARLY YEARS

As a baby-boomer born in 1947 into the first generation of a family of teachers, I benefitted from the rapid economic growth based on the temporary post-war settlement between capital and labour. Education was viewed as a public good and, just as health, a priority for government investment. Teaching offered social mobility to "talented" children of the working class such as my parents, my grandfathers being in small business and "on the trains" and my grandmothers being "homemakers." In 1937, my parents met at Melbourne Teacher's College as scholarships holders after teaching as apprentices, a decade before teaching became a university-trained profession. As a child of the 1940s living in a small country town where my father taught, I contracted polio at three, affecting my lower left leg. This was followed by time in hospital, rehabilitation and part-time school until I turned eight. My mother taught me to read, sing, and walk again while I exercised, before she reentered teaching part-time, then full-time, progressing from primary to secondary teaching, only then completing by correspondence an undergraduate degree in maths and science while credentialling as a lay Methodist minister.

My first instance of discrimination arose from being positioned as "crippled," although this was not how I felt. My parents encouraged my physical activity, which I followed by playing competitive hockey, swimming, squash, tennis—random play rather than the structured treatment advocated by the physiotherapists' norm. I then encountered systemic discrimination as a teaching studentship to fund my undergraduate arts degree at university was revoked because the doctor stated I was physically unfit to teach. Funded by a federal

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 15–31.

government scholarship and my parents, I completed a Bachelor of Arts honours degree in history and mathematics. At Melbourne University, I was amongst the ten percent of school leavers in Australia attending university in the 1960s, and one of the tiny cohort of those from government schools. My sense of marginalization was not fully overcome by my involvement in the large anti-Vietnam War protests beside a friend who had been conscripted and with the sound in my ears of Martin Luther King's speech "I Have a Dream" recorded by my American History professor.

Systemic gender discrimination became overt in the workplace where, as a married woman just like my mother, I was excluded from the government superannuation fund in which my husband, also a secondary teacher, was a member. I was also ignored in all correspondence about our jointly owned house and bank account, recognised neither as an individual or equal. My mother had always insisted on being named, a battle she fought as an individual prior to the second wave of the women's movement and for which she suffered in the small country high school where both my parents taught. Equally, my father, a gentle and loving man respected by students and staff for his humour and intelligence, was depicted as passive, as if my mother's strong femininity meant his weak masculinity. A clear gender division of labour permeated the belief systems, structures and cultures of teaching in the 1960s. Despite my mother's promotion to a Melbourne secondary school, she was denied transport costs to her new job because her husband "owned the furniture." After a successful landmark appeal, she was elected Vice-President of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association from where she won equal pay for women teachers in Victoria and put the first strike motion to stop employment of unqualified teachers, both events occurring in the first week that I commenced teaching in 1970. Over the next decades, she graduated in the first Master of Educational Administration by correspondence cohort, and she was the first female principal of a co-educational high school in Victoria, while she developed child-care facilities, community centres and low rent houses for single mothers. Her history is also my story, informing my activism as a feminist and teacher.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVISM

A conjuncture of events interlinking teacher professionalism and unionism shaped my first years of teaching. Due to the lack of trained teachers and unprecedented numbers of students completing secondary schooling, in my second year I became Year 11 Coordinator of 250 students in a large metropolitan high school. This meant managing the equivalent of an entire small school, with responsibility for timetabling, welfare, career advice, and, of course, discipline. There was no discourse of leadership in schools or the professional literature, and this role was for me indistinguishable from my elected positions of leadership in the union branch and staff association. Union activism in 1970s Australian schools focused less on wages and more on demanding registration of teachers; opposing

centralized external examinations and assessment practices; resisting teacher inspections; and supporting colleagues facing discrimination.

With little government investment in professional development in schools, the weekly *Victorian Secondary Teachers Association News* was the source of educational theory and debates around texts such as the *Manifesto for Democratic Schooling* (Hannan, 1976) and a women's newsletter after the 1975 International Woman's Day. Freire's (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Illich's (1971) *De-schooling* lay on my bedside table jostling Germaine Greer's (1970) *The Female Eunuch* and Marilyn French's (1977) *The Women's Room*, propped up by the *Little Red Schoolbook*. Reading radical professional literature was widespread amongst my colleagues, an enthusiastic team with whom I initiated and taught Year 8 General Studies that integrated English, history, geography, drama, media and sometime math through project-based curriculum. Such grass root activism reinforced my experiences as to the power of collegiality and how innovation in practice is nurtured through collaborative professionalism rather than top-down reform.

In 1975, having divorced and then backpacked around Europe, I volunteered for the failed Labor campaign after the federal Whitlam Labor Government's contentious "dismissal" by the Governor General, one characterized by vicious attacks by religious and social conservatives targeting Labor members of parliament who supported women's right to abortion. This was a lesson in how social and religious conservatives could mobilise public opinion to the detriment of most women. Education was for most teachers and feminists the religion of the 1970s and 1980s, the means to bring about social change and greater equality, and I was on a mission fuelled by this collectivist impulse. Teacher and parent activism mirrored high levels of political participation that informed policy through party committee systems, as was the case with the federal Whitlam Labor Government's program of reform in health, welfare and education (1972-5). Under pressure from the Women's Electoral Lobby, of which I was a member, feminist advocates were installed within the government as bureaucrats and advisors ("femocrats") including a Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister, who instigated the first Women's Budget process that led to scrutiny of all policies for their impact on women. As in Scandinavia, state feminism provided a model for gender equity, informing gender-mainstreaming policies in the EU decades later.

State education bureaucracies were during the 1970s expanding rapidly, with principals often distant figures. The loosely coupled 20th Century educational bureaucracies were relatively benign, providing space for school-based reform compared to the tightly coupled corporate devolved "self-managing" market-driven systems after the 1990s. There were no strategic plans, mentoring, induction or succession planning programs. Indeed, in Victoria, bureaucracies "incorporated" representatives of the social movements (teachers, parents) as part of the policy process. Partial administrative decentralization in Victoria during the 1970s meant school councils included elected teacher representatives. Union activism advocating school-based decision-making together with a strong parent movement led to the establishment of Local School Administrative Committees and Equal

Opportunity Officers in all Victorian secondary schools in the early 1980s. Junior teachers such as myself were elected to manage the school *with* the principal and council. Despite this, my positioning towards authority was clearly more oppositional than compliant, as I practiced (often unreflexively) leadership from below. Not surprisingly, a key theme of my intellectual work has been tracking how feminism as a social, political and epistemological movement has negotiated the changing relations between the individual, the family, the nation state, through education to achieve gender equity and social justice.

MOBILITY AND CAREER TRANSITIONING

Back teaching fulltime in 1976, I commenced a part-time Masters degree at Monash University focusing on sociology, history as well as comparative education while dabbling in media studies—the feminist courses under attack from conservative women in the press. The book pile beside my bed grew to include feminist historians such as Anne Summers' (1975) *Damned Whores and God's Police*, who identified the historical stereotypes of Australian women as being either moral arbiters or the source of moral decay in society. Questioning my role as Year 11 Coordinator in the reproduction of class and gender differentiation through my advice to senior school students at a time of the collapse of the youth employment market in the 1970s led me in my Master thesis to an investigation descriptively titled *Education Policy Responses to Youth Unemployment in the 1930s*. Seeking an intellectual challenge after travelling around Southeast Asia and China with the Australia-China Association in 1980, I applied for a doctorate supervised by—and working as a research assistant with—David Tyack at Stanford University, well known for his landmark US historical text *The One Best System.* History was my passion. Tyack illustrated how history could avoid presentism while also writing a narrative that made his texts relevant to contemporary readers. In writing my doctoral thesis, *The Vocationalisation of Victorian Schooling 1900-60*, I was told to "just tell the story" and "not put theory in." To focus on gender was seen to be a poor career move, although gender was a dominant theme in how schools differentiated through school type, curriculum, and how skill was defined and rewarded in the workplace.

For me, being single and mobile had created significant possibilities for career enhancement. Stanford offered a breadth of courses ranging from feminist history to ethics with Nel Noddings, comparative education with Martin Carnoy, teacher education with Milbrey McLaughlin, curriculum with Joan Talbert, economics of education with Hank Levin and statistics with Sam Bowles. My doctoral supervisory panel was headed by Tyack with the feminist economist Myra Strober, and Larry Cuban who researched school reform. My grad student colleagues included Patti Gumport and Bill Tierney, both now key scholars in higher education, an emergent field in Australia. Despite my eclecticism, I chose to concentrate on organizational theory, leadership and policy, graduating in 1986 with a Masters of Educational Administration and Policy Analysis as well as a doctorate in history written on a Macintosh computer purchased in 1984.

While such curriculum breadth appealed to my interdisciplinary instincts, my somewhat critical eye due to fifteen years as a progressive teacher practitioner, a geographically marginalised "southerner," and a feminist alerted me to the America-centric assumptions embedded in organizational and sociological theory. Reading Bowles and Gintis' (1974) *Schooling in Capitalist America* again reminded me of the function of elite education in reproducing class, ironically a word not used by social scientists at Stanford. Working amongst a critical mass of international students also illustrated the importance of a strong postgraduate research culture, the benefits of coursework across sociology and history as well as quantitative and qualitative methodology in preparation for beyond the doctorate, as well as a structured doctoral program including supervisory panels, colloquia and orals. Such experiences informed my approach to supervision and my involvement with the development of doctoral programs at Deakin University, where with colleagues from the UK such as Rob Walker, colloquia and professional doctorates were first introduced in Australian education faculties.

Back in Australia in 1984, I taught part-time at a different school and lectured at Monash University part-time in the history and sociology of education while completing my PhD in any spare time. I enthusiastically based a school professional development workshop on Wilf Carr and Stephen Kemmis' (1986) *Becoming Critical* and Raewyn Connell et al.'s (1982) landmark sociological text, *Making the Difference: Schools Family and Social Division;* it was an introductory foray into critical theory and action research less enthusiastically received by my teaching colleagues more due to my poor pedagogy than their ideas. Penalized in a teacher promotion system that focused on seniority and subject specialisms both by my interdisciplinarity and my over-credentialling (2 Masters degrees and a near complete PhD), I applied in frustration for a three-year contract lectureship at Monash University in educational administration. With few applicants with similar qualifications in this emerging field in Australia, I got the job. When asked about my research agenda, I intuitively responded: school-based decision-making.

BECOMING AND BEING A FEMINIST ACADEMIC

My research has been informed by these familial, teaching, activist and education experiences in the formation of my academic—as distinct from my teacher—"habitus." My first article in the *Journal of Educational Administration* was on participation and school-based decision-making informed by the feminist political theorist Carole Pateman's (1980) *Participation and Democratic Theory* and organizational research indicating how worker involvement in decision-making led to greater commitment and productivity. My first book chapter was on teacher unionism and its role in policy and education reform within the corporate state. I put theory back into a chapter from my PhD for the *History of Education Review* with an historical examination of the reproduction of class through a study of how Melbourne University blocked school curriculum and assessment reform through control of assessment, in this instance drawing from Bernstein's (1975) notion of closed and open systems. Fascinated by the feminist debates seeking to reconcile

neo-Marxist materialist theories of labour and class with theories of patriarchy, I used feminist theories on technology, skill and the gender division of labour for a *Journal of Education Policy* article out of my PhD on the *Gendering of Skill and Vocationalism in Twentieth Century Australian Education*. Meanwhile, discontented with how the research in the field of educational administration, leadership and policy in which I was lecturing at Monash disconnected from my experience as a teacher, I found solace in a regular academic forum comprising of Melbourne, Monash and Deakin academics in the field. Here I encountered the critical perspectives of Deakin education academics: Richard Bates on power/knowledge relationships, Fazal Rizvi on multiculturalism, Laurie Angus on organizational culture, Peter Watkins' labour process analysis of teachers' work, and John Smyth on teacher professionalism that articulated with my own feminist concerns about the mainstream literature. I felt intellectually and politically at home once I gained a lectureship at Deakin in 1987 (Tinning & Sirna, 2011).

At Deakin, with Jane Kenway (see her essay, this volume), whose background was in sociology and feminist theory, our work was to introduce feminist perspectives into the field of educational administration and policy. While Jane initially concentrated on gender equity policy for girls and the marketization of education, my focus was on educational administration and leadership and "the managerial turn." This was highly competitive "big boy territory," largely dominated from the US, and wide open to feminist critique. Despite contestation within the field arising from the geographic margins (Bates in Australia, Greenfield in Canada, Grace in the UK and Codd in New Zealand), there was little feminist critique other than in the UK, USA, and NZ focusing on the under-representation of women in school leadership (e.g., Charole Shakeshaft and Gaby Weiner). Given the limited theoretical base of the masculinist mainstream literature, informed predominantly from scientific management, management theory, and structural functionalist sociology, my intellectual inspiration came from reading widely across the prolific feminist theory in philosophy, politics, history, sociology, and critical organizational theory—including the feminist standpoint theory of Sandra Harding (1986) *The Science Question in Feminism* and Dorothy Smith (1987) in *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology;* feminist theorists of the state such as Anna Yeatman's (1990) *Bureaucrats, Technocrats, Femocrats: Essays on the Contemporary Australian State*; and the femocrat, Hester Eisenstein's (1996) commentary on feminism as a social movement and gender equity policy in Australia and the USA.

These texts pointed to emerging feminist debates over the politics of difference, gender/power/knowledge and social justice, and they foreshadowed the rise of feminist poststructuralist theory around the body and subjectivity, much of this by Australian feminists such as Elizabeth Grosz (Caine et al., 1998). Texts I read included Carole Pateman's (1988) *The Sexual Contract*; Seyla Benhabib and Drucilla Cornell's (1987) *Feminism as Critique*; Rosemary Tong's (1989) *Feminist Thought*; Roberta Hamilton and Michele Barrett's (1987) *Politics of Diversity*; Barbara Caine, Elizabeth Grosz and Marie de Lepervanches (1988) *Crossing Boundaries: Feminism and the Critique of Knowledges*; Iris Marion Young's

(1988) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*; Linda Nicholson's (1990) *Feminism/Postmodernism;* and Seyla Benhabib, Judith Butler, Drucilla Cornell and Nancy Fraser's (1995) *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange.* These outstanding feminist scholars highlighted how gendered dualisms between mind/body, public/private, and rationality/emotionality embedded in social, scientific, philosophical and political theory positioned women as lesser and weaker, incapable of leadership for example, or, as in liberal theory, assumed gender neutrality in terms of individual or collective experience. Such gender binaries or assumed gender neutrality were entrenched in the literature on educational administration and leadership which was littered with claims premised upon the universality of the male experience, hierarchical principles of scientific management, gender-neutral organisational theory, the competitive individualism of human capital theory, homogenous notions of organizational culture, and research based only on male hero leaders. In what has come to be a much cited pathbreaking chapter titled "Educational Leadership: A Feminist Critique and Reconstruction" published in Smyth's (1989) *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership,* I undertook a systematic critique of the epistemological, political and sociological assumptions embedded in the field.

THE DEAKIN CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

Deakin scholarship was perceived to be subversive to the dominant positivism of US scholars in the field of educational administration and leadership in the late 1980s. A Deakin symposium proposal to AERA was rejected in 1987, my abstract's reviewer commenting that feminism was irrelevant to leadership and educational administration. The threat of alternative perspectives to the established educational administration field became transparent at the 1988 AERA conference. My co-presenters, both male stalwarts of US educational administration positivism, attacked me as a Bates "clone," damned feminist theory, and demeaned as insubstantial because not informed by quantitative methodologies my feminist policy sociological perspective using Yeatman's theories of the state to examine how the integration of social movements (women's and parent movements) into the Victorian state education bureaucracy informed equity policy. Yet support from the audience for my feminist epistemological position that there were different ways of researching and knowing and forms of knowledge indicated that significant theoretical and methodological shifts were underway.

The scholarly environment at Deakin fostered critical perspectives and encouraged collaborative work in teaching and research in an unstructured and fluid organizational context. Stephen Kemmis had amassed scholars around action research alongside the Social and Administrative Studies group recruited by Richard Bates. Together with Jane Kenway, I organised a landmark conference in 1988 that led to the 1993 edited collection *Gender Matters in Educational Administration and Policy: A Feminist Introduction*; developed national and international networks and feminist scholars to visit, including Catherine Marshall, Gaby Weiner, Nancy Jackson, and Patti Lather, resulting in Lather's (1991)

influential monograph *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/In the Postmodern* (see also her essay, this volume); and developed the compulsory off-campus Gender and Education Masters unit which students evaluated as being theoretically demanding and personally challenging. Our desire to promote feminist pedagogies "at a distance" was achieved through group teleconferences and reading groups, pushing ideas elaborated in feminist critiques of critical pedagogy by Elizabeth Ellsworth and Australian feminists Carmen Luke and Jenny Gore.

In terms of practice at Deakin, there was also a strong convergence between what we as scholars theorised around democratic participation and collegial practice such as electing Deans, which also provided opportunities for young female academics to participate in university wide committees. Deakin, modelled on the UK Open University, became an Antipodean node in the international network of critical scholars such Lawrence Stenhouse, Henry Giroux, Bob Stake, Michael Apple, and Tom Popkewitz. Such scholars contributed to the high quality off-campus course materials produced by interdisciplinary teams and published by Deakin University Press. Doctoral students were similarly attracted to Deakin, for its criticality and flexibility, as Deakin provided non-traditional approaches to entrance and supervision. Deakin's reputation for "criticality" spread internationally as the "Deakin diaspora" of academics and graduate students moved on to other universities nationally and internationally during the 1990s (Tinning & Sirca, 2011). My intellectual pursuits were grounded by having a baby at forty-two as a mid-career academic in 1989, prompting my awareness as to lack of child-care support. Pregnancy was still viewed as "something private" by some and "not something a feminist did" by others.

GENDERED RESTRUCTURING, RESTRUCTURING GENDER

My overarching research program had now developed, on reflection rather than through planning, into an examination of the changing relationship between education, the state, the individual, and the family using the lens of leadership and governance and the analytical tools of policy sociology and feminist theory. Considering the impact of neoliberal restructuring on educational work and gender equity has been a long-term project of inquiry and the subject of three Australian Research Council discovery grants. The 1990s was a period of major educational and workforce restructuring in Australia instigated by the Hawke federal Labor Government and a neoliberal conservative government in Victoria. The latter downsized and marketised government schools, creating competition between "self managing" schools in a devolved system of governance that appropriated the earlier discourse of participation but which, ironically, disempowered teacher and parent organisations. "Choice" was to be exercised by the self maximizing individual without regard for others or "the public."

The university sector had also been reconfigured post-1989, with Deakin amalgamating with a large College of Advanced Education in ways that had a negative impact on its research culture. Deakin's Faculty of Education was

constantly restructured and downsized throughout the 1990s as Australian universities became corporatised through the processes of managerialisation and marketization. My research identified a "structural backlash" as the gendered nature of organisations advantaged those in power, largely men, in any restructuring, at the same time the conservative Howard federal Government provoked a popular backlash against feminism, multiculturalism and reconciliation with indigenous people. These studies drew on feminist theories of the state: Yeatman's (1994) *Postmodern Revisionings of the Political;* John Clarke and Janet Newman's (1994) *The Managerial State;* in organizational theory Clare Burton's (1991) *The Promise and the Price: The Struggle for Equal Opportunity in Women's Employment*, which challenged the gender neutrality of notions of merit, and Cynthia Cockburn's (1991) analysis of the processes of gendering of organisations in *In the Way of Women.*

As one who has stayed at Deakin through multiple restructurings, I experienced the sense of loss and grief as my colleagues departed and as executive management was asserted over the academic voice (Blackmore, 1993). Emerging from the study of self-managing schools was evidence of the significance of emotions in organizational change and leadership in times of uncertainty. "Doing Emotional Labor in the Educational Market Place: Stories from the Field of Women in Leadership" (1996) drew a link between emotions, gender and markets within schooling during the reform period of the 1990s. In it I explored how the emotions of envy, desire, hope, greed and anxiety are critical to education markets and the affective economies of organisations in gendered ways, an analysis informed by Steven Fineman's (1993) *Emotions in Organisations*, Jennifer Nias (1996) on the emotions of teaching and Arlene Hochschild's (1984) *The Managed Heart*. Emotionality and rationality as feminists have long argued are inextricably connected, embodied and gendered. More recently, I have argued that emotionality is not just an individual but a collective behaviour—relational and contextual—and thus manifest in the emotional economies of organisations, in the politics of emotions exemplified by educator's anger about neoliberal reforms, and in the post-9/11 "structures of feeling" (Williams, 1975) characterized by the generalized class anxiety manifest in educational policies of choice.

WHY LEADERSHIP?

Leadership became the lexicon for political, social and economic reform during the 1990s and the solution for devolved governance to self-managing institutions. While as a teacher and academic I have tended to lead informally, often against those in formal positions, leadership has been a useful lens through which to investigate the reconfiguration of educational organisations, academics' and teachers' work, and identity. Focusing on leadership facilitates unpacking different perceptions of the unequal distribution and effects of power and how gender works through what Smith refers to as the "relations of ruling." Exploring women's notions of being and knowing (Belenky et al., 1997), Nel Nodding's (1984) ethic of care, and feminist research on women in leadership (Catherine Marshall on

feminist critical policy analysis and leadership; Gaby Weiner on gender equity policies; Miriam David on family/school relations [see also her essay, this volume]; Madeleine Arnot on sociology of gender; Kathleen Weiler on feminist educational history). The danger in my earlier work was to avoid the seductive notion that all women were infused with a sense of care and social justice. Such thinking "set women up" as the "natural" moral guardians of "the social," recreating Enlightenment binaries that essentialised gender stereotypes, with little potential to produce social change generally or gender reform in particular as male advantage was left unexamined.

Raewyn Connell's *Gender and Power* (1987; also see her essay, this volume) avoided this theoretical dilemma by focusing on the social relations of gender and how multiple masculinities and femininities are systematically produced in relation to each other through the gender regimes within organisations such as schools and the gender order of society, thus moving beyond simplistic male/female categories. The notion of hegemonic masculinity provided a capacity to understand how there were dominant notions of organizational culture(s) and images of leadership that were masculinist but which individual men did not necessarily "fit" while recognising that there were subversive and marginalized cultures existing in organisations and society. Connell's theories of gender thus disrupted key organizational theories in mainstream educational administration that assumed a homogenous organisational culture that could be created, managed and directed by leaders. Gender is integral in the production and constitution of such culture(s) in ex/inclusionary ways.

These ideas informed my book *Troubling Women: Feminism, Leadership and Educational Change* (1999), the title drawing from Judith Butler's (1990) *Gender Trouble*, in which I positioned my work as "feminist post-structuralism with a material bent." *Troubling Women* focused on what I perceived to be three problematics in educational leadership: how the underrepresentation of women in leadership was a problem for democratic societies in uncertain times when leadership itself was in trouble; how women in leadership were trouble as they symbolized difference and undermined traditional structures and authority; but thirdly how feminists needed to trouble essentialising discourses about women leaders being more caring and sharing, thus conflating "being female" into "being feminist" while ignoring political, racial, ethnic and religious differences amongst women. Feminist research had, I argued, as with research on and by men, produced its own normative discourse that was impeding critical thinking within the field by focusing only on successful women and leadership while neglecting the wider restructuring of the social relations of gender, such as the casualisation and feminization of educational labour. Thus it was critical to shift focus onto material conditions, the ongoing unequal distribution of power and the social relations of gender within organizational and policy contexts. The feminist issue is not just representational equality for women in leadership but also about substantive ethical and value positions. While flirting with Foucault as many feminists did in the 1990s, I was nervous of its subtle determinism, and turned to feminist reworking of Foucault's notion of power as being both positive and negative and not

incommensurate with the feminist theoretical and practical desire to better understand social change. Foucault's disciplinary technology captured how women leaders individually and collectively exercised agency within certain cultural, structural and social constraints and performance management regimes.

In an increasingly corporatised university sector, being a female professor required choices about my own positioning. As an elected Deputy Chair of Academic Board from 2000 to 2004 and on numerous executive committees, I oversaw the academy becoming internationalized, curriculum commodified and disaggregated into discrete packages of content to be "delivered" not taught and re-branded as instructional design; academics evaluated by generic "satisfaction" market surveys rather than substantive evaluations of content and pedagogy; and a counterproductive skewing of administration towards quality assurance rather than quality improvement, as indicated by the sidelining of Academic Boards from line management (Blackmore, 2007). At the time, I was examining the impact of restructuring on leaders in schools, technical and further education institutes and universities. The data indicated that many but not all women leaders felt a strong sense of dissonance—similar to my own experience—between co-option into a management culture requiring compliance, and their scholarly commitment to their field and, for some, feminist commitment to social justice. The tension was between "being good" and "doing good." Academics and teachers alike expressed feelings of disempowerment and de-professionalisation.

In *Performing and Reforming Leaders: Gender, Educational Restructuring and Organisational Change,* Lyotard's (1984) notion of performativity—be efficient or disappear—had analytical value. But I also argued that "being seen to be doing something" had symbolic power without actually "doing something" of substance. Performativity was producing counterproductive tendencies, a focus on measurable proxies (citations, standardized assessment) as a poor substitute for quality and success, diverting the focus from "the real work" of teaching and research. Performativity also changes, as Judith Butler (1990) argues, practices and identities through repeated performances of gender. Stephen Ball (2000) also explored how performativity had local and global policy effects, and how performative organisations produce fabrication and loss of identity. Linking Ball's work on performativity to critiques of New Public Administration by Newman and Clarke (1996) in *The Managerial State*, Deborah Kerfoot and David Knight's (1993) work on management and masculinity with that of Alvesson and Billing's (1996) theorising of gender and organisations provided a coherent framework for analyzing the way global relations were informing localised social relations of gender in organisations.

Feminist critical policy analysis, particularly through the work of Carol Bacchi (1999), raised the issue of how policy is treated as a solution to a problem rather than being seen as a process of solving a problem, raising the dilemma of categories with regard to equity (Marshall, 1997; Bacchi, 1999). To name women as a policy category essentialised women as a group; not to name them ignored gender inequality. At the same time, shifts in language meant notions of equity or equal opportunity were being weakened by the discourse of diversity (Blackmore,

2006) as difference was reduced to individual preference rather than the legacy of systemic group disadvantage. Nor was there a safe policy haven for feminists or "the other," as the discourse of male disadvantage was mobilized as backlash gender politics during the 1990s. In leadership it meant reasserting old privileges in new forms of entrepreneurial masculinity.

GLOBALISATION: A USEFUL THEORY FOR FEMINISTS?

Poststructuralism became the theoretical fetish of the 1990s in education theory and, amongst feminists, it supplanted the unitary individual by a multiplicity of subjectivities, foregrounding the power of discourse and positionality through the work of Bronwyn Davies in Australia, Valerie Walkerdine in the UK and a key critique of psychology's unitary subject in *Changing the Subject* (Henriques et al., 1984). Positionality usefully provided feminist poststructuralists a way to understand how women leaders experienced the contradictions of agency and constraint, their sense of ambivalence and ambiguity, even when in powerful positions. At the same time, while much attention was being paid to the production of gendered subjectivities, black feminists such as Patricia Hill Collins (1990) in *Black Feminism* and postcolonial feminists such as Gutterai Spivak (1988) in *In Other Worlds* were pointing to how globalization was fundamentally reconfiguring the social relations of gender and material conditions of women's work and lives differently depending on their race, ethnicity and class. Feminists such as Elaine Unterhalter (2007) and Nelly Stromquist (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000) were charting how women and children were bearing the brunt of the structural adjustment programs in the 1980s in Africa and South America. The rise of the Australian Indigenous movement and recognition of how indigenous people suffered under colonial rule provoked national reflection as did Aileen Moreton-Robinson's (1999) challenge in *Talkin' Up to the White Woman* to white feminists. Taking seriously the politics of difference, how were white women, including myself, complicit in the whiteness of educational leadership (Blackmore 2010)? Meanwhile, the field of educational administration and policy has remained relatively untouched by theoretical moves in postcolonial, cultural studies, critical pedagogy and antiracist theories, continuing to assume a gender and racial neutrality in the focus on leadership as a quick solution to the complexities of increasingly culturally diverse educational relationships.

The new policy sociology developing from Stephen Ball's (1994) notion of policy as discourse and text provided a useful tool in analyzing gender equity reform. It recognised the power of policy as discourse, and informed how policy informed leadership practices, created boundaries, could be enabling and disabling, and have contradictory and unexpected effects arising from how policy articulated into practice through multiple readings. Policy's capacity to "steer from a distance" in systems of devolved governance also explained how academics and teachers felt more controlled than under the former bureaucratic regimes as they internalized the performance expectations. By the late 1990s, globalisation was a concept being mobilised across policy sociology, with early explorations about how the

local/global articulate particularly through travelling policies like neoliberal market theory and New Public Administration. As a feminist, suspicious of any new concept or theory in terms of what it meant for gender equity, I queried whether globalization was a useful concept for feminists, or was it merely obfuscating other fundamental changes in gender relations (Blackmore, 1999)? Questioning the notion of globalisation produced different questions. Where could feminists now make claims for equity if the nation state was weakened? Privatisation and commodification raised issues around the post welfare state as it moved from provision towards regulation. How did post-welfarism change women's position in work as they took up the slack of the state around care for the aged, young and sick? What does the changing nature of educational governance across national systems and within nation states mean in terms of the role of international bodies such as the OECD and UNICEF for social justice (Blackmore, 2011)?

Further, the fragmentation of the public sector of health, welfare and education due to neoliberal market reforms increasingly feminized workplaces and produced glaring locational disadvantage by the end of the 1990s. My continuing interest in "at risk" youth led to an Australian Research Council research project on the Local Learning and Employment Networks in Victoria, created as a policy solution to better coordinate agencies managing youth transitions form school to work or further education in disadvantaged communities. This study produced evidence of network modes of working and leading, indeed a form of network sociality, and it raised questions as to whether corporate modes of governance can survive in transnationally and locally networked organisations, an issue I am currently exploring around the changing role of the entrepreneurial university.

Yet to focus on the global was not to neglect the local, and the identity work of teaching and leading. Throughout I have engaged in a critique of the dominant paradigms of school reform and leadership, in particular the narrow and reductionist focus of the school effectiveness and improvement movements which have decontextualised school reform and have provided justification for blaming individual schools for systemic failures, most explicitly through standardized testing and the comparison of individual "like" schools. Given the body of research on what produces educational disadvantage, my recent research focuses on what can be done, what is innovative and strategic, in school-based reform within disadvantaged communities. One trajectory explores how interagency collaboration supports resilient students and schools, and the role of government and non-government agencies in the formation of new networks of governance. Another focuses on how leaders can provide conditions for innovative learning environments, utilizing the concept of redesign from the New London Group's (1996) multi-literacies. Redesign as conceptualised by Pat Thomson and myself (Thomson & Blackmore, 2006) is a purposeful collaborative process, about undergoing fundamental changes in practice, a notion that has informed case studies around spatiality, connectivity and pedagogical innovation in disadvantaged school communities. This body of research continues to highlight how public investment is required to produce systems conducive to enabling

school based reform that benefits all, and education has become a transnational and not a national project, treated no longer as a public but an individual positional good or form of capital.

With the shifting ideological and material terrain post-9/11, Bourdieu's (1997) notions of field, habitus, capital and doxa have become appealing in my research on the regendering of academic and intellectual leadership in the transnational university, although necessarily reworked by feminists such as Lois McNay (2000) in *Gender and Agency*. Bourdieu has argued that education as a field has been subjugated to the fields of politics, economics and journalism, thus changing the rules, language and values of the field of education. The media is a recurrent interest since my honours history thesis on *The Press and the First Victorian Parliament*. Since then, I have explored how Melbourne University used the media to subvert inclusive science curriculum reform; how a Premier of Victoria mobilised the media to manufacture discontent and justify neoliberal school reform (Blackmore & Thorpe, 2003); and how the media represents leadership. These have contributed to theoretical explorations around the emergent area of "mediatisation" of educational policy in policy sociology.

REFLECTIONS ON THIS REFLECTION

As with all narratives, this narrative makes my life history more coherent than it seemed at the time. Much of what I did was opportunistic and serendipitous, out of kilter with the current organizational desire for alignment. My research has inevitably been inextricably intertwined with my life and teaching, in which I have, just as my research participants, experienced ambivalence about the seduction of formal leadership out of a fear of succumbing to the "managerial habitus" which privileges the logics of the market and managerialism over professional and ethical choices. These are new hard times for education and I would argue for women. Evidence continues to mount as to the casualization and feminization of educational work; the widening gender wage gap despite women's educational overachievement; a growing disparity between rich and poor students, schools and communities; and the intransigence of the under-representation of women in leadership. Throughout, social justice in and through education has been the driver of my intellectual work. Most recently, feminist philosophers and political theorists such as Nancy Fraser (1997) on redistributive justice as well as Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum (e.g., Nussbaum, 2011) on capability theory have provided new insights. Feminism as an epistemological, political and social movement continues to inform my daily practice in and through research, although feminism is not a unitary movement, more a range of practices and activities that has family resemblances transnationally, and in a constant state of contestation, as I am, over power/knowledge/identity.

KEY READINGS

Bacchi, C. (1999). *Women, policy and politics: The construction of policy problems.* London: Sage.

Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership and educational change.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus*: *Critical reflections on the 'postsocialist' condition.* Oxford, England: Polity Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Unterhalter, E. (2007). *Gender, schooling and global social justice*. London: Routledge.

REFERENCES

Alvesson, M. & Billing, Y. D. (1996). *Understanding gender and organisation*. London: Sage.

Bacchi, C. (1999). *Women, policy and politics: The construction of policy problems.* London: Sage.

Ball, S. J. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Ball, S. J. (2000). Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: Towards a performative society? *Australian Educational Researcher, 27*(2), 1-25.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1987). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind.* New York: Basic Books

Benhabib, S., Butler, J., Cornell, D. & Fraser, N. (Eds.). (1995). *Feminist contentions: A philosophical exchange.* New York: Routledge.

Benhabib, S. & Cornell, D. (Eds.) (1987). *Feminism as critique.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, codes and control Vol I-III.* London: Kegan Paul.

Blackmore, J. (1986). *The vocationalisaton of Victorian schooling 1900-60.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, California.

Blackmore, J. (1989).Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 93-130). Sussex, England: Falmer Press.

Blackmore, J. (1993). "In the shadow of men?" The historical construction of administration as a 'masculinist' enterprise. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), *Gender matters in educational administration and policy: A feminist introduction* (pp. 27-48). Sussex, England: Falmer Press.

Blackmore, J. (1992). The gendering of skill in twentieth century Australian education. *Journal of Educational Policy, 7*(4), 351-377.

Blackmore, J. (1995). Policy as dialogue: Feminist administrators working for educational change. *Gender and Education, 7*(3), 293-313.

Blackmore, J. (1996). Doing emotional labor in the educational market place: Stories from the field of women in management. *Discourse*, *17*(3), 337-350.

Blackmore, J. (1999a). Globalisation/localisation: Strategic dilemmas for state feminism and gender equity policy. *Journal of Education Policy, 14*(1), 33-54.

Blackmore, J. (1999b). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership and educational change.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructing diversity discourses in the field of educational management and leadership. *Leadership, Educational Management and Administration, 34*(2), 188-199.

Blackmore, J. (2010). 'The Other within': Race/gender disruptions to the professional learning of white educational leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 13*(1), 45-61.

Blackmore, J. (2011). Bureaucratic, corporate/market and network governance: Shifting spaces for gender equity in education. *Gender, Work and Organisation, 18*(5), 433-66.

Blackmore, J., & Kenway, J. (Eds.) (1993). *Gender matters in educational administration and policy: A feminist introduction.* London: Falmer Press.

Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2007). *Performing and reforming leaders: Gender, educational restructuring and organizational change.* New York: SUNY Press.

Blackmore, J., & Thorpe, S. (2003). Media/ting change: The print media's role in mediating education policy in a period of radical reform in Victoria, Australia. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(6), 577-596.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). Forms of capital. In A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Education: Culture, economy, society* (pp. 46-58). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1974). *Schooling in capitalist America.* New York: Basic Books.

Burton, C. (1991). *The promise and the price: The struggle for equal opportunity in women's employment.* St. Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity.* London: Routledge.

Caine, B., Grosz, E., & de Lepervanche, M. (Eds.). (1988). *Crossing boundaries: Feminism and the critique of knowledges.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Eduation, knowledge and action research.* London: Routledge

Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (1994). *The managerial state: Power, politics and ideology in the remaking of social welfare.* London: Sage.

Cockburn, C. (1991). *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sexual equality in organisations.* London: Macmillan.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought*. London: Routledge.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. W., Ashenden, D., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, G. (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, family and social division.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin

Eisenstein, H. (1996). *Inside agitators: Australian femocrats and the state*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Fineman, S. (Ed.) (1993). *Emotions in organisations*. London: Sage.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus*: *Critical reflections on the 'postsocialist' condition.* Oxford, England: Polity Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

French, M. (1977). *The women's room.* New York: Jove.

Greer, G. (1970). *The female eunuch*. London: MacGibbon & Kee.

Hamilton, R., & Barrett, M. (Eds.). (1987). *Politics of diversity*. London: Verso.

Hannan, B. (1976). Manifesto for democratic schooling. *VSTA News.* Melbourne: Victorian Secondary Teachers Association.

Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism.* London: Routledge.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., & Walkerdine, V. (Eds.). (1984). *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity.* London: Methuen.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: The commercialization of human feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Illich, I. (1971). *De-schooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.

Kerfoot, D., & Knight, D. (1993). Management, masculinity and manipulation: From paternalism in corporate strategy on financial services in Britain. *Journal of Management Studies*, *30*(4), 650-77

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within/in the postmodern.* New York: Routledge.

Lyotard, J. L. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Marshall, C. (Ed.). (1997). *Feminist critical policy analysis.* Vols 1-2. London: Falmer Press.

McNay, L. (2000). *Gender and agency: Reconfiguring the subject in feminist and social theory*. Oxford, England: Polity Press.
Moreton-Robinson, A. (1999). *Talkin' up to a white women: An indigenous feminist's perspective.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
New London Group. (1996). The pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Education Review, 66*(1), 60-96.
Nias, J. (1996). Thinking about feeling: Emotions in teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 26*(3), 293-306.
Nicholson, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminism/postmodernism.* New York: Routledge.
Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Pateman, C. (1980). *Participation and democratic theory.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
Pateman, C. (1988). *The sexual contract.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
Smyth, J. (Ed.). (1989). *Critical perspectives on educational leadership.* London: Falmer Press.
Spivak, G. (1988). *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics.* New York: Routledge.
Stromquist, N., & Monkman, K. (Eds.) (2000). *Globalisation and education: Integration and contestation across cultures.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
Summers, A. (1975). *Damned whores and god's police.* Ringwood, VIC, Australia: Penguin Books.
Thomson, P., & Blackmore, J. (2006). Beyond the power of one: Redesigning the work of school principals. *Journal of Educational Change, 7,* 161-177.
Tinning, R., & Sirna, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Critical pedagogies and the legacy of Deakin University: Reflections of the Deakin diaspora.* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Tyack. D. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Unterhalter, E. (2007). *Gender, schooling and global social justice.* London: Routledge.
Williams, R. (1975). *The country and the city*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
Yeatman, A. (1990). *Bureaucrats, technocrats, femocrats: Essays on the contemporary Australian state.* St Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
Young, I. M. (1988). *Justice and the politics of difference.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jillian Blackmore
Alfred Deakin Professor
Deakin University

RAEWYN CONNELL

EQUAL RIGHTS, TO A CERTAIN EXTENT

Memoirs of a Researcher into Mysteries of Gender and Education

My father's father's mother, Sarah, came from Scotland—Inverness, in fact—and migrated as a child to the remote colony of Victoria, Australia, as part of a flood of settlers from the metropole in the mid nineteenth century. She was a Fraser, so we are descended on that side from one of the great clans who made the Scottish highlands a byword for backwardness, poverty and violence before the Clearances substituted sheep for people. The highlands are empty country today.

It is one of the bitter ironies of empire that many of the dispossessed Scots sailed out to the frontier and seized the land of indigenous people there—in Canada, the United States, and also in Australia and New Zealand. There is a family memory of a camp of Aborigines on the bank of the river Yarra near where the Connell home, Narbethong, was built in the 1870s.

Great-grandma was neither backward nor poor, but she did inherit some highland toughness, and a Scottish respect for education. While her husband was building a small fortune as an auctioneer and realtor in the raw boom city of Melbourne, great-grandma produced six children and set about giving them the best possible education. Several were sent to the small university that the colonists had, rather surprisingly, founded in the middle of the 1850s gold rush. Two of my great-aunts were among the pioneers of women's higher education in Australia—come to think of it, in the world.

Two of the girls married; one looked after her parents and the family home; the eldest went out into the world as a teacher. Great-aunt Maud, whose photograph (looking a bit grim, in her academic gown) I still have on my office wall, became a humanities teacher, and fairly soon a school principal. She read five languages, Latin, Greek, Italian, German and French. After her retirement she travelled to Spain in order to learn a sixth. Family legend has it that she arrived in time to trigger the Spanish Civil War.

Maud must have been, as a young teacher, a person of advanced views. I inherited a few of her books, and among them is a social drama by Ibsen, *An Enemy of the People*. It has her signature and the date "1892," which is only two years after the translation was published. I don't have direct evidence of her political ideas when she was older. But I know that my father, who was mentored by Maud and admired her profoundly, was a student radical in the 1930s. He joined the Labor Party at a time when people of his social background almost never did. He in turn strongly encouraged his daughters' educations and supported women in academic life during his own university career. He certainly believed in

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 33–42.

comprehensive schools and coeducation, though because of the configuration of schools in our area, my sisters and I went to segregated high schools.

I don't want to labour the origin story, but it is interesting that there was a streak of progressive ideas about gender and education in the milieu where I grew up. This milieu was the post-colonial professional bourgeoisie, which meant a background of social privilege, but not necessarily a conservative culture. Even my mainstream religious education—I was confirmed in the Church of England, and sang as a second soprano in the church choir—did not change that. Our wing of the church supported the ordination of women. My parents at one stage combined Anglicanism with an interest in the Society of Friends (Quakers), the confession that was the very first in the English-speaking world to have women as preachers, back in the seventeenth century.

I went to public schools—state schools, as my English publisher insists I must call them, because private schools are called public schools in his country—in three countries, and several states within them, making six school systems in all. Most of my schools were gender-segregated, the usual arrangement then. At Dee Why Public School, which had both boys and girls, they were given separate classrooms at opposite ends of the building and separate parts of the playground.

I went to the University of Melbourne in the early 1960s, which was mercifully coeducational, but I lived in a gender-segregated college where I had a very bad time, psychologically. But I learned the pleasure and passion of research. My majors were psychology and history (at the time there was only one sociology department in the country, and that was in another city), and I began explorations in both of them. Fortunately I learned statistics in one major and critical documentary analysis in the other. I was grateful to my psychology teachers for introducing me to Piaget and Freud, great architectonic theorists from the metropole who have given me food for thought ever since.

My honours thesis was a study of what we would now call state formation in early colonial Australia. I found myself in the midst of nearly forgotten archives, handling stiff letters to and from the first Governors of the British settlement, family letters of the first land owners, employment records, petitions, court decisions, military records, and so on. Fascinating: the blood, sweat and tears just visible beneath the faded ink. Some of it brutal stuff, including the punitive expeditions against the Aboriginal people who were being driven off their land (and decimated by smallpox and alcohol), and the public floggings and hangings of convicts. Many years later I began to think about the gendered character of colonialism, and I guess this detailed knowledge of power and violence in the early settlement then resonated in my memory.

I then moved to the University of Sydney, where I became involved not only in doing a PhD but also in the anti-war movement, the Labor Party, the student movement, the Sydney Free University, and a poetry reading group (I once recited Allen Ginsberg's *Howl*, backed by a rock band playing 12-bar blues, to an appalled inner-city audience). I managed to become the co-author of a book on far-right politics, my first notable academic publication, while doing a PhD on an entirely different topic. The energy level dismays me now. I also fell in love, and began the

relationship that lasted, through many upheavals, for 29 years until my partner died. But that is another story.

Part of what we were trying to do in the student movement of the sixties was to democratise the mainstream universities. It sounds odd in this era of audited competitive excellence and global higher education markets, but we did actually make a little progress. Some of my early publications were about this experience. I felt it worth documenting, in order to continue the effort when I became a member of academic staff, which I did following a postdoctoral year in the United States.

In fact, when I applied some progressive education ideas to the unpromising topic of the PhD, the result was my most-reprinted article ever! "How to Supervise a PhD," was published in 1985 by the journal of the academic union in Australia (now the NTEU, National Tertiary Education Union; I'm still a member). Australian universities were enrolling increasing numbers of research students but often left them to sink or swim. I argued, from practical experience, that PhD supervision was a demanding form of teaching needing reflection as well as care and enthusiasm. The article was intended to help colleagues, but it was picked up by student organizations around the country and reprinted in many guidebooks for new students. An appropriate result for a former student activist.

My first formal educational research was my PhD thesis, on the development of children's political ideas, published as *The Child's Construction of Politics*. The Australian PhD differs from the US model in being essentially individual; there is no coursework, no cohort of fellow-students, the thesis is bigger, and the examination is external. Basically the student has to make up the project, with more or less guidance from a supervisor. I drew on my background with Piaget to look at the issue then called "political socialisation" in US political science, but from another angle. I interviewed kids from 5 to 16. This was undoubtedly the funniest research project I have done, listening to (say) 5-year-olds' ideas about presidents, prime ministers and monarchs. It was also sinister, showing the prevalence of fear, then directed at foreigners, war and communism.

Overlapping with this, I was involved with a number of other researchers (including my father: nepotism at work!) in a large study of Sydney teenagers. This quantitative work covered family relations, social attitudes, peer group life, cognitive development and many other topics. It gave me evidence for the pervasive social class effects in education and a feel for its complexities.

This project also resulted in my first publication on gender. Madge Dawson, a remarkable woman who mentored many young activists at the time, had got together a panel on "The Australian Family" at a big science congress in Sydney. The topic was bland, but the content was feminist, gay-liberationist, and more. She asked me to give a paper. I could more-or-less programme a computer in those days (a mainframe), so I cranked out a new lot of statistics and wrote a quantitative study of sex differences in teenage life. It was published as "You Can't Tell Them Apart Nowadays, Can You?" The title seemed witty at the time.

My research on education has mainly concerned social justice issues and the education system itself—a massive and potent social institution, constantly in change. Education is, fundamentally, about creating capacities for practice,

capacities that are both individual and social. In the course of this, some people are dealt advantage and others are dealt disadvantage. That used to be deliberate and quite open: school systems were born segregated, by class, gender and race, as I saw in my own schooling in the 1950s. It's now more covert, and happens through curriculum making, testing, funding and selection. But it still happens.

In the later 1970s, now working in a sociology job at Macquarie University, I joined with Dean Ashenden, Sandra Kessler and Gary Dowsett in a close-focus study of how educational inequality worked in everyday school processes. We interviewed students aged about 14, their parents (usually at their homes), their teachers, and their principals—individually, conversationally, and in detail, 424 in all. The result was an extraordinarily rich body of information, which took us years to analyze, working case by case.

I still remember the forty minutes I spent in a leather chair in a well-appointed office, listening to the principal of an elite private school giving me a stunning rundown of the corporate hierarchy, housing trends, cultural divisions, families and factions of an Australian city's ruling class. I could have published it in a sociology journal without changing a word. But I also remember talks with working-class mothers and fathers in fibro cottages on the same city's outskirts. They knew as much, but about different social facts.

This project turned into two books, more than a dozen articles, a video, endless conference presentations and workshops with teachers and parents. It was the most intense research collaboration in my career, and the four of us remain friends more than thirty years after the project began. My title for this essay, "Equal Rights, to a Certain Extent," comes from an interview in that project, and we were originally going to use it as the title for a book.

The main report was actually named *Making the Difference*. It described families' educational projects, gender in schools, class differences in educational experience, curriculum, schools as institutions, and strategies for democratising the school system. It turned out to be an academic best-seller in Australia, as it was picked up and used as a textbook in teacher education programmes, something we had not expected.

Making the Difference was read a little overseas, but not a great deal because it was only published in Australia (and then, in translation, in Brazil). We are only globalized one-way. This was an object lesson to me in what I later came to understand as the political economy of knowledge. After that, I tried to get my books co-published in the global metropole. This started with *Gender and Power*, in 1987, and the difference in international visibility was immediate. I think *Making the Difference* was a better book, but it is far less cited in international databases.

The second book from the project was *Teachers' Work*. We had marvellous interviews with teachers, providing a basis for thinking about their lives and careers, and the nature of their work and workplace. It was kind of industrial sociology that located teachers at the centre of major issues about education.

Both reports contained a lot about gender. This project was where I really learned about how gender hierarchies are constructed in institutional settings. I

think the very first use of the term "hegemonic masculinity" was in a booklet we wrote for teachers about gender relations in schools, called *Ockers and Disco-maniacs*. (I won't try to explain this title; you had to have been there at the time!) And this was where I formulated the idea of "gender regimes" that became important in my theorising and later research. We got some idea of the patterns of men's and women's occupational experience as teachers, and we also got considerable insight into the gender dynamics of ruling-class and working-class families. Here we saw class, ethnicity and gender together, not as "intersectionality" was later construed in US sociology, but as a dynamic interplay, a mutual constitution of structures.

By the mid-1980s I felt I had enough material to attempt a large-scale synthesis. My theoretical blockbuster was called *Gender and Power*, a title I wasn't happy about but which was the best on a list of twenty-five alternatives. I wrote it, mostly at night, in a back room in London during a study leave, while our new baby slept in a carry-cot on the other side of the room; I was responsible for the midnight feed. The book was an attempt to work out a full-scale social analysis of gender, using the best tools of theory and assembling a wide range of research findings, as they stood then. It criticized essentialist and sex role theory, discussed both psychological and social levels, tackled problems of embodiment (not very successfully) and politics. I think its main conclusions hold up fairly well today, though of course all the detail is out of date.

Because *Making the Difference* and *Teachers' Work* included mainstream working-class schools, I got an undeserved reputation as knowing about poverty. So I was commissioned to do a national study of the Disadvantaged Schools Programme (DSP), to help a rethinking of this very creative enterprise. I worked intensively on this with Viv White and Ken Johnston, and in quick time we put together a portfolio of studies including surveys of teachers, oral history, school case studies, conceptual work and policy proposals.

In the late 1980s, though, the DSP, along with its mother institution the Australian Schools Commission, were under attack by neoliberals, disguised as the Labor Party leadership. Our lovely project reports were filed and forgotten by the economists who had been brought in to run education policy in Canberra. Deakin University came to the rescue and published them, disguised as an education policy case study, as *Running Twice as Hard*.

I kept thinking about the issues, and a couple of years later, on the invitation of the splendid Canadian journal *Our Schools Ourselves*, published a little book called *Schools and Social Justice*. This pulled together some of the DSP findings and offered some new thinking about "curricular justice." But the Australian publisher of this book soon went broke, so it was never reprinted and had little impact locally—the opposite of the *Making the Difference* story. My paper in a mainstream US educational journal that presented the line of thought was reprinted four times overseas, once in translation.

Meanwhile I had been involved in a different kind of educational action research, in community education for adults. This involved the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Sydney. Social action was vital for stopping the epidemic, but it

needed a research base. Together with Sue Kippax, Gary Dowsett, June Crawford, and others, I designed field studies of men's sexual practice and its social contexts, using current theory in sociology and psychology. Unlike most social research, the results were immediately used in peer education and policymaking on a life-and-death issue; there were no anti-retroviral medications then. So there was pressure to make our work simultaneously high-quality research and meaningful for action. This project became the starting-point for a very large research programme and the National Centre in HIV Social Research, led by Sue Kippax.

I was not active in that Centre, but I had a hand in expanding the research focus. By the end of the 1990s a "safe sex" strategy had become established in Australian gay communities. But these communities were mostly middle-class. What was happening among men who had sex with men in other communities? Gary Dowsett and I designed further research to find out, and we were given extraordinarily interesting and moving interviews about working-class men's lives and sexuality. The findings were fed into community education programmes operating in very difficult and sometimes dangerous settings.

I have always been an interested observer of masculinity, and in the late 1970s began the effort to make sense of men's lives, and their tensions and contradictions, in the light of feminist thought. In the early 1980s I worked with Tim Carrigan and John Lee, both activists in the gay movement, on theories of gender, and a main result of this was a paper "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." Published in the United States, this was quite widely read and helped to crystallize studies of masculinity as a research field. It remained programmatic, so I felt I had to fill in some of the empirical detail. The new work took the shape of a life-history project with four groups of men, whom I thought would be experiencing challenges or changes to existing gender patterns.

This project, too, was empirically very rich, as the life history method turned out to be a good choice for the purpose. Among other things, it yielded a good deal of memories about experiences of school. With all my previous projects related to gender, sexuality and education, I was therefore in a good position to be an expert on boys' education, just when this was becoming a public issue, and best-sellers about "deep masculinity" were flying out of the bookshops. In fact, the NSW Department of Education asked me to give them guidance on the issue, and I wrote some briefing papers and policy suggestions, which never saw the light of day.

I did publish some papers about masculinity in education journals. I showed how schools constructed multiple masculinities, through curriculum differences, discipline, sports and peer group life, and then had to negotiate the relations between them. Unfortunately this wasn't the simple anti-feminist message the media wanted to hear in the days of the "What About the Boys?" backlash. So I missed my chance for world fame.

In the early 2000s, now a professor of education and back at the University of Sydney, I was involved in another big collaborative study, with Toni Schofield and Sue Goodwin and colleagues from the NSW government. This concerned gender relations in public sector organizations. Gender reform in Australia seemed to have stalled since the palmy days of Equal Opportunity and Anti-Discrimination laws.

We hoped that a research base would help fire up new gender equity initiatives. The project ran into severe political difficulties, but we did some beautiful fieldwork in ten different worksites, ranging from a sewerage plant to a top-level policy unit. They included the education sector, though for reasons of confidentiality I couldn't identify the education sites separately.

This gave me an impetus for thinking again about the state, about how gender embeds in institutions, and how institutions are changing in the new market society. We didn't have any impact on government policy, but I did write some good papers about gender in organizational life. Toni and Sue wrote a notable study (Schofield & Goodwin, 2005) of how gender works in the actual process of policy formation, something that is rarely researched.

I also became involved, with Steve Crump and colleagues from the school system, in a study of new vocational education courses in senior high school. This led back to my old interest in working-class families' relationships with education and a new round of interviews that explored the dilemmas created for parents by the changing school system and labour market. Vocational education is one of the most gender-segregated parts of the curriculum, though we could see this changing a bit as, for instance, boys learned to cook in "hospitality" courses.

This project, together with research by my doctoral students and my share in writing a textbook on social dimensions of education, revived my interest in questions about teachers. Teachers' work was now being re-shaped by neoliberal accreditation and auditing regimes, locally and internationally. I have always valued my connection with school teachers and their unions—it helps keep me balanced, as an academic, and connected with practical issues—and I wanted to give something back, in the new circumstances.

So I convened a very lively series of seminars at the University of Sydney on the theme of "the good teacher," with visiting speakers as well as our own talent. I shamelessly borrowed from the contributors' ideas in writing a report on the subject, published in 2009. But I haven't yet been able to develop a research or action agenda out of this, as I had hoped to do.

In the 1990s I was travelling more widely because of the worldwide interest in masculinity research, and I was meeting gender researchers on every continent. What they were doing was exciting and sometimes challenged the European and North American theoretical approaches I had learned so much from. I began to search deliberately for publications of gender research and theory from the global South. This was, in fact, part of the larger project that eventually, after fourteen years of research, turned into *Southern Theory*.

However, a conceptual framework doesn't change quickly; it took a long time to integrate this new experience into my own theoretical approach. My English publishers asked me to write a second edition of *Gender and Power*, and I tried, but for some reason it didn't come together. (I have managed second editions of four other books.) When the invitation came to write an introductory book about gender, however, I took it, and this gave me a chance to integrate a lot more diverse international material. The second edition *Gender: In World Perspective*

went much further in this direction, and has an explicit southern theory argument about gender.

Thinking globally was essential; "globalization," though, is a problematic concept, and global power relations are constantly being reshaped. I became more and more concerned with how to understand the broad social consequences of the neoliberal market agenda, whose impact within the public sector I had already seen. With the assistance of John Fisher, I began collecting reports of research about social relations at times of neoliberal transition. An invitation to a conference in Germany to speak about mothers and fathers gave me the occasion to pull together research on changes in family relationships. The paper was published as "The Neoliberal Parent" and it was the starting-point for my current research on neoliberalism.

Another invitation, to a conference in England, gave me occasion to connect the analysis with education specifically. I called the paper "Kartini's Children: On the Need for Thinking Gender and Education Together on a World Scale." Kartini was a pioneering Javanese feminist, mega-famous in Indonesia, who developed a programme for gender reform through education; but she died tragically while very young. She is one of the Southern thinkers who are rarely referred to in Anglophone social science, but who should be part of our consciousness of history.

So: an unfinished story. I've left out a lot, including my own role as an educator—teaching gender courses to undergraduates, supervising a lot of theses in the area, even being a public educator, for instance in my work with the United Nations on men and gender equality. It has been a long and winding road, from student activism to abstract theory, policy work, and a role as a kind of academic grandmother. Is there a moral?

Well, one lesson might be that you can research almost any gender issue, but you have to be willing to shift among methods. I've done surveys by questionnaire, telephone, and face to face; documentary research; topical, life-history, and oral history interviews. I've done some organizational ethnography, some on-line work with databases, on-line consultations, and a certain amount of what might generously be called action research. All were relevant at different times, all fed into the collective construction of knowledge.

Another lesson might be that you can't research gender without getting mixed up in issues about class, sexuality, the state, imperialism, knowledge systems, and more. In putting this essay together I found it hard to sort out from my publication list what was just about gender and education. The stuff was always wandering off somewhere else, like a two-year-old! That's a theoretical point, I guess: don't be too rigid about the categories, and don't get caught up in systems thinking.

A third lesson might be that you are never really finished with a significant problem. No research project, no theoretical effort, is definitive and final. I'm sure readers will have noticed in the narrative above how some topics come back for a second bite. Actually I think that's an important epistemological point, about the social as well as the natural sciences. Scientific knowledge is open-ended. Not only is it corrigible but it is actively corrected and rethought. That's a collective process,

it doesn't just happen throught the work of one person. If knowledge ceases to be extended, corrected and reworked, it ceases to be science.

A fourth lesson … But three is enough. Work them out for yourselves!

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Connell, R. (2010). Kartini's children: On the need for thinking gender and education together on a world scale. *Gender and Education, 22*(6), 603-615.

Connell, R. (2009). *Gender: In world perspective* (2nd ed. of *Gender*). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Connell, R. (2009). Good teachers on dangerous ground: Towards a new view of teacher quality and professionalism. *Critical Studies in Education*, *50*(3), 213-229.

Connell, R. (2008). Masculinity construction and sports in boys' education: A framework for thinking about the issue. *Sport, Education and Society*, *13*(2), 131-145.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin Australia.

Connell, R. (1996). Teaching the boys: New research on masculinity, and gender strategies for schools. *Teachers College Record*, *98*(2), 206-235.

Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Connell, R. (1989). Cool guys, swots and wimps: The interplay of masculinity and education. *Oxford Review of Education*, *15*(3), 291-303.

Kessler, S., Ashenden, D., Connell, R., & Dowsett, G. (1985). Gender relations in secondary schooling. *Sociology of Education*, *58*(1), 34-48.

Connell, R., Ashenden, D., Kessler, S. & Dowsett, G. (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, families and social division*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

REFERENCES

Carrigan, T., Connell, R., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, *14*(5), 551-604.

Connell, R. (1971). *The child's construction of politics*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

Connell, R. (1974a). Anti-Pygmalion: Reflections on some experiments in reforming universities. *International Social Science Journal*, *26*, 483-497.

Connell, R. (1974b). You can't tell them apart nowadays, can you? *Search*, *5*(7), 282-285.

Connell, R. (1985a). *Teachers' work*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. (1985b). How to supervise a PhD. *Vestes: Australian Universities Review*, *28*(2), 38-41.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Cambridge, England: Polity.

Connell, R. (1993). *Schools and social justice*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Our Schools Ourselves.

Connell, R. (1994). Poverty and education. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(2), 125-149.

Connell, R. (1996). Teaching the boys: New research on masculinity, and gender strategies for schools. *Teachers College Record*, *98*(2), 206-235.

Connell, R. (2002). The globalization of gender relations and the struggle for gender democracy. In E. Breitenbach, I. Bürmann, K. Liebsch, C. Mansfeld, & C. Micus-Loos (Eds.), *Geschlechterforschung als Kritik* [Gender studies as criticism] (pp. 87-98). Bielefeld, Germany: Kleine Verlag.

Connell, R. (2003). Working-class families and the new secondary education. *Australian Journal of Education*, *47*(3), 237-252.

Connell, R. (2006). Glass ceilings or gendered institutions? Mapping the gender regimes of public sector worksites. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(6), 837-849.

Connell, R. (2009a). The neoliberal parent: Mothers and fathers in the new market society. In P.-I. Villa & B. Thiessen (Eds.), *Mütter—Väter: Diskurse, Medien Praxen* [Mothers—fathers: Discourses, media, practices] (pp. 26-40). Münster, Germany: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Connell, R. (2009b). Good teachers on dangerous ground: Towards a new view of teacher quality and professionalism. *Critical Studies in Education*, *50*(3), 213-229.

Connell, R. (2009c). *Gender: In world perspective* (2nd ed. of *Gender*). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Connell, R. (2010). Kartini's children: On the need for thinking gender and education together on a world scale. *Gender and Education, 22*(6), 603-615.

Connell, R., & Gould, F. (1967). *Politics of the extreme right: Warringah 1966*. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University Press.

Connell, R., Dowsett, G., Kessler, S., & Ashenden, D. (1981). Class and gender dynamics in a ruling-class school. *Interchange*, *12*(2-3), 102-117.

Connell, R., Ashenden, D., Kessler, S. & Dowsett, G. (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, families and social division*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R., Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Dowsett, G., Baxter, D., Watson, L., & Berg, R. (1989). Facing the epidemic: Changes in the sexual lives of gay and bisexual men in Australia and their implications for AIDS prevention strategies. *Social Problems, 36*(4), 384-402.

Connell, R., Davis, M., & Dowsett, G. (1993). A bastard of a life: Homosexual desire and practice among men in working-class milieux. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, *29*(1), 112-135.

Kessler, S., Ashenden, D., Connell, R., & Dowsett, G. (1982). *Ockers and disco maniacs: Sex, gender and secondary schooling*. Sydney, Australia: Inner City Education Centre.

Kessler, S., Ashenden, D., Connell, R., & Dowsett, G. (1985). Gender relations in secondary schooling. *Sociology of Education*, *58*(1), 34-48.

Kippax, S., Connell, R., Dowsett, G., & Crawford, J. (1993). *Sustaining safe sex: Gay communities respond to AIDS*. London: Falmer Press.

Lang, J., Greig, A., & Connell, R., in collaboration with the Division for the Advancement of Women. (2008). *The role of men and boys in achieving gender equality*. "Women 2000 and Beyond" series. New York, NY: United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women. Retrieved from: http.www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/w2000.html.

Schofield, T., & Goodwin, S. (2005). Gender politics and public policy making: Prospects for advancing gender equality. *Policy and Society*, *24*(4), 25-44.

Raewyn Connell
University Professor, University of Sydney
www.raewynconnell.net

MIRIAM E. DAVID

A "MOTHER" OF FEMINIST SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION?

As a lifelong feminist sociologist of education and social policy, I was delighted to be asked to make this contribution to an international collection on leadership in gender and education. I have struggled to develop the art of writing in an autobiographical and narrative style, in keeping with methodological developments in the social sciences and humanities. About 10 years ago, I transformed a book that I had been invited to write on the sociology of the family into an intellectual auto/biography, entitling it *Personal and Political: Feminisms, Sociology and Family Lives* (David, 2003). Using the "second-wave feminist" slogan (Weiler & David, 2008) that "the personal is political," I pursued a biographical approach, locating my own professional developments and learning within international, socioeconomic and political contexts. I identified three periods that contextualized my own professional and personal learning around changing forms of liberal democracy. In what follows, I shall reprise some of this study, whilst also reflecting upon my subsequent learning and teaching within the academy. I shall also address these through the prism of an inaugural lecture that I gave at the Institute of Education, University of London, in November 2009. Here I sought to reflect upon transformations in global higher education from a feminist perspective, using my own biography again, and seeing this as a valedictory statement on my lifelong learning and the new context of the global knowledge economy.

Feminist perspectives and theories, drawing as they have on political activism and the desire and hope for social change in the direction of gender equality and social justice, have been fundamental to my teaching and scholarly activities within the academy over the course of my career. My generation of academic feminists have, therefore, become known as "second wave" to distinguish us from "first wave" who were women struggling for political change in public life, and especially the franchise, at the beginnings of the 20th century (David, 2003, 2009; Weiler & David, 2008). Subsequent generations of academic feminists have become known as "third wave," although the wave metaphor is heavily contested. Whilst my brand of feminism is a mix of academic and activism, I have never left the academy since I entered as an undergraduate student of the social sciences back in the early 1960s. My positions have, though, inevitably changed and developed over the course of my career, from being a student of sociology, to becoming a social researcher, then a university teacher and researcher, to a changing balance of administration, teaching and research or scholarly activities, to a balance of managing research and supervision of doctoral students, and thinking more

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 43–59.

reflexively about the nature and forms of the neoliberal global university. Now I am deeply concerned about the university of the future, with its pedagogies and practices within an era of austerity (David, Hey, & Morley, 2011).

Throughout I feel I have been on a continuous journey of learning, gaining new experiences and expertise. I have drawn inspiration from a variety of people and sources, and equally I hope to have influenced a diversity of students, scholars and activists in the struggle for women's equality, gender and social justice. But what precisely has been the nature of my influence from a feminist perspective, and how helpful are familial analogies to thinking about spheres of influence? Given that I was involved in early pedagogies and curricula for higher education courses in sociology, social policy and education, and doing research on family, gender and education, can I claim to be a "mother" of feminist sociology of education?

A LEADER IN GENDER AND EDUCATION: A CONTRADICTION IN (FEMINIST) TERMS?

In thinking about how to pen this essay, I was troubled by two terms in the title of the overall volume, and agonized about precisely how to raise these as fundamental questions. The first is about the nature of the field of endeavour—gender and education—since the concept of gender has not always been critical to the work with which I have engaged. When I embarked upon my academic career, neither gender nor women's equality were on the academic agenda. They were certainly not on the academic curriculum of the sociology that I was taught, nor were there any mentions of the contested nature of familial or work relationships. The nearest we came to learning about these questions was to be introduced to *Women's Two Roles* by Myrdal and Klein (1956), which was becoming an international classic study of women in the family and work. We also had to consider anthropological evidence about the structuring of families within "primitive" or non-developed societies such as Africa and Asia (e.g., Mead, 1928; 1935) but the sociology of the family was not at all critical of traditional family structures but was rather accepting of them as part of the theory of structural functionalism (Parsons, 1951, 1961).

My early understandings and politicization about women not having equality with men in either the public or the private sphere came from outside the academy. It was largely from my involvement in social and political movements in the 1960s. Having been involved with socialist movements during my teenage years, in the aftermath of my first degree, I became involved in the women's liberation movement through friendships forged as an undergraduate student (David, 2009). We all began to develop our understandings and insights through consciousness-raising groups, which started to emerge throughout England, as in other industrial societies such as Australia, Canada, France and the USA, towards the end of the 1960s (Weiler & David, 2008). Initially, we campaigned for political changes in women's position in education, employment and the family, as well as in relation to sexual relationships and reproduction. These slowly became "demands" upon the state rather than academic questions, although, at the same time, we were

desperate to learn more about women's socioeconomic position relative to family-household and work—what we then called sexual relations and divisions in society. This kind of political and social analysis later became known as understanding "women's oppression" in industrial societies. So we developed readings and materials, and were largely self-taught about the changing circumstances of women's lives. We became responsible for developing the materials for higher education, and for the pedagogical approach, relying on personal experience as evidence (David, 2003).

The term "feminism" was not widely used; rather we talked about ourselves as "in women's lib." As we drew strength from the involvement of women not only in the UK but also from other countries, especially of the now "global north," we began to formulate a more specific understanding of our politics and our activism, around sociopolitical equality (Weiler & David, 2008). The demands and the developments slowly morphed into what became known as the feminist movement of the 1970s, and with feminism grew both a socio-political activity and a perspective on academic studies, especially within the humanities and social sciences, including education. But at that time, we still did not prioritize nor privilege academia, or higher education. Indeed, initial courses—in the UK at least—developed in so-called extra-mural departments (now known as continuing education) rather than internal to the university, as courses on women's studies voluntarily taken rather than for undergraduate or postgraduate students. It was only in the 1980s that undergraduate or postgraduate courses on feminist perspectives, methods or methodologies began to proliferate (David, 2003, pp. 61-82).

The notion of "leadership" in this collection's title also troubles me, given the form of emergence of feminist activism and associated scholarship around concepts such as collectivism and collaboration. Although of course I can name, and will do so during this essay, a number of inspirational women as writers and scholars, the idea of leadership is ambiguous and somewhat individualistic. Nevertheless, an early inspiration for women of my generation, struggling to find relevant literature and studies, was the French feminist Simone de Beauvoir, who was herself struggling to find new ways of living (David, 2003, pp. 33-38, pp. 114-115). Initially, for me at least, it was not her *Second Sex* (1949) that had instant appeal but her *Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter* (1958). In this she explored her own biography and her own growing up in bourgeois Paris and going to university in the 1920s. This was one of the first known attempts at feminist autobiography, written, however, from the vantage point of de Beauvoir's experience and knowledge. It was not written until she was in her early fifties (David, 2003, p. 33) and the appeal was her attempts to deconstruct her own privilege, and yet, at the same time, her female oppression within the haute bourgeoisie in France. It was a seductive mix of an analysis of power and privilege, and it remains a vibrant account of a young woman's life and disappointments both in university and in love. Although she had better grades than Sartre at the Sorbonne, he nevertheless was ranked first, and this rankled with the emergent politico and his partner, de

Beauvoir. Her influence on international feminist writing and feminist sociologists is now legendary (Evans, 1985; Okely, 1986; Moi, 1990).

The discourse of early feminist discussions around the "personal" was inevitably perhaps intensely familial, moving between notions of daughters, as Beauvoir had, to sisters and to mothers with all the attendant rivalries and jealousies. "Sisterhood is powerful" was a slogan we used and the title of one early American feminist volume of readings (Morgan, 1970). In an effort to subvert conventional notions of power politics, and to work more collaboratively, discussions raged over whether we could erase relations of power from our vocabulary and hence the recourse to notions of sisterhood, being closest also to the revolutionary French terms of fraternity or brotherhood, alongside equality and freedom or liberty. Some had misgivings early on, and the American feminist sociologist Jo Freeman, for example, wrote of "the tyranny of structurelessness" (1973) whilst Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley (1976), two influential British feminist academics, raged against the idea of sisterhood, finding it unhelpful as an alternative to patriarchal structures.

Perhaps the most problematic familial concept that was also discussed intensively was the idea of "motherhood" (Stambach & David, 2005) and how that was deeply institutionalized within our society, and a key source of "women's oppression," Adrienne Rich's *Of Woman Born* (1979) was a deeply poetic elegy to developing notions of feminism and was truly inspirational as we began to develop our concepts and ideas. Embedded in our Judeo-Christian culture are patriarchal structures stemming back to biblical times, and these influenced our early understandings. Given that I come from a Jewish family background, as did many influential American second wave feminists, struggles over patriarchal notions of father and mother were deeply felt. It was around these familial notions that we first engaged our intellectual curiosity, especially given that being "a Jewish mother" has its own problematic connotations. I also come from a background where my father was a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany. The concept of leadership also has Germanic overtones of the "führer" and so this concept is not a very comfortable one for me. We were engaged in a struggle for ethnic or racial justice, as well as other forms of social justice, and the seeds of socio-political activism were sown early in my growing up, although not directly about feminism, nor about women's liberation. I have returned to these pressing social and political questions as I begin to have more freedom to choose the topics that I research and write about (David, 2009).

Thinking about the continuities and changes in the lives of refugees in different sociopolitical contexts has become more of a concern for me as I also reflect upon the global university in an era of austerity (David, 2011). My research and scholarship has therefore taken a circuitous route, as I commented in an inaugural lecture I gave at Keele University (David, 2002). Nevertheless, for much of my research career, my studies followed my children's lives through schooling, and into and beyond higher education, including postgraduate doctoral work. In other words, a perennial topic for me, throughout much of my scholarly life, was a critique of motherhood, and mothering in relation to schooling and education,

including into university. The idea of "maternal" as opposed to "paternal" or "patriarchal" leadership is to me deeply embedded in the critiques that we, as feminists, continue to make about the problematic structures of the economy and society. These become more pressing as we move into a global knowledge economy, and what the American feminist scholar, Sheila Slaughter, with colleagues (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), has called "academic capitalism," in which universities engage in market-like behaviours.

"COMMENCEMENT" OF FEMINIST STUDIES OF EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY

Having attended my son's PhD commencement in political theory at the University of California, Berkeley in May 2011, I have had recourse to reflecting upon my own commencement back in the mid-1970s. Whilst the term "commencement" is not used in the UK, the idea of thinking of graduation from the academy into the (academic) labour market is considered a growing phenomenon in the literature of higher education research, a field of my more recent interest (David, 2010). My own PhD and graduation was relatively unconventional, especially at the time, although it was not necessarily conventional to undertake a PhD in the social sciences. On graduation with a bachelor's degree in sociology from Leeds University, I became a social researcher in the University of London, without much thought about an academic career. Marriage and motherhood were then conventional social expectations and I was not particularly unconventional nor was I sufficiently radical as to defy social mores. Yet I became involved in the women's movement at the same time as I was working on a succession of research projects in three different colleges of the University of London. This political involvement was entirely separate from my academic studies. My third project grabbed my interest more than the previous two, as it was about educational policy, national and local politics, inspired as it was by the socialist-economist academic for whom I worked, Professor (now Lord) Maurice Peston. Concepts of educational and social equality underpinned the rationale for the study and I became interested in how they were put into practice in a variety of different local settings (David, 1977). I undertook the study as a social researcher without having obtained my doctorate.

A year spent undertaking a comparable study of local educational politics in the Boston metropolitan area, based as I was at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, persuaded me of the importance and interest of both continuing academic work on educational equality and my need for a PhD in order to be able to become an international scholar. I was attached to the Center for Educational Policy Research at Harvard at the time when *Inequality: A Reassessment of Family and Schooling in America* (Jencks et al., 1972) was published. The intellectual understanding of the causes and effects of educational inequality from families, socioeconomic backgrounds and employment were what taxed us as a group of scholars, from economists to sociologists. Bowles and Gintis (1976) were also embarking upon their study of schooling in different economic and social contexts whilst I was there. It was an intellectually invigorating time, and I undertook a

study of the politics of local schooling in the United States (David, 1975). I was influenced by several scholars at Harvard, most notably Mary-Jo Bane, David Cohen, Nathan Glazer, and Sandy Jencks, all of whom were interested in their different ways in critiquing educational policy developments in the USA, although largely around economic, social and ethnic or racial circumstances. However, I was not yet ready to develop a sustained or even slight feminist approach to inequality. Yet I did feel the lack of a doctorate was holding me back from further academic engagement.

On my return to the UK in the summer of 1973, and to an academic post as a lecturer in what was then called social administration at the University of Bristol, I decided to turn my research study of English local educational governance into a PhD. With the reluctant support of Maurice Peston, who questioned the value or necessity of a doctorate for further academic study in the social sciences, I submitted and obtained my PhD from the University of London in the spring of 1975, entitled *The Politics of Educational Change.* This was subsequently published as a monograph entitled *Reform, Reaction and Resources: The 3Rs of Educational Planning* (David, 1977). I was relatively unusual amongst my colleagues in Bristol social sciences to have a doctorate, although several were then in the process of undertaking one, including female colleagues.

It was during the development of these educational critiques of family, local politics and national policies that I was becoming aware of the wider ramifications of these questions for sexual or women's equality. I was also becoming more involved in the women's movement in Bristol and had several academic colleagues who were also involved. I had, in fact, tried to become involved in Cambridge, Massachusetts, but had not been able to find an appropriate network of academic feminists, although I had been involved in a Jewish feminist group there (David, 2003, p. 63). In Bristol the emerging women's movement was based upon students and young academics within both the University and the then Bristol Polytechnic (now University of West of England). I became a member of a group of women who created and taught women's studies courses for the Extra-Mural Department of the University and together we founded what became known as the Bristol Women's Studies Group. We were a group of 9 women across the humanities and social sciences—Elizabeth Bird, Ellen Malos, Marilyn Porter, Suzanne Skevington, Helen Taylor, Linda Ward, Helen Weinreich-Haste, Jackie West, and myself. In putting together materials for what became the first reader in women's studies in the UK, entitled *Half the Sky* (1979), we wanted to be known by a collective name, and chose Matrix, as a very female or even maternal collective noun, but our publishers did not think it would be suitable for marketing purposes. We struggled to develop our collaborative approach, asserting our female collectivity as we wrote in our introduction:

> This book has come out of our collective experiences of teaching women's studies courses over the past few years. None of us is a full-time teacher of women's studies but we have all taught courses in a variety of contexts, primarily adult education… What we can say is that women's studies is both

> a growing subject in its own right and an approach to traditional subjects … a result of a demand which has primarily come from women as part of their desire to understand more fully the past and present position of their sex … an increasing interest in what it means to be a woman which stems from the recent wave of feminism. By feminism we mean both an awareness of women's position in society as one of disadvantage or inequality compared with that of men and also a desire to remove those disadvantages … Female oppression is not so much about individuals as about how society is organized in ways which result in women's lives being restricted specifically because they are women. (pp. 1-2)

We embarked upon the project because there was very little material available for teaching these issues. Indeed, as the late Diana Leonard later remarked, most of the initial materials for feminist and women's courses came from women undertaking their doctoral work, especially in the United States. She mentioned particularly Kate Millett's (1970) ground-breaking study about sexual politics (Leonard, 2001). We collected together ephemeral materials and collated chapters to create a critique of women's inequality across the life course, from childhood, through family and education, into motherhood, and then health issues, creativity, and into older age. We were a group of scholarly women, all associated in various ways with higher education, although our intentions were to produce materials for enticing women into study and not for higher levels of study. At a recent reunion of the group, over 30 years on, we remarked upon how influential this approach has been to our subsequent academic lives. We all continued to be engaged in developing feminist critiques and studies within academia, maintaining an activist emphasis including thinking about our ageing lives. Most of us have become senior academics with expertise in feminist or gender issues, with six professors (Professors David, Haste, Porter, Skevington, Taylor, Ward) and three holding major senior and research positions in academia, receiving public honours for their work (Dr. Bird, Ms. Malos, and Ms. West).

At the same time as being engaged on this exciting new form of scholarly work, I was also involved in putting together an undergraduate course critiquing family and sexual divisions with colleagues in sociology and social policy, namely the sociologist Jackie West and the social policy expert Hilary Land. Each of us developed our own expertise and yet we worked collaboratively to develop an appropriately coordinated curriculum on family and social policy in the UK. Both Hilary and Jackie were influential in my own emerging critiques (Land, 1976; West, 1982) and our work had a mutually supportive core, as Jackie was also involved with *Half the Sky*. Hilary and I, for example, were invited to present a paper at a Fabian Society seminar on the future of the welfare state in London. We were subsequently invited to write it up for an edited volume of the same name (Glennerster, 1983). We entitled our essay, somewhat provocatively, "Sex and Social Policy," and it was the only piece in the edited collection on the theme of women's inequality in social and economic policies. It was a critique of sexual

equality policies including the setting up of the Sex Discrimination Act, 1975 and the attendant Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC).

Perhaps it was a measure of our growing critical influence as feminists that we were sued for libel by the first deputy director of the EOC, Lady Elspeth Howe, whose husband was Sir Geoffrey Howe. We had commented upon her resignation following her husband being made Chancellor of the Exchequer when Mrs Thatcher became Prime Minister in 1979. By the time the book was published in 1983, Lady Howe was a student of social administration at the London School of Economics and the book was required reading. She felt that we misrepresented the reasons for her resignation (David, 2003), but

> the incident revealed to us the controversial impact of even relatively mild forms of equal opportunity proposals and policies which did not go beyond the liberal perspective on employment rather than deeper issues of childcare, sex and sexuality. Our intention was to use a particularly public example to demonstrate difficulties of equalizing opportunities for employment between men and women even within the liberal polity. If it were difficult for middle class women and families, however much more so we reasoned for working class and poor households. (p. 97)

Quite clearly female rivalries around patriarchal men and authority also die hard, as this example so clearly illustrates.

My own work for the undergraduate course eventually became a book entitled *The State, The Family and Education* (David, 1980) in which I developed a historical and sociological analysis of women's positioning as mothers, daughters, teachers and others, drawing on Marxist and socialist work, especially from Althusser (1971). There was at that time very little feminist work on which to draw. That study led me into more studies on family and education, especially critiquing women's positioning and developing more critical and substantive studies than critiques of policy development. Over the years, however, I have been pleasantly surprised by the international influence that the book has garnered and how academic colleagues from countries such as Australia, Canada, Sweden and the USA have found my critique useful and stimulating of further work.

A third piece of work that I undertook in Bristol was with Caroline New about childcare and women's work, entitled *For the Children's Sake: Making Childcare More than Women's Business* (New & David, 1985). Working collaboratively with friends and colleagues is inevitably a struggle around forms of control and leadership, and Caroline and I found ourselves having to work carefully on this. We were at the time becoming involved in a form of self-help counseling called Re-evaluation Co-counseling (RC) and we used this as a way to help us through the writing together. Caroline has since then developed a strong analysis of this as a method of working (Kauffman & New, 2004). This idea of working on the emotional aspects of women writing together is important to understand as part of the reemergence of women's equality.

FEMINIST STUDIES OF MOTHERING AND SCHOOLING

Whilst I was an academic in Bristol, I began to develop an international network of colleagues, particularly through studies of mothering and schooling. Especially important was the work of Canadian colleagues based at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, including Dorothy Smith and her students, such as Alison Griffith and Kari Dehli. Dorothy Smith (1987) developed a critical methodological approach of "institutional ethnography" and an analysis from "the standpoint of women" that had enormous influence on those of us trying to develop a socialist and feminist analysis of women and children in educational policies. Over a thirty-year period, her studies influenced the scholarly work of feminists not only in Canada but the UK and Australia (David, 2003, pp. 99-100). Whilst I had started to develop a similar approach when I was in Bristol, this kind of study blossomed when I moved to South Bank University in London in 1985.

I moved to South Bank to become the head of the very large department of social sciences in the heady days when women were being recruited to such positions in increasing numbers. South Bank appointed three women to head departments in the humanities, law and social sciences in rapid succession, followed quickly by others in nursing and education. However, these were troubling times for the politics of local government of higher education, in parallel with universities in the public sector. The Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) was the body that controlled local authority higher education for 5 institutions, but by 1990 the Conservative government had decided to abolish this system, including the ILEA, deeming it to be too radical and socialist. Two years later, however, under the Higher Education Act 1992 new universities were created, and South Bank was one of the first to become a new or "post-1992" university. South Bank, like the other ILEA former polytechnics, struggled over its politics for students and for academic staff as much as for research, and this included particularly struggles over women's equality as academics, students and researchers. One of the first women leaders of a polytechnic, then new university, was appointed to South Bank, as first Director and then later Vice-Chancellor. She was a committed liberal feminist and strove to develop equal educational policies, although when made a life peer in the House of Lords, she chose to sit on the Conservative benches.

I too struggled to develop an identity as a "woman leader" within the social sciences; the struggles were as much with my female as male colleagues. Invited by a former colleague at Bristol to write about these issues for her edited collection, I called my essay "*Prima Donna Inter Pares*" to highlight the difficulties of being a "first woman" amongst equals (David, 1989). The title was drawn from a newspaper article I had read about Mrs Thatcher, and I tried to make light of my attempts to develop a feminist or female style of leadership. Previously, I had been invited to contribute an essay to a volume on the then emerging sociology of education. This was my first stab at writing autobiographically (David, 1987) and it was, however, initially quite a struggle to move out of the straitjacket of traditional academic social science and sociology, with its emphasis

on positivist methods. I had not found that essay at all controversial (David, 1987), but I had not reckoned with the sensitivities and sensibilities of my colleagues at South Bank with the second autobiographical piece. They were hurt by my public display of feminist politicking and, perhaps rightly with the benefit of hindsight, called me to account and asked me to explain why I had gone public without first consulting them. I was in fact discussing the difficulties and issues in moving from an elite university to a highly academic department in a higher education institution in financially stringent times. The trials of feminist leadership or management were indeed tough during this period of time in a new university caught in the vice of local and national politics over emergent new forms of higher education. South Bank, in every respect, was a huge contrast with Bristol. How much more so must this be the case with the advance of neoliberal league tables for research-intensive versus teaching-intensive universities? Bristol is now an exemplar of a Russell group university (select public research-focused universities in the UK), and whilst South Bank has become an extremely strong research centre for the social sciences, the university remains caught within the politics of new universities. And I too have not been immune to the difficulties of being in a university that is not highly valued in public policy terms, despite its excellent social science research.

Whilst I was at South Bank, I was promoted to a professorship and was the first woman in the inaugural round, in which 8 people—of whom 7 were men—were bestowed the honour for their research expertise. In my inaugural professorial lecture, inevitably, I developed an autobiographical style, in keeping with the convention of presenting one's own intellectual and academic research perspective. I was also the first to present an inaugural lecture at London's South Bank in 1990. It was entitled "What is Education for?" (David, 1990), and in it I discussed my research on the history and policies of education, including higher education and the polytechnic itself, around the theme of equality of educational opportunity, including on grounds of sex and socioeconomic backgrounds of poverty versus privilege.

It was at South Bank that I gathered together a group of doctoral researchers, within the Social Sciences Research Centre of Excellence, who all undertook similar kinds of study around family and education or home-school relations. It was an incredibly energetic and creative period of research; individually all five doctoral students successfully completed their PhDs and moved on to become highly successful in their individual academic careers (David, 2003, p. 143). Together we all also created a body of feminist research on mothering and schooling that has spawned new ways of thinking and researching with completely unanticipated and creative consequences. One particular collaborative work was put together with three of these research students, namely *Mothers and Education: Inside Out. Exploring Family Education Policies and Experiences* (David et al., 1993). Ros Edwards, Mary Hughes and Jane Ribbens each wrote about their own research projects from historical, social policy and sociological perspectives, and together we created some new perspectives on how to think about these relationships. These three feminist scholars also produced their own research

papers and books on their doctoral work. They have gone on to develop wholly new and innovative ways of thinking, feminist methodological developments and texts (e.g., Ribbens & Edwards, 1998).

Ros Edwards and I continued to research together on children and methods of studying children, whilst Jane Ribbens and I moved into another area of thinking about mothers' choice of school for their children. We also began to work with Anne West and colleagues at the Centre for Educational Research at the London School of Economics, developing new perspectives on school choice (West & Ribbens, 1994). Separately but connectedly, I also began to explore parental choices with yet another of these creative and innovative research students, Diane Reay (1998). Together with Stephen Ball, we began to look at the complexities of choice of university across students in a number of London schools, leading eventually to the publication of *Degrees of Choice* (Reay, David, & Ball, 2005). We also worked with a number of international colleagues, on these themes of family school choices, and especially the theoretical underpinnings, and here for example Delia Langa Rosado of Spain (Rosado & David, 2006) and Amy Stambach at Wisconsin in the United States.

Indeed, I like to argue that the zenith of my career was when Amy's and my essay (Stambach & David, 2005) on feminist theory and school choice was accepted for publication in the prestigious American feminist journal, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. I could think of no higher personal honour than to have been accepted for publication here, in a journal that was to international feminist researchers quite simply the best. Being accepted here was probably thanks to Amy's knowledge of the American approach to publication, and yet, on the other hand, I feel that my support of this excellent young woman's anthropological research on mothers and schools was also vitally important.

Looking back it is striking to see what a seamless web of creativity, around methodologies and substantive studies, was initiated during this period of time. Both Ros and Diane, in particular, have become towering feminist researchers in their own right, with Ros having run the Families and Social Capital Research Group at London's South Bank, and Diane now a distinguished professor of education at the University of Cambridge. Whilst it may be immodest to claim to have been the "mother" of their feminist and scholarly creativity, I take some pride in the claim of being the midwife to their considerable talents and endeavours.

BECOMING A FEMINIST "MOTHER" IN GENDER AND EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

During the 1990s, the discourse about women's oppression was changing, from a concern with sex and sexuality to the distinction between sexuality and gender roles, although feminist remained at the forefront of these shifting conceptualizations. My own work also began to respond to these changing perspectives, and I began to work with two women whom I have come to regard as my professional "sisters," namely Madeleine Arnot and Gaby Weiner. Together we successfully bid for funds to undertake a major study for the UK Equal

Opportunities Commission (EOC) on gender and schooling. We considered boys' and girls' achievements in secondary schools in England and Wales, and we examined the role of schools in changing this gender balance in examination results. Initially we reported to the EOC and then we transformed our research study into a book entitled *Closing the Gender Gap: Postwar Education and Social Change* (Arnot, David, & Weiner, 1999). In demonstrating that girls' educational achievements began to surpass boys' in public examinations at the end of secondary schooling, and in attempting to provide a social and educational explanation, our book has had a major impact upon the sociology of education and the development of a field of gender and education scholarship. Whilst the notion of a gender gap and its changing form has also been important within public policy, with the rise to power of the New Labour government in the UK, specific policy responses have been very muted. Indeed, some have questioned the approach, and others have argued that women's equality has been achieved, given girls' successes at school (David, 2009). This "feminisation debate" (Morley, 2011) has become a central theme of public policy debate about schooling and higher education in the 21st century.

Indeed, during the first decade of the 21st century, the question of women's equality in education and across the life course became much more heavily contested than it had been in the last decade of the 20th century. By the beginning of this century, I had considerable expertise of being a senior woman in academia, having been involved in setting up or running a number of professional groups, specifically to enhance the cause of women in higher education, such as a group of senior women managers in academia entitled *Through the Glass Ceiling,* and the Women's Studies Network Association, which changed its name to the Feminist and Women's Studies Association. At the turn of the century, we turned our attention to the setting up of the Gender and Education Association (GEA), linked closely with the innovative and successful journal *Gender and Education*. At the launch of the GEA in April 2002, together with Christina Hughes, I became the inaugural co-chair. This organization has developed into a strong professional association, developing conferences, seminars and resources for feminist researchers, academics and school teachers. It has become a key intellectual home and source of solidarity for feminist education researchers in the academy. I have returned to become the policy officer for the association.

This has become increasingly important as the global academy is becoming less sympathetic and supportive to this kind of scholarly activity, combined as association building is with notions of social and political activism and change. My own experiences have borne out how much more antagonistic to such explicit work some higher education institutions have become. For example, I had a brief sojourn at what was then the London Institute, an amalgam of five colleges for the creative arts. I was appointed for my research expertise in the humanities and social sciences as Dean of Research across the colleges (David, 2003). The expectation was that I would be an academic leader and not a manager, leaving the financial control issues to senior management who did not have academic expertise or experience. However, this somewhat arcane distinction made life very difficult for

developing a research culture in the arts, and my qualities as an academic leader were found wanting, or gender politics perhaps interceded.

Whatever the reasons, I found the culture outside my comfort zone, so I left to take up an altogether more comfortable position developing a professional doctorate in education at the University of Keele. I was able here to develop one on the specific topic of gender and education management, alongside returning to undertake research on these themes. Indeed, I began to study doctoral education and assessment with two very congenial colleagues who have been an enormous source of influence on my own feminist intellectual development, namely the late Professor Diana Leonard and Professor Louise Morley. Together we studied forms of doctoral examination, namely the viva voce, and we wrote on these questions. One of our articles won an award for being the best journal article of that year (Morley, Leonard, & David, 2003). In my inaugural lecture at Keele, I chose the euphonious title *From Keighley to Keele*, and I reflected upon my intellectual journey through family and sociology, to becoming the director of an innovative doctoral programme in education and gender. I referred warmly to my EdD students on this programme as my little GEMS (gender and education management students). They were indeed, and the opportunity to develop a programme of studies for an international group of students all concerned with questions of the analysis of changing patterns of gender discrimination, sexual harassment and balance in education was very exciting and rewarding. The students were from higher education institutions or universities across the globe, and all were already very experienced teachers. They were excited by the prospects of researching about their own situations and from a personal perspective; and they were truly exciting to work with. For example, Ruby Greene's study of health and sex education programmes in Guyana and the role of calypso in embedding a particular sexualized culture was an amazing piece of work and so too was Jane Rarieya's study of female headteachers in Kenyan schools. Moving into doctoral education in the social sciences and education, and drawing on my previous experiences of supervision of doctoral students was a wholly satisfying and inspiring experience for me. I also explored the questions of the politics and practice of sex education with another feisty feminist researcher, Dr Pam Alldred (Alldred & David, 2007).

The students at Keele, as at South Bank, represented a diversity of women having access to new forms of higher education. They were examples of the newly named policies of widening participation to or in higher education. It was indeed a privilege to be able to work with such students, and to draw inspiration from them, at the same time as inspiring them to greater intellectual curiosity about their own situations. The question of policies of widening participation became then my own intellectual concern, as I moved to become one of the Associate Directors of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme, a nationwide set of studies of education across the life course, funded by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council. My responsibilities were for studies of higher education, including forms of access from school to university. In particular I coordinated seven studies of different forms of access to or participation within higher education, looking across a diversity of students and courses of study. Whilst

gender was one of the concerns, it was not the most pre-eminent issue. Rather the major focus was on other forms of social diversity, such as social class or low socioeconomic status (David et al., 2009). The "feminisation debate" in public policy arenas had taken a strong hold on our publicly funded *research*.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS ON BEING A "MOTHER" IN THE FEMINIST SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Reflecting upon my feminist studies in gender and education has become increasingly an issue, as this approach has become a concern of an international network of education feminists (Weiler & David, 2008). Sue Middleton (2003) of Waikato University in New Zealand prompted several of us to think about the changing forms of feminism in the academy, and as a result we gathered together at a symposium at the American Education Research Association annual meeting in 2006 to consider the issues. This resulted in a special issue of *Discourse* edited with Kathleen Weiler (Weiler & David, 2008) in which colleagues from Australia, Canada, the USA and UK reflected upon *Second Wave Feminism and Education* in these metropolitan and Anglophone countries. Our concerns were with reflecting upon the specificities, as well as the communalities of the ways the women's movement had influenced our scholarship and continued to be reflected in our concerns with questions of gender and education in the neoliberal global academy. Sue Clegg and I wrote together about these effects with UK higher education and how the personalization agenda had come to dominate (David & Clegg, 2008). We had previously considered the trajectories of the personal in forms of higher education, and our own passionate pedagogies (Clegg & David, 2006) around feminist experiential approaches.

Similarly, Louise Morley and I organized a symposium at a meeting of the Society for Research in Higher Education to ponder the complexity of gender issues in higher education, seeing these as challenges and opportunities (Morley & David, 2009). This has also led to a series of reflective seminars hosted by Louise Morley's Centre for Higher Education and Equity Research at the University of Sussex. Here the "feminisation debate" and specifically the question of whether women's equality had now been accomplished in higher education became a major topic of debate. A number of presentations from this inspirational seminar series on "imagining the university of the future" were put together for a special issue of *Contemporary Social Science.* Here we tried separately and together to think about what the university of the future might look like if feminist approaches, perspectives and concerns became central and critical.

Whilst it is clear that over the course of my academic career feminist perspectives in sociology and education are now taken more seriously, they remain of questionable significance. In policy debates they are either rendered invisible or seen as risible: gender equality has been achieved and our concerns should be about "poor working-class white boys." Is this what "motherly" concern should be or is there an alternative, more critical feminist motherly concern for the future of both men and women and their educational lives? It is perhaps a measure of how

influential feminists and feminist scholars in higher education have become that we are seen as threatening and derided. I would however argue that feminist scholarship and research on women's learning lives on: it is vibrant and vigorous and values women equally with men, and it is vital to our learning lives.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

David, M. E. (1980). *The state, the family and education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

New, C., & David, M. E. (1985). *For the children's sake: Making child care more than women's business.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

David, M. E., Edwards, R., Hughes, M., & Ribbens, J. (1993). *Mothers and education: Inside out? Exploring family-education policy and experience*. London: Macmillan.

David, M. E., West, A., & Ribbens, J. (1994). *Mother's intuition? Choosing secondary schools*. London: Falmer Press.

Arnot, M., David, M. E., & Weiner, G. (1999). *Closing the gender gap: Post war education and social change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

David, M. E. (2003). *Personal and political: Feminisms, sociology and family lives*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

David, M. E., & Stambach, A. (2005). Feminist theory and educational policy: How gender has been involved in home school debates about school choice. *SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*(2), 1633-1659.

Reay, D., David, M. E., & Ball, S. J. (2005). *Degrees of choice: Social class, race and gender in higher education*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Alldred, P., & David, M. E. (2007). *Get real about sex: The politics and practice of sex education*. London: McGraw Hill/Open University Press.

David, M. E. (2009). *Transforming global higher education: A feminist perspective*. London: Institute of Education.

REFERENCES

Alldred, P., & David, M. E. (2007). *Get real about sex: The politics and practice of sex education*. London: McGrawHill/Open University Press.

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays.* London: New Left Books.

Arnot, M., David, M. E., & Weiner, G. (1997). *Closing the gender gap: Postwar education and social change.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America.* New York: Basic Books.

Bristol Women's Studies Group. (1979). *Half the sky: An introduction to women's studies*. London: Virago.

Clegg S., & David, M. E. (2006). Passion, pedagogies and the project of the personal in higher education. *21st Century Society: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences, 1*(2), 149-167.

David, M. E. (1975). *School rule in the USA: A case study of participation in budgeting*. Cambridge, England: Ballinger.

David, M. E. (1977). *Reform, reaction and resources: The 3Rs of educational planning*. Windsor, Ontario, Canada: Berks National Foundation for Educational Research Publishing Company.

David, M. E. (1980). *The state, the family and education.* London: Routledge, Kegan and Paul.

David, M. E. (1987). On becoming a feminist in the sociology of education. In G. Walford (ed.), *Doing sociology of education* (pp. 269-293). Lewes, England: Falmer Press.

David, M. E. (1989). Prima donna inter pares: Women in academic management. In S. Acker (Ed.), *Teachers, gender and careers.* London: Falmer Press.

David, M. E. (1991). *What is education for?* Inaugural professorial lecture. London: South Bank Polytechnic.

David, M. E. (1993). *Parents, gender and education reform*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

David, M. E. (2002). From Keighley to Keele: Reflections on a personal, professional and academic journey. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education, 23*(2), 249-269.

David, M. E. (2003). *Personal and political: Feminisms, sociology and family lives*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

David, M. E. (2009a). Social diversity and democracy in higher education in the 21st century. *Higher Education Policy, 22*(1), 61-79.

David, M. E. (2009b). *Transforming global higher education: A feminist perspective.* Inaugural professorial lecture. London: Institute of Education.

David, M. E. (2010). A personal and professional reflection on doctoral supervision. In M. Walker & P. Thomson (Eds.), *A doctoral supervisor's companion* (pp. 247-260). London: Routledge.

David, M. E., & Clegg, S. (2008). Power, pedagogy & personalisation in global higher education: The occlusion of second wave feminism? *Discourse*: *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(4), 483-498.

David, M. E., & Land, H. (1983). Sex and social policy. In H. Glennerster (Ed.), *The future of the welfare state: Remaking social policy* (pp. 138-157). London: Heinemann Educational Books .

David, M. E., & Woodward, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Negotiating the glass ceiling: Senior women in the academic world*. London: Falmer Press.

David, M. E., Edwards, R., Hughes, M., & Ribbens, J. (1993). *Mothers and education: Inside out? Exploring family-education policy and experience*. London: Macmillan.

David, M. E., West, A., & Ribbens, J. (1994). *Mother's intuition? Choosing secondary schools*. London: Falmer Press.

David, M. E. with Bathmaker, A-M., Crozier, G., Davis, P., Ertl, H., Fuller, A., Hayward, G., Heath, S., Hockings, C., Parry, G., Reay, D., Vignoles, A., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Improving learning by widening participation in higher education.* London: Routledge.

David, M. E., with Hey, V., & Morley, L. (Eds.). (2011). Special issue: Challenges, Changes and Crisis in global higher education: Imagining the university of the future. *Contemporary Social Science, 6*(2).

de Beauvoir, S. (1949/1953). *The second sex.* London: Four Square.

de Beauvoir, S. (1958/1963). *Memoirs of a dutiful daughter.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Evans, M. (1985). *Simone de Beauvoir: A feminist mandarin.* London: Tavistock.

Freeman, J. (1973). *The politics of women's liberation.* New York: McKay.

Glennerster, H. (ed.). (1983). *The future of the welfare state. Remaking social policy.* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1973). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Kauffman, K., & New, C. (2004). *Co-counselling: The theory and practice of re-evaluation counseling.* New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Land, H. (1976). Women: Supporters or supported? In D. L. Barker & S. Allen (Eds.), *Sexual divisions and society: Process and change*. London: Longmans.

Langa Rosado, D., & David, M. E. (2006). A massive university or a university for the masses? Continuity and change in higher education in Spain and England. *Journal of Education Policy, 3*(3), 343-364.

Leonard, D. (2004). *A woman's guide to doctoral studies.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Middleton, S. (1998). *Disciplining sexualities: Foucault, life histories and education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Mead, M. (1928). *Coming of age in Samoa.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Mead, M. (1935). *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Millett, K. (1970). *Sexual politics.* New York: Doubleday.
Mitchell, J., & Oakley, A. (Eds.). (1976). *The rights and wrongs of women.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
Moi, T. (1990). *What is a woman and other essays.* Oxford, England: Blackwell.
Morgan, R. (1970). *Sisterhood is powerful.* New York: Random House.
Morley, L. (2011). Misogyny posing as measurement: Disrupting the feminisation crisis discourse. *Contemporary Social Science, 6*(2), 223-237.
Morley, L., & David, M. E. (2009). Celebrations and challenges: Gender in higher education introduction. *Higher Education Policy, 22*(1), 1-2.
Morley, L., Leonard, D., & David, M. E. (2003). Quality and equality in British PhD assessment. *Quality Assurance in Education, 11*(2), 64-72.
Myrdal, A., & Klein, V. (1956). *Women's two roles.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
New, C., & David, M. E. (1985). *For the children's sake: Making childcare more than women's business.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
Okely, J. (1986). *Simone de Beauvoir.* London: Virago.
Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. London: Routledge.
Parsons, T. (1961). *Theories of society: Foundations of modern sociological theory*. New York: Free Press.
Reay, D. (1998). *Class work: Mothers' involvement in their children's primary schooling.* London: UCL Press.
Reay, D., David, M. E., & Ball, S. J. (2005). *Degrees of choice: Social class, race and gender in higher education.* Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.
Ribbens, J., & Edwards, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Feminist dilemmas in qualitative research: Public knowledge and private lives.* London: Sage.
Rich, A. (1976). *Of woman born.* London: Virago.
Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic.* Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.
Smith, D. E., & Griffith, A. (1990). Coordinating the uncoordinated: Schooling, mothering and the family wage. In G. Miller & J. Holstein (eds.), *Perspectives on social problems, Vol. 2* (pp. 25-34). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Stambach, A., & David, M. E. (2005). Feminist theory and educational policy: How gender has been "involved" in family school choice debates. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*, 1633-1659.
Thomson, P., & Walker, M. (Eds.). (2010). *The Routledge doctoral student's companion: Getting to grips with research in education and the social sciences*. New York: Routledge.
Weiler, K. & David, M. E. (2008). The personal and political: Second wave feminism and educational research: Introduction. *Discourse*: *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(4), 433-435.
West, A., Noden, P., Edge, A., Davies, J., & David, M.E. (1997). *Parental choice, involvement and expectations of achievement in education*. London: London School of Economics, Centre for Educational Research.
West, J. (Ed.). (1982). *Work, women and the labour market.* London: Routledge.

Miriam E. David
Professor Emerita of Education
Institute of Education, University of London

MARGARET EISENHART

LIFE IN THREE-WALLED ROOMS

BEGINNING

I am a person who has always been much more interested in other people's lives than my own. Growing up in white, middle-class Washington, DC, I had friends and classmates who had lived all over the world and regularly moved on from Washington to exotic places like San Diego, Honolulu, Germany, Japan, and Africa. I so wanted to go with them, to meet the wonderful people they would meet and see the fantastic places they would see. My grandfather had been a Bureau of Indian Affairs agent in Wyoming, who later worked at the Smithsonian Institute, and collected *National Geographic* magazines. I poured through every issue and imagined myself observing chimpanzees or visiting the czar's summer palace. Much to my dismay, my family stayed home. No surprise, I suppose, that I grew up as a girl who intended to go wherever she wanted, with whomever she wanted, and do whatever she wanted as an adult. No surprise either, that I became an anthropologist and a feminist, although I couldn't articulate these stances until much later, and I continue to grapple with what it means to apply them in my own life.

I took the title for this essay from Valerie Boyd's book, *Wrapped in Rainbows* (2004), a biography of Zora Neale Hurston, the famous black author, anthropologist, feminist, and participant in the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s. In one section of the book, Boyd describes Hurston returning to her all-black hometown of Eatonville, Florida, after studying anthropology at Columbia with Franz Boas. Boyd writes:

> Back in her hometown's embrace, with the spyglass of anthropology at the ready, Zora fully recognized and appreciated the affirmation that was inherent in a town such as Eatonville, where black culture flourished free from the burdensome, acquisitive white gaze. Eatonville was, as one observer would put it, "like a four-walled room." Self-governing and self-determining, it was markedly different from the places where most of Zora's Harlem Renaissance colleagues had grown up: [Where there were] "rooms with one wall missing, exposing their lives to the white man's intentions and inspection."

In contrast to Boyd's Hurston (and growing up in circumstances very different from hers), I felt trapped in a four-walled room at home and loved the idea of a three-walled room open to the outside. This is how I headed off to college.

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 61–70.

COLLEGE

In college at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, I was deeply affected by the black civil rights movement. Primed by experiences in Washington at the time of Martin Luther King's assassination (on the day of my high school prom), Robert Kennedy's assassination (on the day of my high school graduation), and the ensuing race riots, I went south with an urgent interest in learning more about black-white race relations in my own country as well as a strong desire to experience life in another country. I was initially discouraged by negative reports from other students about Emory's anthropology department and decided to major in French literature in hopes of spending my junior year in France (a Western country purportedly more open to blacks and unconventional gender roles than the U.S. at that time). I spent an eye-opening and deeply reflective junior year in Lyon, France, including extended stays in Denmark and Finland. I returned to Emory more interested than ever in cultural differences and cross-cultural relations. By this time, a new cultural anthropology professor had been hired, and she was a woman (the first in the department and one of only a few on campus at the time), Gwen Neville Kennedy! I signed up for her courses and was immediately engaged in everything from baboon socialization to Paleolithic stone tools to Irish family relations. Gwen was an outstanding teacher, an energetic anthropologist, and a strong female role model. I could not have been more inspired or impressed. At the same time, I also happened to take an elective course in educational studies (for no clear reason that I can recall) and began to learn more about school desegregation issues in the South from an academic perspective. This conjunction of anthropology and education courses led me to think about a career in a field that would combine the two. I had no idea that such a field existed, but when I mentioned my idea to Gwen, she told me about the work of George Spindler and others in anthropology of education. I began to think about pursuing that in graduate school.

INTERLUDE

Not surprisingly, as a young (twenty-something) woman now well accustomed to the American South, I found myself considering college graduation and marriage at the same time. Of course, I would have told anyone who asked that marriage would never interfere with *my* career plans, but it did. My husband-to-be had just been offered a prestigious scholarship for graduate study at Duke University, and so I moved with him to North Carolina in search of a job. I still had my eye on graduate school and was determined to find a job that would strengthen my experience in the area of anthropology and education that I hoped to study. Amazingly (in all kinds of ways), I got a position as an admissions and recruitment counselor at historically black Shaw University in Raleigh, NC. My job was to recruit white students to an all-black college in the South in 1972! Needless to say, I got some first-hand experience with southern black-white relations, including a quick retreat from a college fair night in advance of the Ku Klux Klan, as well as

many close friendships with civil rights activists, both black and white. After a year and half, I failed to recruit a single white student and realized that I was not strong enough to continue. So, I applied to graduate school in anthropology.

GRADUATE SCHOOL

I applied to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill because it was nearby and I qualified for in-state tuition. I got in but was told that I would have to craft my own program if I wanted to pursue anthropology of education, since no one on the faculty focused on that area. Not really knowing what it meant to craft my own program, I agreed. Luckily for me, someone with an interest in that area was hired the very next year. And she was a woman (only the second in the department)! The cognitive/psychological anthropologist Dorothy Holland (then Dorothy Clement) became my mentor, advisor, and life-long friend and colleague. For nearly 40 years, Dottie has guided, nurtured, challenged and inspired me. I cannot imagine my career without her.

For my Masters' thesis, I studied young black and white children's playground interactions, using a conceptual scheme developed by anthropologists John and Beatrice Whiting for comparing children's socialization across cultures. I also got a divorce. For my dissertation, I wanted to focus on school desegregation as it was taking place all around me in North Carolina—what was actually happening as southern schools were forced to desegregate (beginning with busing in 1972); what did it mean to students, teachers, parents, and community members engaged in it; what changes did it bring; and what were its implications for the future? Dottie and another faculty member, Joe Harding, were interested in this too, as was, fortuitously, the National Institute of Education (now the Institute for Education Sciences). We received a grant from them for a two-year ethnographic study of a newly desegregating elementary school in North Carolina.

This type of study was not common in anthropology at the time. Most academic anthropologists did their ethnographic fieldwork abroad and encouraged their students to do so as well. Fieldwork in the United States was more commonly done by qualitative sociologists inspired by the Chicago School, and fieldwork about education was usually a small part of larger community studies done by anthropologists in other countries or sociologists in the United States. Only a small group of anthropologists—fewer than 20 were well-known—focused their scholarship on formal schooling, and most of them worked in communities of Native Americans in the U.S. and Aboriginals in Canada. Other anthropologists had long worked on applied topics (such as designing medical practices, agricultural techniques, or innovative equipment that would be culturally appropriate for specific non-Western or non-mainstream groups), but ethnographic studies of national experiments, generally supported by the anthropologists who studied them, were extremely rare. Dottie, Joe and I were in this small group.

For me, our study of Grandin Elementary School (a pseudonym) was the opportunity I had been waiting for, and it turned me into an anthropologist of education. I spent two to three days a week for two years, observing and

interviewing students, teachers, and parents at Grandin, which was forcibly desegregated during the summer of 1975 when our research began. I spent the first year focused mainly on the 5th graders; the second year, I focused mainly on the 6th graders. Our analysis revealed a "veneer of harmony" that permeated the culture of the school and community but hid racial misunderstandings and tensions festering beneath it (Clement, Eisenhart, & Harding, 1979). I was introduced to so much about anthropology and ethnography in the course of this study: how to talk to and learn from people who were different from me, how to focus on language use, how to use theoretical concepts such as social roles and identities to interpret individual actions and stances, how to inductively analyze fieldnotes and interview transcripts for codes and themes, how to write and present an ethnographic monograph, and how to negotiate relationships with study participants, sponsors, and critics. Dottie and Joe included me in every aspect of the work—from planning to organizing to implementing to analyzing to presenting to writing.

In my dissertation, I reanalyzed the Grandin data to look for evidence of patterns in gender relations. Given our findings about race relations (which were tightly controlled by adults so as to create a superficial sense of harmony in a context of racial tension), I was interested in whether a different pattern would emerge for gender. It did. For the most part, gender relations at the school were conventional (boys interacted and played with other boys, girls with other girls), uncontroversial (gender segregation of interests and activities was not questioned), and received little scrutiny (adults rarely intervened or contributed). Of special interest was the finding that gender relations among the students were mediated primarily by peers, leaving them on their own to work out their relationships, most of which took conventional forms (Eisenhart & Holland, 1983). In this context, a surprising finding was that white girls anticipated having more gender-traditional jobs or careers than black girls. This finding became the basis for Dottie's and my second collaboration, a second proposal to NIE, the study that resulted in the book *Educated in Romance* (Holland & Eisenhart, 1990), and the work that I have done on women in education since then.

FIRST REAL JOB

Shortly before defending my dissertation, I began to look for an academic job. The first thing I discovered was that there were very few. (I must have known something about this in advance, but I found myself shocked that *I* might not find a job; hadn't I followed my passion, worked hard, and almost completed seven years of graduate study?!) The second thing I discovered was that jobs in education paid better than those in anthropology. Only one anthropology department in the U.S. advertised a job for an anthropologist of education that year. One other job was advertised in a College of Education. The anthropology department job was taken by the most prominent anthropologist of education in the country on leave from his regular position at Stanford. Miraculously I was offered the other job—at Virginia Tech, after a friend turned it down. Also miraculously, I was hired after the search committee chair received a letter from a prominent anthropologist suggesting that

any anthropologist worth her salt would travel often to faraway field sites and could not be expected to contribute much to a College of Education.

Once at Virginia Tech (in 1980), I did travel one week a month for several years to the exotic outpost of North Carolina to work with Dottie and others on the *Educated in Romance* study, and I did manage to contribute to the College of Education. At Tech, I was the first to teach anthropology of education and qualitative research methods to students in the College. The College was ahead of most other graduate education programs in offering a foundations course in anthropology and a course in ethnographic research taught by someone trained in anthropology (me). I also taught women's studies courses there. I loved my seven years at Virginia Tech, especially the close friendship I developed with Hilda Borko (a junior professor there at the same time) and the unwavering support for my research from more senior professors, especially Gary Fenstermacher, Tom Hunt, and Sheila Slaughter. They taught me how important scholarly research was in the field of education.

EDUCATED IN ROMANCE

The study that became *Educated in Romance: Women, Achievement and College Culture*, was motivated by the idea (based on the Grandin study) that black college women might think about and prepare for more gender-atypical jobs and careers than white college women and that the women's career decisions would be mediated primarily by their college peers. To explore this idea, Dottie and I designed two ethnographic case studies of 23 women during their first two years of college on two university campuses—one historically black and one historically white campus. The ethnographic work was supplemented with a survey administered to 350 women on the two campuses and longitudinal follow-up telephone interviews with the 23 women at the end of their senior year and again three years after their college graduation. During the follow-up phase, Dottie and another colleague, Debra Skinner, collected gender-related words and stories from another sample of college women (Holland & Skinner, 1987). Intent on closely examining the women's peer group interactions, relationships, and talk during their freshman and sophomore years, we got to know the young women as friends and spent time with them in their dorms, at social events with their friends, on study trips to the library, at sports and other campus events, and even on dates. We expected to hear and observe them discussing school, academic interests, and career ideas among other things. But we were wrong; they spoke very little about these matters. Instead, their peer talk and activities focused on attractiveness and romantic relationships with men. Eventually we identified a "culture of romance"—a taken-for-granted way of thinking about how the world of heteronormative romance works—that permeated the women's peer group talk and interactions and, in many cases, diverted the women's attention away from academics and career preparation. In the culture of romance, young women measured their worth in terms of their ability to attract desirable men and to be treated well by them. College men also were affected by this imagery, but they

could acquire status among their friends from being leaders in school, sports, and various other activities. Women's high status came mostly from their involvement in romantic relationships with attractive men. Women who attracted attractive men became the objects of intense interest, scrutiny, and envy. In contrast, women who did well in school, assumed leadership positions, or became star athletes—but did not attract attractive men—were not nearly as interesting or enviable. Women who could not or did not bring their appearance or behavior into line with this image of popularity were at risk of being marginalized by their peers. Women who were *too* popular with men were also at risk, because peers questioned their reputations. And finally, women who acted as if they were not interested in men were at risk, because others thought them "strange," "weird," or gay. This system left a lot of young women feeling both dependent on men and inadequate or unattractive. This pattern was found among both black and white women and regardless of stated career choice (gender-traditional or not). Only a few of the women seriously pursued academics or a career in college, and all of those who kept their relationships with men in the background of their lives.

Educated in Romance stands as one of the few ethnographic studies of students in college and arguably the only one that advances a cultural mechanism for U.S. college women's contribution to the reproduction of gender during the height of a women's movement. Although we did not find what we set out to find or what we, as feminists, wanted to find, this study and this book established my name in women's studies, higher education, anthropology, and ethnographic research. Twenty years after its original publication, it remains the work that I am best known for.

SECOND JOB

In 1985 I received tenure at Virginia Tech and expected to stay there. I was happy with my job and colleagues and did not want to move, but my second husband, Joe Harding, who followed me to Blacksburg, was stuck in a dead-end job, and my stepson was preparing to leave for college. David Berliner, whom I knew thanks to Fenstermacher and Borko, was serving as an outside consultant for a faculty reform effort at the School of Education at the University of Colorado Boulder, and he invited me to apply for one of the open positions there. I knew nothing about Boulder at the time, but Joe had family ties in Colorado. I decided to apply, and I got the job. We moved to Colorado in 1987.

At Colorado, I was hired to be a qualitative researcher first, an anthropologist of education second, and a gender specialist not at all. Nonetheless, I began to concentrate my work on girls and women who were engaged in (non-traditional) science and technology pursuits. This work led to the publication of *Women's Science: Learning and Succeeding from the Margins*, which I co-authored with Liza Finkel and three of my graduate students in 1998. The *Women's Science* study was designed to investigate places where women did well in science or technology. In the face of so many accounts of women discouraged or pushed out of science, we wanted to learn about places where women were successful in science: where

they learned science and enjoyed their work and colleagues, where they were present in more than token number, and where they were recognized and promoted for their accomplishments in fields historically associated with men. We wondered what such organizational spaces looked and felt like and how they might differ from those with few or no women. It proved difficult to find such places, and the ones we did find were not the ones most people think of when they think of science. Our sites were not conventional classrooms or laboratories; they were not the sites of spectacular discoveries or large federal grants. Rather, they were all "on the margins" of established communities of scientific or technical practice. One was an atypical high school genetics class; one was a college engineering internship; one was a political action group; and one was a non-profit environmental agency. In these sites, we found women more scientifically literate than the general population, we found them occupying close to 50% of high status positions, we found women's performance scores to be equal or higher than men's, and we found women excited and satisfied in their work. What we discovered in case studies of these four sites were bright young women, interested and well-prepared in science and technology fields, who were consciously choosing low-status, low-paying or even volunteer work as a way to pursue their interests, while, at the same time, more elite, higher-paying jobs in science and technology were going unfilled around them. Why was this happening?

By investigating beliefs about scientific expertise, personal competence, and gender identity at each site, and closely following the women's decision-making about whether and how to continue in science, we learned that the women were influenced by a "discourse of (alleged) gender neutrality"—that is, by a particular way of talking and thinking about "doing science" where gender fairness was a priority. The women were first attracted to the sites by claims that men and women in science were treated equally there. The claims were evident in advertisements, from teachers and counselors, and in reports from those who already worked there. This discourse both attracted women to the sites and hid some features that disadvantaged women more than men. Women were attracted by the idea that they would be treated equally at work. But they were disadvantaged to the extent that competent work was talked about as if it were genderless or gender-neutral when in fact doing good work required behaviors that were easier for most men than for most women. As a rule, women found access and success only insofar as they acted like prototypical white, middle class men. For example, successful women (and men, too) had to conform to work practices culturally and historically associated with male professionals who give primary attention to their work, who have wives at home to take care of children, and who enjoy the prerogative of feeling safe from harm on their own in public places. The discourse of gender neutrality, especially when contrasted with all the evidence presented by the media about discrimination against women in elite science, enabled the women we studied to celebrate and legitimize lower-status sites of science. In these sites, women's struggles were not defined in terms of access, opportunity, rewards, or promotions in male-dominated fields. Instead, they were defined as individual

struggles to be successful, satisfied, and safe in places believed to be gender-neutral that were not.

RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE

After my experience with *Women's Science,* I decided that I could no longer simply study girls' and women's gendered experiences in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) fields; I wanted to put my expertise to use with young women. In 1999, I started an after-school program in science and technology for low-income, middle school girls of color in downtown Denver. The program was designed to draw on the girls' existing interests, facilitate their exploration of science and technology, support their school science activities, develop computer skills, build self-confidence, and question women's underrepresentation in STEM. The program ran for ten years, mainly as community outreach with a very small research component (funding came from local philanthropies who supported direct services but not research). In 2004, I began working on a collaborative research proposal to the National Science Foundation for a similar after-school program for high school girls that would be studied rigorously. The proposal included an after-school program in engineering exploration designed for low-income, high-achieving high school sophomore girls of color in three states. It also included ethnographic, case study, and survey research supplemented with social media messages (email, texting, and Facebook) to learn about the program, the girls, and the context of their lives. This work was funded in 2006 and has continued since, supported by additional NSF grants allowing us to follow the young women through college and to begin another study of high school opportunities in STEM. These projects, entitled "Female Recruits Explore Engineering" (FREE) with Monica Bruning and Jill Bystydzienski, and "High School Pathways to STEM" with Lois Weis, have allowed me to combine my academic interests in anthropology, gender, education, and STEM with a desire to contribute to the communities I have studied and come to know well.

As yet, I am not sure where this work will take me in the future. A current goal is to situate my work with young women and people of color in STEM in the context of the U.S. national agenda to produce more scientists and engineers to power economic productivity and safeguard national security. This agenda is manifested in educational policies and practices intended to increase the number and diversity of young people who become interested in STEM fields, develop proficiency and expertise in these areas, and persist into jobs and careers in these fields. I am interested in the "odd connections" (Tsing, 2005) that span local and translocal settings, multiple spaces and timescales, and flows of money and influence that this agenda sponsors and sustains.

SUMMARY AND FINAL NOTE

I have always been interested in what people, especially girls and people of color, learn in and around schools—not so much what they learn about subject matter,

but what they learn about who they are, how they fit in, and how they learn to maneuver in spaces afforded by schooling, education, culture and society. They, like me, must live in and make sense of many three-walled rooms.

PERSONAL FAVORITES (OF MY OWN WORK)

Holland, D., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). *Educated in romance: Women, achievement and college culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eisenhart, M. (1995). The fax, the jazz player, and the self-story teller: How *do* people learn culture? *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 26*(1), 3-26.

Eisenhart, M., & Finkel, E. (1998). *Women's science: Learning and succeeding from the margins.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Eisenhart, M. (2001). Changing conceptions of culture and ethnographic methodology: Recent thematic shifts and their implications for research on teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching*. (4th ed.; pp. 209-225). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Eisenhart, M. (2001). Educational ethnography past, present, and future: Ideas to think with. *Educational Researcher, 30*(8), 16-27.

Eisenhart, M. (2005). Hammers and saws for the improvement of education research. *Educational Theory, 55*(3), 245-261.

WORKS THAT HAVE PARTICULARLY INFLUENCED ME

Haraway, D. (1990). *Primate visions: Gender, race and nature in the world of modern science.* London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Morrison, T. (1987). *Beloved*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Nespor, J. (1997). *Knowledge in motion: Space, time and curriculum in undergraduate physics and management.* London and New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs.* New York: Columbia University Press.

REFERENCES

Boyd, V. (2004). *Wrapped in rainbows: The life of Zora Neale Hurston.* New York: Scribner.

Clement, D., Eisenhart, M., & Harding, J. (1979). The veneer of harmony: Social race relations in a southern desegregated school. In R. C. Rist (Ed.), *Desegregated schools: Appraisals of an American experiment* (pp. 15-64). New York: Academic Press.

Eisenhart, M., & Finkel, E. (1998). *Women's science: Learning and succeeding from the margins.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Eisenhart, M., & Holland, D. (1983). Learning gender from peers: The role of peer groups in the cultural transmission of gender. *Human Organization, 42*, 321-332.

Holland, D., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). *Educated in romance: Women, achievement and college culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holland, D., & Skinner, D. (1987). Prestige and intimacy: The cultural models behind American's talk about gender types. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp. 78-111). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Margaret Eisenhart
University Distinguished Professor and Charles Chair of Education
University of Colorado Boulder

DEBBIE EPSTEIN

A FEMINIST DNA

Exploring a Political/Intellectual History

BEING JEWISH—BEYOND THE PALE

Before the opening credits of the Coen brothers' (2009) film, *A Serious Man*, a prologue tells a story from the *shtetl*.[1] An old man arrives home late because the wheel came off his wagon on the way back from the market and an old neighbour, whom he has invited to come to share the soup his wife is making, helped him with the repair. She insists that the neighbour died of typhus three years before and that the "person" who helped him must be a *dybbuk*—a wandering spirit from the dead, usually mischievous or malevolent. There is a knock on the door; the *dybbuk*/helper arrives for the soup. The fearful wife stabs the visitor, insisting that he is a *dybbuk*. The visitor does not bleed, but staggers out of the cottage. Because a *dybbuk* would not die, this leaves open the question of his true identity.

The film proper, set in 1960s mid-West America, tells the story of the peasants' descendant, Larry Gopnick, a university professor currently up for tenure. It traces the terrible, tragicomic things that happen to him and his family; his life bears the trace of his ancestor's offence to the *dybbuk*. For me, the film is quintessentially an exploration not only of morality, a modern interpretation of the story of Job, but also of what it means to be Jewish. Culturally and historically, Jews are, indeed, haunted by our pasts.

Like the Coen brothers' film, my story begins in a *shtetl*. Here it was that, despite the fact that Jewish girls were generally denied an education, my great-great-aunt, Mirelle Zuckerman, was famed for her studies of the *Torah* and *Talmud* and had once, possibly uniquely for a Jewish woman, (successfully) defended herself in a rabbinical court.[2] Mirelle's spirit continues through my distaff inheritances, not as a malevolent presence, but rather making mischief through the line of feminist thinkers and activists in my family: in traditional Jewish thinking, being a Jew is inherited through the maternal line.

THE DYBBUK OF HERITAGE

Along with 90% of South African Jews, my family were migrants from Lithuania. My mother's parents arrived at the turn of the 19th century and their children were born in South Africa. My father, his mother and sister joined his father in South Africa around 1913 after the three of them had spent two or three years in Canada where the rest of his extended family settled. These Jews were fleeing the pogroms of Tsarist Russia, of which my father had vivid memories. Like many others, my

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 71–87.

grandparents brought with them a commitment to socialism and atheism, often developed, ironically enough, in the *Yeshivas* (religious schools) where the boys were educated. This may be because a significant part of rabbinical education is devoted to the development of *pilpul*, the ability to argue in detail, to analyse a sentence, a concept or a text. The consequent culture of intellectual argumentation, indeed deconstruction (and maybe it is not a coincidence that Derrida was Jewish), led many *Yeshiva* students of the late nineteenth century to abandon religion in favour of some form of socialism. My family were therefore part of the atheist, socialist/communist Jewish community, many of whom were later to be found amongst white anti-apartheid activists, and the tradition of argumentation was carried forward into my family of origin and beyond.

As the nineteenth century turned into the twentieth, South Africa was already split racially between white and black inhabitants. There was also conflict between English- and Afrikaans-speaking white South Africans. In a wrangling common in many countries at the time (see Roediger, 1994, for a discussion of how some, but not other, migrants to the United States became "white"), Jews were eventually designated as white—though this was far from a foregone conclusion—and therefore benefited from the privileges of white supremacy, whilst continuing to endure significant anti-Semitism. Most South African Jews, including my family, left their early poverty behind them within a generation and joined the professional middle classes.

My paternal grandfather described himself as a "freethinker" (that is, an atheist) and was evidently something of a socialist—he supported striking South African miners by supplying them with food from his corner shop without making them pay, leaving his own family almost destitute. My paternal grandmother took seriously religious injunctions about giving to the poor, impressing on my father the duty to treat poor people without charge when he became a doctor.

My mother's parents were socialist, atheist Jews. My grandfather, Abram, described himself in a letter to Trotsky (who was then in exile in Mexico) in 1939 as "a supporter of the 4th international local group."[3] My earliest political memory is of him showing me photographs of three men with beards—Marx, Lenin and Trotsky—and explaining how important they were, and that two of them were Jewish.

My maternal grandmother, Tybil, was a strong socialist and feminist, active in the South African suffragette movement.[4] She was exercised about women's reproductive rights and told me of her own two illegal abortions. One result of her feminism, and my grandfather's support for it, was that all of their four daughters were exceptionally well educated for women of their time, with careers in medicine, music, horticulture and science. My mother, Polly (1904-1999), studied horticulture in Pretoria before winning a scholarship to do a masters degree at the University of California, Davis. She was forced by the marriage bar to leave her job when my parents married in 1934. Her sister, my aunt Tikvah, studied physics and mathematics at the University of Cape Town before going to Berlin to study for her PhD with Lisa Meitner, leaving without completing her doctorate when Hitler was elected.[5]

MORAL MISCHIEF: A SOUTH AFRICAN CHILDHOOD

These women, together with my grandfather and father, encouraged me to join in "adult" discussions of politics, fairness, justice, the rights of women, the evils of apartheid, and other major issues from an early age. Political struggle was a part of everyday lived family experience. In 1951, Tikvah became one of the first people to be threatened with the loss of her passport by the apartheid regime and she fled to the UK. Meanwhile, my mother involved me directly in her activism, taking me with her when it was her turn in a rota of liberal white women, to feed the prisoners in the early days the first big Treason Trial of anti-apartheid activists. I still make the soup for Passover in the saucepan that she used to give those on trial, including Nelson Mandela, their meals.[6] In 1957, when I was twelve, I accompanied her to give rides to township people boycotting the buses but who nevertheless needed to get to work. At 14 I attended my first formal political meeting with my parents, which the then leader of the ANC, Chief Albert Luthuli, described what happened in the following terms:

> The police arrived too late to prevent the disturbance with which this meeting began. A well-organised group of Afrikaner men entered, and before anybody was aware of what was developing they assaulted the chairman and secretary—and the guest speaker. The secretary (a woman) was flung into the auditorium, and I found myself being systematically kicked under the platform table. Our assailants revealed at their trial that they acted as they did because the considered it grossly improper for an African to address a white gathering. (Luthuli, 1962, p. 212)

My mother said of the same event:

> I made up my mind I wouldn't move. They were moving all the chairs around me, I was sticking there. And Denis Higgs came up to me and said very gently, you know, you must go, you can't stay here. (Paton, 1992)[7]

Highlighting the intersectionality of my parents' world, my father's recollection was that the "meeting was broken up, by students actually, students and roughnecks. … I wasn't assaulted because somebody recognised me as their doctor, so they let me off" (Paton, 1992, p. 140).

My own memory is that as soon as Chief Luthuli was introduced, some large men jumped up on to the stage and yelled out in Afrikaans that they weren't going to allow a "Kaffir" to address a white meeting.[8] Then Chief Luthuli was on the floor, punches were being thrown and chairs were flying past our heads. My mother sat there, firmly, with her hand on my arm, saying, "I'm not going to allow these bloody thugs to make me move," and Denis came up and said to her, "Polly, you can stay sitting here if you like, but please let me take Debbie outside." She then agreed to move and we all waited outside the hall until, quite a while later, the police arrived, the hooligans were removed and the meeting took place.

While the politics of (anti-)apartheid were unsurprisingly central, progressive feminist attitudes to gender and sexuality were also important. Tikvah never took

on her husband's family name, and my parents talked openly of having "lived with" each other before marriage.[9] They also had gay male friends (though not, so far as I know, any openly lesbian ones). But, of course, progressive attitudes towards sexuality did not mean that heteronormativity did not reign supreme, as can be seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Aged three or four in my flower girl's dress, a replica of my cousin's wedding dress.

I was very happy with this flower girl's dress and with being prey to precisely the kind of naturalisation of heterosexuality that is still current in early years educational contexts, within families and in everyday life for little girls and boys. I was the epitome of a hyper-feminised, rather girlie girl. My "wedding dress" and my delight with (and in!) it, my investment at this young age in the rituals of

conventional (though Jewish) marriage, and the imagined future thus created, speak to the production of a gendered, heterosexual self. This quite forceful—and often pleasurable—construction of heterosexuality has been one of my intellectual preoccupations and I have written about it at length.[10]

Of course, as well as being a flower girl, I was a schoolgirl. Education was an important weapon in the apartheid armoury. The introduction of "Bantu Education" was, as Hendrick Verwoerd, later Prime Minister of South Africa explained, explicitly aimed to ensure that Africans did not reach a level of education that fitted them for anything other than menial labour.[11] In schools for white children, often based on the traditions of English public schools (even when they were state ones), a "national curriculum" was introduced in the Transvaal, where I lived, during the1950s under the title Christian National Education. The part of this curriculum that I remember best and with the most horror was called "Race Studies." I remember arguing back when we were taught the "scientific facts" about the different "races" of South Africa, the primitive "Hottentots," the aggressive Zulus and the hard-done-by Afrikaners—all recognised by their phenotypical characteristics as well as by their characters. But I was (uncharacteristically) silenced on the day our lesson was about how to recognise the mean and cunning Jews—their level of cunning perhaps indicated by the fact that nine out of the ten girls who came top of my year were Jewish.

Cunningly, I went to university a year early, at sixteen. Like my good friend Jane Kenway (see also her essay this volume), I was a quarrelsome, questioning, querying pupil and student. At Wits (the University of the Witwatersrand), I quickly became involved with radical students protesting the passing of the Extension of Universities Education Act (1959)—a newspeak name for a law that denied English-medium universities the power to admit African students—and campaigning for human rights in South Africa. Six months into my first year at Wits, and fearful of arrest, I left South Africa for the UK in August 1962, aged seventeen. I did not return until 1995, the year after the first democratic elections.

THE ACTIVIST ABROAD

After a short (and horrible) period back in school to do A levels, I went, in 1963, to the newly formed Sussex University. In its second year of existence, with 155 students, Sussex was an extraordinary experience. Its interdisciplinary approach attracted me and informed my intellectual development, while my fellow students included an array of radical, clever and political people, as well as a range of "debs."[12] While "contact time" was not extensive, contact quality was intense and intellectually generative. Politics was the lifeblood of Sussex at this time and I became secretary of the Students' Union in my second year. I spent so much time on politics, I ended up with a lower second-class degree and couldn't get funding for a PhD on the labour movement in the inter-war years. Eventually thwarted, I trained as a schoolteacher and spent the next twenty years teaching across all age groups from three to eighteen, most of it in the early years.

The politics did not stop but rather became an intrinsic part of my professional praxis. This took the form of a commitment to teaching in working class schools and to "progressive" ideas about teaching. I wanted to make a difference to children's life chances by making them fall in love with reading, creativity and playing with mathematical concepts. Harold Rosen taught me during my teacher training at the London Institute of Education in 1968/9, and his work (e.g., Barnes et al., 1969) and that of Connie Rosen (e.g., Rosen & Rosen, 1974) continued to influence me as I became a more experienced teacher and, particularly, as I moved from secondary to primary and early years teaching. Like the Rosens and other radical teachers, I wanted to see children liberated from the stultification of rote learning, and my commitment was very much to working in schools that served working-class families. The two local education authorities in which I taught, the Inner London Education Authority and Hertfordshire were both open (though in different ways) to these ideas.

My abiding commitment to race equality found expression in my involvement in the National Antiracist Movement in Education and the anti-apartheid movement. At the same time, ethnic minority pupils started to arrive in early years schools in Hertfordshire and the panic in many of these predominantly white schools was palpable as they started teaching in schools where English was not always the first language and where racism may have started being expressed in more direct ways than simple exclusion. This led me to develop an activist and pedagogic interest in how to work with teachers, support staff and pupils in my own and other schools. In turn, I got a job with the Birmingham education authority, working with predominantly white primary schools on issues of whiteness and anti-racist strategies. This work became the subject of my doctoral thesis (Epstein, 1991; published as Epstein, 1993a) and a resource book for teachers (Epstein & Sealey, 1990).

Both Hertfordshire and Birmingham were places where I was also involved in feminist politics, through consciousness-raising and Women for Peace, in the National Union of Teachers through which I became Women's Convenor for the Socialist Teachers' Alliance and, when the anti-homosexual Clause (later to become Section) 28 of the Local Government Act 1988 was introduced, I became a leading member of the Stop the Clause Campaign in Birmingham and nationally.[13]

In 1987, when I was already 42 years old, I started a doctorate part time at the University of Birmingham's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). The themes of my thesis and, indeed, all of my subsequent work reflect an early and middle life steeped in issues of inequalities, particularly those connected to race, gender, sexuality and class. My work is very much the product both of the contexts in which I have lived and in my personal and political responses to them and primarily and directly addresses ways in which the dominant is held in place. My academic work, to which I now turn, can therefore be seen as an exercise in personal sense making of the power dynamics that have shaped my life.

TEACHER TO STUDENT TO ACADEMIC: PURSUING QUESTIONS OF RACE, GENDER AND SEXUALITY

My doctoral research arose directly out of my interests as an activist teacher in predominantly white Hertfordshire. An Open University course on race and education had shown me that I was able to think and write academically (a distinction making up for my disappointing first degree), while a job in Birmingham working to develop antiracist strategies in white primary schools provided me with my research question and the opportunity to collect ethnographic data through my work. Doctoral students in CCCS sat in on the MA in Cultural Studies, which was an intense reading and learning experience. During a year, we read and discussed in detail a huge range of social and cultural theory, including Foucault's *History of Sexuality, Volume 1* (1978) and several of his other important texts (1965, 1977, 1980), Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* (1995), Marx (e.g., 1963, 1888/1998), Freud (e.g., 1977/1991, 1984/1991, 1917/2006), Melanie Klein (Mitchell, 1986), Lacan (1989), as well as the various collective books that had come out of the Centre (e.g., CCCS, 1981, 1982; Franklin et al., 1991; Hall et al., 1978). These books were produced through a rich process in which "sub-groups" of faculty and graduate students met as peers over a period and discussed issues on a theme, reading, writing and researching individually and together, then bringing their work to the group for further intense interrogation and development. This was a remarkable and hugely productive way of working and one which we followed in the Politics of Sexuality Group to produce *Border Patrols: Policing the Boundaries of Heterosexuality* (Steinberg et al., 1997)—one of my favourites amongst my own work, but never well marketed by the publishers.

Simultaneously, my supervisor, John Gabriel, introduced me to writers about race, social (including education) policy and education, many of whom I had not previously come across. Most importantly for my development as a researcher, he introduced me both to a particular version of educational ethnography that had been developed and adopted within CCCS (e.g., Griffin, 1985; Willis, 1977). At an early stage, reading Stephen Ball's (1987) *The Micro-Politics of the School* had a profound influence on the way I approached my research. This book showed me how the workings of power in schools could be analysed by deploying theories of discourse drawn from Foucault. Equally, Valerie Walkerdine's work (e.g., 1981; 1984) became an important point of reference and debate, and a whole chapter of the thesis was devoted to engaging with (largely) her critique of child-centred education. As a teacher who had considered myself to be child-centred but was convinced by her cogent critiques, I had to find ways of continuing to value and respect the agency of children without being caught up in Piagetian discourses. This led me to further reading of radical thinkers about education and finally to finding the work of William Godwin (1793, 1797). I was enthused by Godwin, but disappointed when I remembered that he had written 200 years previously but that many of the same critiques of education could still be made, as Walkerdine showed.

EDUCATION WASHES WHITER?

My doctoral research, set in white schools, prompted thinking that has continued throughout my academic career. Notions of what it meant to be white in a society that, as Stuart Hall (1980) so memorably argued, was structured in dominance, had been forcibly impressed on me in school and everyday life. I now started to explore the ways of whiteness (or white domination) in the very different context of schools in a British city with a large ethnic minority population living, for the most part, in particular areas. Birmingham was divided geographically both by ethnic group and by class. Thus, in white working class schools, the few ethnic minority pupils were also most frequently the children of professional parents, such as the local doctor. Their families were often of Indian descent, having been expelled from Uganda or Kenya in the 1970s. What I realised was that whiteness was, in part, maintained as dominant and protected by making these children's skin colour invisible—in other words, to "whiten" them. As one head teacher said to me, "We only have one ethnic child in our school, and she's so middle class you don't notice."[14]

Two themes emerged for me. First, there is the marginalisation of individuals, groups of people or, indeed, problems, through making them invisible. I return to this below in relation to questions of sexuality and heteronormativity. Second, there is the whole issue of the "whitening" of people of colour. This second theme has been present in much of my subsequent work. For example, in "Boyz' Own Stories" (Epstein, 1997a), I argue that "homophobia and (hetero)sexism are themselves imbricated with racialised meanings. The normative heterosexual family is, by implication if not definition, white and middle class" (106). I went to to discuss acting out of the weddings in early years schools as a performance of whiteness as well as of heterosexuality. More directly, "Marked Men: Whiteness and Masculinity" (Epstein, 1998a) drew on memoirs, auto/biographies and fiction to explore the production of elite white masculinities in South Africa, while "Walking the Talk: Young People Making Identities" (Epstein & Johnson, 2008) is an exploration of the complexity of identity making in schools through the lenses of gender, sexuality, class and race. These three articles serve as examples, but race and whiteness is rarely absent from my work (see, e.g., Epstein 1995a, 1996c, 1997b, 1997c, 1998b, 1999, 2000; Epstein et al., 1998b, 2001, 2003b; Epstein & Johnson 1998, 2008; Epstein & Sears, 1999b; Epstein & Steinberg, 1997, 1998).

In my current project on elite schooling with Jane Kenway and others (http://education.monash.edu.au/research/projects/elite-schools/), working ethnographically in the UK and South Africa has caused me to revisit my notions of "whitening." The girls in both the UK and South Africa embody, and are encouraged to adopt, ways of walkin g, talking, dressing, doing their hair, and so on, that are, on the face of it, a form of whitening. Yet those young women from China and India, for example, in the UK are also strongly identified with their home countries and their rising global power. Unlike the migrant children I knew from earlier work, they appear to be consciously making themselves mutable as members of a transnational capitalist class. Equally, the girls in the South African

school, primarily from rich families in countries further north in sub-Saharan Africa, are strongly identified as African. There is a noticeable difference between their confidence in their African-ness and the ways in which girls from within South Africa seem to have become somewhat estranged from black people in the townships through their apparent embodiment of whiteness. This can be understood in the context of theorising whiteness, gender and sexuality and how this will differ from my previous understandings of the ways in which these social difference shape and are shaped by each other.

OPEN TO QUESTION: THINKING THROUGH SEXUALITY AND GENDER

The move I made from my PhD on antiracist strategies in white schools to my postdoctoral research on sexuality was the result of meeting particular people at critical times in my career, developments in my personal life, and the introduction of Section 28 in the House of Commons. When I gave up my job with Birmingham Local Education Authority in order to become a full time student in 1989, I supported myself from a combination of savings and working part time for the Open University. Taking on an administrative role at the Gender and Education MA course summer school in 1990 introduced me to women who have influenced my thinking and career since. Shortly prior to the introduction of Clause 28, I had come out as a lesbian and rapidly became deeply involved in the protests. At summer school, all the tutors gave a seminar on their particular research interests, and though I was the administrator, Rosemary Deem and Gaby Weiner (the course directors) invited me to offer a seminar, too. There was a day on the course in which the content looked at different feminist perspectives and, as a result of discussions with two gay men who were taking the course, I decided to do a session called "Whatever Happened to Lesbian and Gay Perspectives?"

Following this session, Gaby invited me to offer a paper at the next British Educational Research Association conference in a symposium on inequalities. At that point, I was reluctant to do a paper outside my PhD topic and Gaby challenged me to focus some, at least, of my future work on sexuality, pointing out that race and racism had been put on the educational research agenda primarily by black activists and academics and it was likely that a similar process would be needed in relation to sexuality, heterosexism and homophobia. Subsequently, she and Rosemary invited me to submit a proposal for a book about sexuality in their *Gender and Education* series, and this led to my first publication on these issues, the edited collection *Challenging Lesbian and Gay Inequalities in Education* (Epstein, 1994a) and to much of my subsequent work.

Schooling Sexualities

I had come to know Richard Johnson during my PhD, when he was Director of CCCS, and he was a key presence in the Politics of Sexuality Group. As an early career researcher, I was nervous about editing *Challenging Lesbian and Gay Inequalities in Education* (1994a), and Richard gave me huge support in this work,

which sought to map out the position of lesbian and gay teachers and students in the UK in order to open up sexuality as a field of educational study and to begin to theorise it. Together we wrote the concluding chapter for *Challenging* in which, based on the various contributions to the book, we began to analyse and map out the almost uncharted territory of sexuality in schools. The result was an enduring collaboration and friendship as well as *Schooling Sexualities* (Epstein & Johnson, 1998), which was, to a large extent, responsible for opening up a space in which research on sexuality in schools could take place, not just in the UK but more widely.

Schooling Sexualities drew on Richard's expertise in the analysis of texts and social policy and my ethnographic data and sensibilities. Together we wanted to theorise sexuality in school contexts and beyond. We did not focus exclusively on the experiences of non-heterosexual students and teachers but sought to understand how sexualities more widely are constructed, held in place and reproduced in and around schooling. To do this, we analysed not only the world of the schools in which I conducted ethnographic work and the responses of lesbian and gay participants in our research, but also the national political context, including Section 28, sexual scandals of various kinds in the press, and the schools as sexualised and sexualising institutions. The penultimate chapter considers sex education as "An Impossible Practice?" and the book's conclusion offers ways of imagining "Sexuality and Education Otherwise," picking up a question that was present in my PhD and the book that arose from it (Epstein, 1991, 1993a) as well as in the extensive work with teachers that I did for LEAs and schools: How can we make a difference to what actually goes on in schools, classrooms and playgrounds in order to weaken dominance and reduce stigmatisation and discrimination of all kinds?

In 1991 I moved from Birmingham to London to take up a post at the Institute of Education in the Centre for Research and Education on Gender (CREG). While there I continued my work on sexualities, this time focusing on *Children's Relationship Cultures* in multi-ethnic primary schools in Birmingham and London.[15] Theoretically this work was a continuation of what we had done in the Politics of Sexuality Group. We wanted to understand formations of identity, discourses of sexuality and the making and breaking of friendships and romantic relationships in the institutional contexts of primary schooling. How, we asked, did these young children make sense of these relationships? What differences did class and ethnicity make? What were the psychosocial factors and imperatives that moved them? And what was the impact of the school and of individual teachers?

While at the Institute of Education, I was fortunate to supervise a closely knit group of doctoral students. Working with them individually and in groups, we thought across their range of topics, working with and through intersectional social differences. Between them, they addressed questions of: class, gender and education (Shereen Benjamin and Penny Jane Burke), race, class and gender (Suki Ali and Sarah O'Flynn), masculinity (Jon Swain and David Telford), gender and sexuality (Sarah O'Flynn, David Telford, Dora Oliveira and Mary Jane Kehily), national identity (Brenda Murphy) and critical pedagogies (Andrew Burn, Rebekah

Willetts and Shereen Benjamin). What was special about this particular cohort of students was the way we were able to work collectively, each of us enriching and challenging the thinking of the others. While I have had many wonderful doctoral students subsequently, the increased and increasing pressure on both faculty and students in universities has meant that I have not since been able to achieve the kind of mutual support, coherence and cross-fertilisation that I found in this group.

MASCULINITIES—THE BOYS' DEBATES

As the British and international moral panic about boys' underachievement took hold, Diana Leonard, who was then Director of CREG, identified this as a space in which we should try to make an impact. Given my overarching interest in how dominance is held in place, I leapt at the chance and, with Diana, Jannette Elwood, Valerie Hey and Janet Maw, obtained an Economic and Social Research Council grant to hold a series of seminars over two years (1996–8). As well as exploring the whole issue of boys' "underachievement," we set out to open up the field in the seminar papers, which were published in *Failing Boys? Issues in Gender and Achievement* (Epstein et al., 1998a) and a special issue of the *International Journal of Inclusive Education* (Epstein et al., 1998c).

In turn, this led to the book series entitled *Educating Boys, Learning Gender* in which Maírtín Mac an Ghaill (see also this volume) and I sought out books that engaged critical men's studies in order to explore questions of masculinity in schools.

BACK "HOME"

Returning to South Africa in 1995 was a tumultuous, roller coaster experience. The country had both stayed the same and completely changed. As I have written elsewhere, the

> South Africa I left is not the South Africa of my serial visits in which I have done ethnography and other qualitative research in township schools and now in our elite school. I am, then, a "familiar stranger." I know the history well, I feel at home as I walk out of the airport, I know how to speak and respond to people without making the kind of mistakes that South Africa bluntness sometimes leads me into in the UK. I rejoice in the positive changes that have taken place since 1994 and mourn the extent of the remaining poverty and inequality—the legacy of apartheid. (Epstein et al., in press)

During this first return "home," I met Robert Morrell (then at the University of KwaZulu-Natal) who became a long-term research collaborator and friend. We came together over our shared interest in masculinities in the first instance and a wider interest in and concern about gender, sexuality and violence in the context of South Africa. We developed a project, funded by the British Council, to explore not only the impact of the HIV and AIDS epidemic on South Africa and South Africans, but also to investigate the possibilities and effects of interventions in

schools to combat gender inequality and gender-based violence and, in so doing, to contribute to a diminution on the rate at which HIV was spreading. The core team for this project consisted of two ex-South Africans living in the UK (Elaine Unterhalter and myself) and three South Africans (Robert Morrell, Relebohile Moletsane and Deevia Bhana) working with some teacher-researchers, who were part-time graduate students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and some MA students from the UK who used the work with us for their dissertations. We worked primarily in two township secondary schools and two primary schools (one in the leafy suburbs and one in a township) in KwaZulu-Natal, the South African province with the highest rate of infection. Returning to the schools each year for five years, we were able to build up a detailed longitudinal picture and develop our understanding of, and ability to theorise, the impact of different kinds of intervention in schools (and, indeed, beyond). The work resulted in our book, *Towards Gender Equality: South African Schools during the HIV and AIDS Epidemic* (Morrell et al., 2009), which gives a brief historical and current outline of South African education, develops a framework for understanding interventions for equality, and explores different aspects of our qualitative research in our schools.

CURRENT CONCERNS

I continue to be concerned with how the dominant is held in place in two specific spheres. First, I have been turning my gaze towards the impact of managerialism on universities. In so doing, Rebecca Boden and I have considered how neoliberal managerialist moves have impeded research and the production of knowledge (Boden & Epstein, 2006), created ethical bureaucracies (usually) with little or no ethical sensibility (Boden et al., 2009) and led to melancholy academic subjectivities in which critical thinking has been stultified (Boden & Epstein, 2011). While this work has often been difficult and depressing, we have also sought ways to understand how we, as academics, can refuse the impositions we are currently experiencing to develop more hopeful ways of being in the academy.

Second, as noted above, I am engaged in a multisited ethnography of elite schools in globalising circumstances with Jane Kenway and others. For the fieldwork in this project, we have two researchers in each site—one a (relative) stranger to the place and the other a (relative) "native." My sites are South Africa (with Jane Kenway) and the UK (with Johannah Fahey). There are methodological implications in this work which we have explored elsewhere (Epstein et al., in press) and the empirical and conceptual richness of the work is extraordinary. It brings to light all the "differences that make a difference" (Epstein & Johnson, 1998, p. 4) with which I have been concerned as an activist, a teacher and a researcher throughout my life—class, gender, race and sexuality are all key dimensions of our work, expanded through the lens of globalisation and post-coloniality. The generative nature of our team discussions (usually via Skype) is an exciting intellectual adventure.

THE END OF THE AFFAIR?

My abiding interest in questions of identity, difference and the ways in which the dominant is held in place continues as I approach the end of my (formal) academic career. Increasingly, I have been drawn to considering these issues through theorisation of the psychosocial, drawing on psychoanalytic theory. I have followed this trail by training as a psychotherapist and now work part time as a professor and part time as a psychotherapist. In both cases, I wish to integrate the political, psychic and social not only in order to understand but also to contribute to change.

NOTES

[1] Shtetls were Jewish villages somewhere in the Pale of Settlement—the origin of the phrase 'beyond the pale'—established by Catherine the Great to exclude Jews from Tsarist Russia.

[2] The Talmud is the book of rabbinical arguments and commentaries on the *Torah* (the five books of Moses) and the law. It provides the basis of Jewish law.

[3] Much of this information is drawn from the biography of my parents written by my daughter, Diana Paton (1992).

[4] White South African women got the vote in 1930.

[5] There are several obituaries for Tikvah online, for example http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/obituary-tikvah-alper-1610123.html (accessed 22 February 2012).

[6] See http://www.historyworkshop.org.uk/radical-object-my-mothers-saucepan/ for a photograph and explanation of the saucepan.

[7] Denis Higgs was a mathematician and a friend of my brother's from Cambridge. Born in the UK, he came to South Africa to take up a post at the University of Witwatersrand, became involved in anti-apartheid struggle and joined the National Committee for Liberation, becoming involved in various acts of sabotage (see Claire, 2006, for a full account). In breach of the Immorality Act, he married a black woman, Holly, and escaped with her to Zambia. He was abducted from Lusaka by the South African Special Branch and driven to Johannesburg in the boot of their car. Because he was a British citizen, those of us in the UK were able to activate the Foreign Office and he was released. He and Holly came to the UK and from there went to Canada where he took up a post at Macmaster University. Neither of them ever recovered from the trauma of the abduction.

[8] "Kaffir" is a derogatory term for black African people.

[9] Until Diana wrote the biography, my brother and I had always taken the term 'lived with' literally. In fact, it turns out that they were using it to mean that they were sexually active together.

[10] See Epstein (1993b, 1994a, 1995a, 1995b, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996/7, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1999), Epstein et al. (2001, 2003a, 2003b), Epstein and Johnson (2008), and Epstein and Sears (1999a).

[11] Ironically, the word 'Bantu', used by the government to designate black people, actually means 'people.'

[12] 'Deb,' short for 'debutante,' a young woman who would be 'presented' at court in the society 'season.'

[13] Section 28 of the Local Government Act 1988 prohibited the promotion of 'homosexuality by teaching or by publishing material'. It specified that:

> A local authority shall not—
>
> (a) intentionally promote homosexuality or publish material with the intention of promoting homosexuality;

(b) promote the teaching in any maintained school of the acceptability of homosexuality as a pretended family relationship.

I have written elsewhere about the impact of the now repealed Section 28 (for example, Epstein, 1994b).

[14] This use of the term "ethnic child" to indicate a child of colour implies that white people have no ethnicity, which is, of course, conceptually flawed. More accurately, the head could have spoken of having only one child from an ethnic minority in his school.

[15] Funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, award number R000237438. Other members of the team were Mary Jane Kehily, Maírtín Mac an Ghaill and Peter Redman.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Epstein, D. (1993). *Changing classroom cultures: Anti-racism, politics and schools*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Epstein, D. (Ed.). (1994). *Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press

Epstein, D. (1996). Keeping them in their place: Hetero/sexist harassment, gender and the enforcement of heterosexuality. In J. Holland & L. Adkins (Eds), *Sex, sensibility and the gendered body* (pp. 202-21). Basingstoke, England: Macmillan.

Epstein, D. (1997). Boyz' own stories: Masculinities and sexualities in schools. *Gender and Education*, *9*(1), 105-115.

Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V., & Maw, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Failing boys? Issues in gender and achievement*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press

Epstein, D., Fahey, J., & Kenway, J. (in press). Multi-sited global ethnography and travelling biography: Gendered journeys. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*.

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling sexualities*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S., & Telford, D. (2003). *Silenced sexualities in schools and universities*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Morrell, R., Epstein, D., Unterhalter, E., Moletsane, R., & Bhana, D. (2009). *Towards gender equality: South African schools during the HIV and AIDS epidemic*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Steinberg, D. L., Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Border patrols: Policing the boundaries of heterosexuality.* London: Cassell

REFERENCES

Ball, S. J. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization*. London: Routledge.

Barnes, D., Britton, J., & Rosen, H. (1969). *Language, the learner and the school*. London: Penguin/London Association for the Teaching of English (LATE).

Boden, R. & Epstein, D. (2006). Managing the research imagination? Globalisation and research in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 4*(2), 223-236.

Boden, R., & Epstein, D. (2011). A flat earth society? Imagining academic freedom. *Sociological Review, 59*, 476-495.

Boden, R., Epstein, D., & Latimer, J. (2009). Accounting for ethos or programmes for conduct? The brave new world of Research Ethics Committees. *Sociological Review, 57*(4), 727-749.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. (1981). *Unpopular education: Schooling and social democracy since 1944*. London: Hutchinson.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. (1982). *The empire strikes back: Race and racism in 70s Britain*. London: Hutchinson.

Claire, H. (2006). *The song remembers when*. Cape Town, South Africa: Juta & Co.

Coen, E., & Coen, J. (2009). *A serious man*. USA: Focus Features

Epstein, D. (1991). *An examination of anti-racist pedagogies, inset and school change in the context of local and national politics*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham (England).

Epstein, D. (1993a). *Changing classroom cultures: Anti-racism, politics and schools*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Epstein, D. (1993b). Practising heterosexuality. *Curriculum Studies, 1*(1), 275-286.

Epstein, D. (Ed.). (1994a). *Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press

Epstein, D. (1994b). Introduction: Lesbian and gay equality in education—Problems and possibilities. In D. Epstein (Ed.), *Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education* (pp. 1-10). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D. (1995a). *Gender and sexuality in the early years*. OMEP(UK) Research Update.

Epstein, D. (1995b). "Girls don't do bricks": Gender and sexuality in the primary classroom. In J. Siraj-Blatchford & I. Siraj-Blatchford (Eds.), *Educating the whole child: Cross-curricular skills, themes and* dimensions (pp. 56-69). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D. (1996a). Corrective cultures: *Romeo and Juliet*, Jane Brown and the media. *Curriculum Studies*, *4*(2), 251-272.

Epstein, D. (1996b, April). *Cultures of schooling/cultures of sexuality*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Epstein, D. (1996c). Keeping them in their place: Hetero/sexist harassment, gender and the enforcement of heterosexuality. In J. Holland & L. Adkins (Eds.), *Sex, sensibility and the gendered body* (pp. 202-21). Basingstoke, England: Macmillan.

Epstein, D. (1996/7). "Real boys don't work": Boys' 'underachievement', masculinities and the harassment of sissies. In D. Epstein (Chair), *Gender and education: Are boys now underachieving?* Seminar series conducted at University of London Institute of Education.

Epstein, D. (1997a). Boyz' own stories: Masculinities and sexualities in schools. *Gender and Education, 9*(1), 105-115.

Epstein, D. (1997b). Cultures of schooling/cultures of sexuality. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 1*(1), 37-53.

Epstein, D. (1997c). What's in a ban? Jane Brown, *Romeo and Juliet* and the popular media. In D. L. Steinberg, D. Epstein & R. Johnson (Eds.), *Border patrols: Policing the boundaries of heterosexuality* (pp. 183-203). London: Cassell.

Epstein, D. (1998a). Marked men: Whiteness and masculinity. *Agenda, 38*, 49-59.

Epstein, D. (1998b). "Real boys don't work": Boys' "underachievement," masculinities and the harassment of sissies. In D. Epstein, J. Elwood, V. Hey, & J. Maw (Eds.), *Failing boys? Issues in gender and achievement* (pp. 96-108). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D. (1999). Sex play: Romantic significations, sexism and silences in the schoolyard. In D. Epstein & J. T. Sears (Eds.), *A dangerous knowing: Sexuality, pedagogy and popular culture* (pp. 25-42). London: Cassell.

Epstein, D. (2000). Reading gender, reading sexualities: Children and the negotiation of meaning in "alternative" texts. In W. J. Spurlin (Ed.), *Lesbian and gay studies and the teaching of English: Positions, pedagogies, and cultural politics* (pp. 213-233). Urbana, IL: National Council for the Teaching of English

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1994). On the straight and the narrow: The heterosexual presumption, homophobias and schools. In D. Epstein (Ed.), *Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education* (pp. 197-230). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling sexualities*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (2008). Walking the talk: Young people making identities. In E. Atkinson & R. De Palma (Eds), *Invisible boundaries: Sexualities in primary schools*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Epstein, D., & Sealey, A. (1990). *"Where it really matters …": Developing anti-racist education in predominantly white primary schools*. Birmingham, England: Development Education Centre.

Epstein, D., & Sears, J. T. (Eds.). (1999a). *A dangerous knowing: Sexuality, pedagogy and popular culture*. London: Cassell

Epstein, D., & Sears, J. T. (1999b). Introduction: Knowing dangerously. In D. Epstein & J. T. Sears (Eds.), *A dangerous knowing: Sexuality, pedagogy and popular culture* (pp. 1-10). London: Cassell.

Epstein, D., & Steinberg, D. L. (1997). All het up! Rescuing heterosexuality on the Oprah Winfrey Show. *Feminist Review, 57*, 88-115.

Epstein, D., & Steinberg, D. L. (1998). American dreamin': Discoursing liberally on the Oprah Winfrey Show. *Women's Studies International Forum, 21*(1), 77-94.

Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V., & Maw, J. (Eds.). (1998a). *Failing boys? Issues in gender and achievement*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press

Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V., & Maw, J. (1998b). Schoolboy frictions: Feminism and "failing" boys. In D. Epstein, J. Elwood, V. Hey, & J. Maw (Eds.), *Failing boys? Issues in gender and achievement* (pp. 3-18). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Epstein, D., Maw, J., Elwood, J. & Hey, V. (Eds.). (1998c). Boys' "underachievement" [Special issue] *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *2*(2).

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S. & Telford, D. (2001). Othering education: Sexualities, silences and schooling. *Review of Research in Education, 25*, 127-180.

Epstein, D., Hewitt, R., Leonard, D., Mauthner, M., & Watkins, C. (2003a). Avoiding the issue: Homophobia, school policies and identities in secondary schools. In C. Vincent (Ed.), *Social justice, education and identity* (pp. 120-136). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S. & Telford, D. (2003b). *Silenced sexualities in schools and universities.* Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Epstein, D., Fahey, J., & Kenway, J. (in press). Multi-sited global ethnography and travelling biography: Gendered journeys. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*.

Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason* (R. Howard, trans.). New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, trans.). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, volume 1* (R. Hurley, trans.). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Franklin, S., Lury, C., & Stacey, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Off-centre: Feminism and cultural studies.* London: Routledge.

Freud, S. (1991a). *On sexuality: Three essays on the theory of sexuality and other works* (A. Richards, Trans.). London: Penguin.

Freud, S. (1991b). *On metapsychology: The theory of psychoanalysis* (A. Richards, Trans.). London: Penguin.

Freud, S. (2006). Mourning and melancholia. In A. Phillips (Ed.), *The Penguin Freud reader*. London: Penguin.

Godwin, W. (1793). *An enquiry concerning the principles of political justice and its influence on general virtue and happiness.* London: Robinson.

Godwin, W. (1797). *The enquirer. Reflections On education, manners, and literature. In a series of essays*. London: G.G. and J. Robinson.

Gramsci, A. (1995). *Antonio Gramsci: Further selections from the Prison Notebooks* (D. Boothman, Ed., Trans.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Griffin, C. (1985). *Typical girls? Young women from school to the job market.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hall, S. (1980). Race, articulation, and societies structured in dominance. In UNESCO (Ed.), *Sociological theories: Race and colonialism*. Paris: UNESCO

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state and law and order*. Basingstoke, England: Macmillan.

Lacan, J. (1989). *Écrits*. London: Routledge.

Luthuli, A. (1962). *Let my people go.* Johannesburg, South Africa: Collins.

Marx, K. (1963). *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.* New York: International Publishers.

Marx, K. (1998). *The German ideology including theses on Feuerbach*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Mitchell, J. (Ed.). (1986). *The selected Melanie Klein*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin

Morrell, R., Epstein, D., Unterhalter, E., Moletsane, R., & Bhana, D. (2009). *Towards gender equality: South African schools during the HIV and AIDS epidemic.* Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Paton, D. (1992). *Polly Alper Epstein. Ben Epstein. A double biography*. Kenilworth (private publication), David and Rona Epstein.

Rosen, C., & Rosen, H. (1974). *The language of primary school children*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin for the Schools Council.

Steinberg, D. L., Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (Eds.). (1997*). Border patrols: Policing the boundaries of heterosexuality.* London: Cassell

Walkerdine, V. (1981). Sex, power and pedagogy. *Screen Education, 38*, 14-24.

Walkerdine, V. (1984). Developmental psychology and the child-centred pedagogy: The insertion of Piaget into early education. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Urwin, C. Venn, & V. Walkerdine (Eds), *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London: Methuen.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Alsdershot, England: Saxon House.

Debbie Epstein
Professor of Education
Cardiff University

BECKY FRANCIS

MAKING AN IMPACT?

Does gender matter anymore? Do Western women have equality already, and even if not, have the gains already been sufficient to render gender inequality a minor issue compared with the growing socioeconomic inequality haunting Europe as I write? Feminists will answer that I am positing the questions in the wrong way—that actually, gender and socioeconomic background (and other variables such as ethnicity, age, dis/ability, and so on) are bound up together. And that a more careful questioning would reveal that these economic inequalities impact certain groups more than others—women being a case in point. Moreover, sociological analysis demonstrates that far from having "taken our place at the top table" in terms of both power and representation, women remain scantly represented in the most powerful, influential and/or best remunerated occupational positions. And cultural analyses reveal that gender distinction in cultural representation has remained undiminished since feminism's second wave: Since the late 1990s, especially, we have simultaneously seen increasing objectification and "pornification" of women in popular culture, and a continuing lack of representation of women in high culture. Both aspects continue to play out in school classrooms, where gender performativity still results in gender distinction, and hackneyed discourses that elevate the masculine as the norm still interpolate boys as the natural social agents and girls as their admiring observers, in spite of the much vaunted "underachievement" of boys.

I make these arguments partly because they draw from an important and influential body of feminist work to which I have contributed. But also, I make them because one of my recent frustrations has been the arguable failure by (we) feminist academics to sufficiently highlight, and demand attention to, these continuing inequalities. I intend to take the opportunity to address both aspects in this chapter.

I have been both pleased and anxious at the invitation to write this chapter—as indeed I am sure the editors were both pleased and anxious to be commissioned to produce this book. Pleased because gender and education has been acknowledged by Sense Publishers as a sufficiently influential field of study to be included in their series on leadership in educational foundations. Gender and education—and women's studies and gender studies more generally—have maintained a dogged struggle to be taken seriously in academia, even in the present, and it is really only due to the persistent, undisputable credentials the field generates that the sceptics are silenced.

The anxiety of course comes from our feminist phobia about "leadership," coupled with the individualistic, and even heroic positioning of contributors to this

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 89–101.

book as "leaders in the field." This is uncomfortable from established feminist perspectives, which tend to emphasize collectivity (see Paechter, 2007, for debate). In writing this chapter, then, I want to avoid autobiography, which would in any case be rather boring in my case. Instead I want to use the opportunity to make a couple of key points in relation to the field. But also, I wanted to include other voices in my chapter. This represents the fundamental interconnectedness of my own career with that of others: the support and mentoring I have received from others (notably feminist colleagues) to enable my own career; and the like support that I have been able to offer to others in turn.

Of course, this is a very superficial, token gesture towards the huge amount of help I have had and the pleasurable friendships and partnerships I have engaged throughout my academic career. One of the most significant "leg-ups" I received when a post-doctoral researcher was the invitation from Christina Hughes, then an editor of *Gender & Education*, to sit on the organising committee of the Gender and Education Association conference. This in turn led to a place on the journal editorial board and eventually to editorship of the journal with Christine Skelton (see also her essay, this volume). Christine is of course the person who has had the most profound effect on my work and career, as my longest collaborator. Impressed by her brilliant work on gender identities in the primary school (the broad topic of my own PhD), I wrote to her and we first met in 1997. We have been writing together ever since, and she has been an inspirational, wise, funny, loyal friend and mentor. Similar accolades would go to another close collaborator, Louise Archer, with whom I have also co-directed research projects and authored books. And my institutional career has especially intertwined with that of Barbara Read, an immensely talented ethnographer and theorist who has worked with me at three different universities. The list goes on of course, and I am focusing on those with whom I have worked and published most closely.

Of the three other voices represented in this chapter, one is among those who have notably supported me in my career. Pat Mahony is, and will always be, a model for me for (a) what she has achieved in terms of her own influential feminist research, and her success as a manager in building research cultures in the various institutions in which she has held leadership roles; and (b) her complete disregard for (masculinised) notions of academic "gravitas," in spite of her seniority (or her seniority in spite of her lack of pomposity). She recruited me to my first professorship at Roehampton University.

I was involved in the recruitment of Drs Maylor and Osgood to the Institute for Policy Studies in Education (IPSE) at London Metropolitan University, and have held "official" mentoring roles with both. One of Jayne Osgood's PhD supervisors, after leaving IPSE I was also proud to have been selected by Jayne and Uvanney Maylor as a mentor under the Economic and Social Research Council Teaching and Learning Programme's "Meeting of Minds" mentoring scheme. Both have been brilliant colleagues and friends, and both are now well established, impressive academics in their own right, with internationally-recognised bodies of scholarship.

Dr Jayne Osgood, Reader in Education, London Metropolitan University

What brought you to the field or got you involved with gender and education?

I began my career in educational research shortly after New Labour came to power in 1997 and the evidence-based policy movement was gaining ground. Initially employed in an organisation undertaking applied research, I became increasingly concerned by the privileging of unreflexive, uncritical and policy-conformist research. Moving my career to the higher education sector represented a pivotal moment whereby the space and opportunity to form alliances, professional and personal friendships, with inspirational feminists became available. I was enthused to find that politically-motivated research was practiced, valued and making a difference—offering an important critical contribution to debates about the persistence of inequities—that I had seen all but silenced in other research environments.

What do you see as key issues for the field at present?

The relationship between theory and activism remains as important and thorny as ever! Postmodern modes of feminism are readily denigrated and dismissed as trivial whilst second-wave feminist activism is frequently considered outdated. There remains so much to discover and learn from each other, across the fuzzy boundaries of age, race, sexuality, class.

Other issues of grave concern:

- The fetishisation of domesticity and a seeming retreat to the home front for mothers and daughters;
- Disillusion with "having it all." Despite heavy investments in educational careers, women find themselves torn between work and family or battling to manage both at great personal psycho-social cost;
- An alarming resurgence of gendered stereotyping, perpetuated through media, online, marketing, educational resources, etc.
- The sexualisation and objectification of girls, which relates to the other three points above.

GENDER AND EDUCATION: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACADEMIC FIELD

There is no doubt that the academic subfield of gender and education has been a notable success story in the Global North.[1] More broadly, gender theory is leading edge and widely respected internationally; this has had a positive impact on the subfield, which draws directly on (and feeds) the wider work. And this influence—exemplified in citation indices and the like—is especially remarkable given that many of our education colleagues still do not acknowledge feminist work. The success of the journal *Gender and Education*, both in terms of its genuine

international representation and standing, its high ranking on the Social Citation Index, and its consistent representation of cutting-edge theory, stands as an exemplary case within this. Numerous feminist colleagues have been involved in the journal's inception and development, and as I have already remarked, it has provided opportunities for many of us that we might have struggled to find elsewhere. I remain immensely proud of my own role as editor for two terms along with Christine Skelton (again, the journal's democratic structure and regulated periods of office mark it healthily apart from the practices of many other journals). In the UK, feminist scholars are now represented at all levels within the education discipline, including numerous professorships, and even membership of the education sub-panels of the research audit mechanisms, the "REF" (Research Excellence Framework) and "RAE" (Research Assessment Exercise).[2]

Becoming part of the "academic establishment" has of course brought its own challenges and dilemmas, as I considered in my keynote to the Gender and Education Association biannual conference in 2011. One such dilemma I alluded to above—the common feeling that cooperation, collaboration and even "sisterhood" is an integral aspect of feminist practice—but antithetical to those practices of competition and elitist "gatekeeping" that comprise fundamental aspects of academic culture (and to academic career progress). For many of us (certainly for me!) this results in an uneasy co-existence between feminist principles and academic norms. We try to be collaborative, kind, and to offer colleagues opportunities, but often we find that this can lead to over-burden and resentment—for example, at our tiredness in always having to "go the extra mile"; at lack of equity in the opportunities offered to us (or not) in turn; at lack of acknowledgment; at this burden of helping others as an impediment to our own careers, and so on.

Carrie Paechter (2007) is critical of feminist squeamishness here, maintaining that actually the "feminist" desire to be collaborative maps all too closely onto feminine performances of "niceness." Observing girls' practices in primary schools, and building on my own observations of primary school girls' constructions of themselves as "sensible and selfless" (Francis, 1998), Paechter and her colleague Sheryl Clark (Clark & Paechter, 2007) argue that girls' desire to be "nice"—non-competitive, disowning their high ability and aggression—impedes their achievement in competitive elements of schooling. They also argue that this "niceness" is spurious, often masking practices of aggression and exclusion among girls (see also George, 2007). Paechter (2007) draws an analogy with our own practices as feminists in academia, arguing that,

> Academic feminism … has a current and pervasive ideology that suggests that women should work together in an ethos of mutual caring and understanding, so that the suppression of dissent, intellectual difference and disagreement becomes highly important. This builds on the cultures of the schoolgirls we used to be, acting to prevent us, as individuals, claiming our places in the academic world. Instead of striking out on our own, we are

> pulled back into the requirements of the community to share, to care, to be good, to behave in feminine, rather than masculine ways.

My own experiences and reflection on such analyses has begged questions around feminist politics—ought we to be demanding our equal seat at the table with male colleagues, and "doing what it takes" to get there, or does this represent a liberal feminist acquiescence to masculinist values and behaviours? The alternative would be a radical feminist rejection of academic practices towards collectivist, non-competitive principles, and prioritisation of impact over academic credentials. But realistically we who pursue academic careers are many miles away from that. Indeed I get increasingly frustrated with a tendency to be rather self-righteous and judgemental over credentialism and competitive, marketised processes in the schools system—sometimes a "washing clean of hands" in relation to involvement with mainstream education policy—when we are all deeply implicated in such practices within higher education. As I have pointed out, none of us actively resist the REF wherein we are sorted and rewarded or punished for our "excellence" and productivity; there is no active campaign against academic league tables; we do not protest the entrance criteria for our institutions that (a) comprise a key driver for the credentialism we see in the school system, and (b) are based on elitist and arguably spurious notions of "ability"; and we now exist in a substantially privatised system. Not for us, then, to cast stones.

In any case, what I have experienced is the uneasy coexistence of feminist values within an academic culture and field of practice which must be seen as a masculine environment par excellence. The whole academic system—including its underpinning premises, validating discourses, and resulting practices—is based on premises of rationality, learned objectivity, natural intelligence, and a highly individualistic, meritocratic approach to a supposed hierarchy of ability in which "the best" are assumed to do best in the system (whether this refers to "first class" students, to academic careers, or indeed to universities themselves in terms of their research assessment outcomes and international rankings). Yet as we are acutely aware as feminists, this meritocracy is mythic, and student success, academic careers, and institutional outcomes all remain impacted by social variables and sociopolitical policies and practices.

So in many senses academia remains a hostile environment, presenting specific dilemmas for feminists. As I asked at the GEA conference (Francis, 2011), Can the professional "gatekeeper" model with which we constantly work in the academy be consistent with personal practices of social justice? There is also the intensification of labour within higher education institutions, which, as feminist researchers have documented, can especially impact women academics for a range of reasons. For feminists, what this "impossible" struggle to maintain "niceness" and a collaborative approach within a systematically individualistic, competitive system frequently leads to is a burning resentment at our overwork and relative lack of progress (in contrast to others who are not hampered by niceness), and anxiety or self-hatred at our compliance and implication in masculinist practices. Indeed, Paechter (2007) suggests that this feminist academic "niceness" is also a fantasy,

masking practices that are neither collectivist nor "nice," but perhaps a necessary product of the academic environment. (For example, most of us have experienced having a journal paper rubbished by an anonymous feminist referee, or similar sad tales of "backstabbing" which are experienced as more visceral or disappointing because at the hands of feminist colleagues).

Nevertheless, academic careers remain comparatively privileged in many senses—both in the intrinsic value, pleasures and affirmations of research and teaching, and in remuneration. While not losing sight of the continuing inequalities within academia according to gender, "race" and social class, and of the problematic elitist and masculinist premises identified above, it is important that we also recognise the relative privilege of our positions, and to enjoy the pleasures afforded. In reflecting on the challenges posited by Carrie Paechter's problematisation of "niceness" in relation to feminist ethics, I have endeavoured to distinguish between the feminine and the feminist. I have argued that we should re-couch our feminist supportive and collaborative practices as *generosity*, rather than niceness. Generosity is a less gendered concept, and one that gives ethical value and mutual pleasure. Generosity from others has helped most feminist academics in their careers, and we should celebrate this as a collectivist feature of our embattled feminist ethics. Even if it disadvantages us as individuals, it strengthens us as a group. In the current climate of intensified labour and competition, it is easy to grow bitter and judgemental. We should be both more generous with one another, and also more generous with those outside the academy. We have to celebrate and encourage small victories and stands against inequality and discrimination wherever they manifest. As Gramsci observed, "the struggle can take many forms."

THEORY AND PRACTICE

Picking up on some themes in the inserts above, I want to use the second part of this chapter to characterise my theoretical journey to date and highlight what I consider to be my current theoretical contribution. This "journey" also reflects an increasing frustration at the tendency in some quarters for feminist poststructuralist theory to actually impede practice and impact. There are various reasons for this, including (a) the relativist scepticism towards "truth" claims that undermines "modernist" campaigning approaches; (b) the seduction of theory for its own sake (diverting attention from impact and outcomes); and (c) until recently, exacerbation of such tendencies due to the valuing of theory over practice in academic audit.[3] I would indict myself within such trends, as I have certainly been guilty of being carried away by my enjoyment of theory to prioritise analysis over recommendations for practice. I have resolved to try to do better! My recent experiences as Director of Education at the RSA (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce), a "think and do tank," have illuminated the more efficient occupation of the educational impact terrain (both methodologically and in scope) by third sector organisations.[4]

Dr Uvanney Maylor, Reader in Education, University of Bedfordshire

What brought you to the field or got you involved with gender and education?

As an African-Caribbean woman, I was concerned at the absence of Black women and their voice, particularly in relation to teaching and teacher education, and more generally in higher education. Black women have had a strong and powerful presence in grassroots supplementary school education, and despite their small numbers in mainstream schooling, they have played a significant role, yet this was rarely acknowledged by the mainstream. I also wanted to understand why African-Caribbean children were invariably caricatured as educational failures even when there was evidence to the contrary.

What do you see as a key issue for the field at present?

Unfortunately, I think little has changed, so my current concerns are those I've held for some time. For instance, we still face teacher stereotyping with negative consequences for Black attainment—notably these negative perceptions are not limited to White educationalists either. Black children are still perceived as presenting challenges rather than educational opportunities—a factor reflected in the large numbers of excluded Black children.

These negative stereotypes and low expectations are also extended to Black staff and students in higher education. A series of incidents I have encountered in higher education over the past two years constantly remind me that some people are viewed as belonging or having a "rightful" place in academia, whereas others (i.e., Black people) are considered intruders. It is issues such as these that still remain to be addressed in the field of gender and education. The gendered educational lens needs to be racialised and classed so there is wider understanding (across all groups) of the gendered educational inequality encountered by various ethnic groups, and the implications of this both within education (in all spheres) and at a societal level. We cannot in 2012 still have students and staff coming to the field of education expressing bewilderment and naiveté with regard to educational inequality.

Equally importantly, although the above has highlighted many negatives, I would argue that the field of gender and education should seek to highlight positive educational experiences across all groups as this would help to further enhance our understandings.

Pat Mahony, Emeritus Professor of Education, University of Roehampton, and Visiting Professor, King's College London

What brought you to the field or got you involved with gender and education?

I was already teaching Philosophy in a department of education and was part of a staff group identified as "radical." I went to a women's liberation conference and heard a range of feminist presentations analyzing different aspects of women's lives. The experience blew my mind, and the way I saw the world changed forever. This is only a partial explanation, of course, since it fails to address why I was disposed to be so moved by the accounts I heard of women's oppression. Leaving sociological or psychological exploration of this question aside, from then on research into girls and women teachers' experiences of schooling was the obvious thing for me to do when instructed by the dean to "publish or perish."

What do you see as key issues for the field at present?

One issue for me is the failure of some feminist writing to try to be comprehensible. There is surely a politics to writing, and I can't see what is feminist about producing text that is so dense and obscurantist that it remains virtually unintelligible outside the small club within which it has currency. This is not to argue against development of theory; quite the opposite. If its purpose is to be progressive, then it needs to be written and explained clearly.

On a related point, if I read one more feminist PhD that solemnly claims "there is no such thing as truth," I might just flip!

Finally, some noise about social attitudes towards older women would liven things up—especially the role of schools in the construction of "age."

My concern that contemporary gender theory has sometimes become dislocated from practice (and even, occasionally, from empirical work), relates somewhat to my preoccupation with theory that can facilitate both sufficient acknowledgment of gender fluidity, and our articulation of the continuing gender inequalities that exist in schools and other educational settings.

As an English graduate who had specialised in literary criticism, and in feminist criticism under Kate Hodgkin (daughter of another great feminist scholar, Anna Davin), I was already versed in the likes of Barthes, Derrida and Kristeva when I was lucky enough to win a funded PhD studentship in Education at what was then the University of North London. Consequently I lapped up the poststructuralist work that had recently begun to emerge in the field of gender and education—work by the likes of Valerie Walkerdine, Bronwyn Davies and Chris Weedon. This brilliant scholarship was entertaining, resonant, passionate and powerful, as well as theoretically convincing. I was thoroughly sucked in. Especially, Bronwyn Davies' work introduced me to Foucault and his conception of discourse. Foucault's understanding of power as circulating via discourse and discursive practices, rather

than as held by particular individuals and/or groups to the exclusion of others, addressed some conundrums in feminist theory and offered a convincing articulation of the nuanced and highly complex interactions observable in educational environments. I relished the project of identifying and naming discourses articulated by teachers and pupils in the classroom and the ways in which these supported the existing gender order.

That was 1993 (when I began my PhD). I have maintained a discourse analytical approach ever since. However, this immediately generated a range of well-documented tensions between feminist (emancipatory) and poststructuralist (relativist, even nihilistic) positions. Following the debates between feminist advocates and critics of poststructuralism, and especially those who sought to resolve and/or move these debates forward, I have struggled to be convinced by explanations that seek to incorporate poststructuralist theory with emancipatory projects (see, e.g., Davies, 1997; McNay, 2000). I continue to be persuaded by the early arguments by the likes of Balbus (1987) and Jones (1997) that feminist and poststructuralist philosophical positions are basically antithetical (see, e.g., Francis, 1999, 2002). This being said, discourse analysis remained the key theoretical and analytical lynchpin of my work, and poststructuralist contributions dominated my reading and thinking. So I have been categorised (sometimes self-categorised) as a poststructuralist, in spite of the continuing philosophical anxieties.

These philosophical conundrums extended not just to "mission" (feminist or deconstructive), but also to analysis of power in relation to aspects of social identity such as gender, "race," and social class. Especially, I have found that while poststructuralist discourse analysis provides methodological tools to effectively identify the discursive practices underpinning performance of gender difference, poststructuralism cannot sufficiently account for concentrations of power as certain subjects and social groups are more able to mobilise discourses and/or to materially benefit from them. Relatedly, there is insufficient conceptual attention to the impact of the material (whether embodied or financial), and to how certain dominant discourses are retained and perpetually reinscribed in spite of resistance, and of discursive flux via changing socioeconomic conditions. Such limitations are, I have argued, especially exemplified by the conundrums raised via Judith Halberstam's (1998) interventions around female masculinity, which I found so intriguing (e.g., Francis, 2008b, 2010).

My own experiments with such analyses led me to argue for the need for conceptual tools that could:

- Account for the fluidity of gender constructions while recognising the on-going power and effect of the gender dualism;
- Acknowledge the concentration of power according to social structures (gender/sexuality, "race," class, etc.) while simultaneously recognising the fluidity and dispersal of power through discourse;
- Acknowledge the role of the material in gender production without returning to biological essentialism.

For these reasons I have been drawn to the work of Mikhail Bakhtin. As I have argued elsewhere, there are numerous synergies between Bakhtin's theories and

feminist agendas (I have no space to elaborate here, but see Francis, 2010, 2012). Like Foucault, Bakhtin is interested in the role of language in the mobilisation of power. Yet Bakhtin is far more attuned to the role of the material in such processes. I have been especially interested in his perception of language as a field of struggle between centripetal and centrifugal forces, and his related concepts of monoglossia and heteroglossia. Bakhtin (1981) uses the term "monoglossia" to refer to dominant forms of language that represent the world-view/interests of dominant social groups, which are positioned or imposed as unitary and total. However, for Bakhtin language is never static or fixed, but is instead diverse and inherently dialogic. Heteroglossia is represented and maintained by the centrifugal forces that broaden language and its meaning (e.g., local dialects, creoles, and so on that challenge established, high status genres); and different meanings and readings constantly jostle in assertions or subversions as subjects use language in different ways. Thus while at the macro-linguistic level there may appear to be stability (monoglossia), at the micro level there is plasticity, contradiction and resistance—heteroglossia. Moreover, the material conditions (for example, the social and geographic discursive environment, and the embodiment of speakers and listeners) are central in these processes.

In recent work I have transposed Bakhtin's concepts of monoglossia and heteroglossia to gender, and it is this that I consider to be my most useful theoretical contribution to date.[5] The dominant, binary account of sex/gender comprises gender monoglossia. Integral to this binarized account of sex/gender is the animation of the Male/masculine as Subject and the denigration of the Female/feminine as Other (de Beauviour, 1973; Walkerdine, 1990). This binary account of gender bears power in that it authors itself as universal and "the truth"/real, and it works to suppress and/or incorporate heteroglossia in order to maintain the monoglossic account. However, on even a cursory examination this monoglossic account of gender duality can be demonstrated a fallacy—restless heteroglossia bubbles below the surface, and every gender dualistic claim or example can be provided with a counter-example that deconstructs or parodies it.

The gender binary which sits at the heart of the monoglossic account of gender is built on delineation of attributes as male/masculine and female/feminine. In the Western context, this delineation relates directly to Western enlightenment (masculinised) values. Hence characteristics valorised within this value system are attributed to the male Subject, and disparaged antitheses to these values are projected onto the female Other. Thus emerge the gender binaries identified and analysed in feminist literary criticism and other arenas: for example, masculinity as rational, strong, active; and femininity as emotional, weak, passive. A raft of empirical data from the field demonstrates that actually expression of such characteristics is heteroglossic and not closely linked to "sex" assignment. But I have also shown how specifically resonant tropes can be drawn on to signify gender monoglossia in interaction when otherwise behaviour might be read as heteroglossic (Francis et al., 2009; Francis, 2010). I have begun the work of mapping a monoglossic gender matrix (Francis, 2012), but also maintaining

articulation of the contradictory productions that I maintain inevitably characterise *all* performances of gender (e.g., Francis, 2008b, 2010).

Such application of Bakhtinian concepts to gender addresses some of the theoretical conundrums raised above. Performances and readings of gender are integrally impacted by embodiment and by other social structures in which bodies are produced; behaviours performed by a White, middle-class male may be understood by spectators as "assertive," where the same behaviours expressed by a Black working-class male may be read instead as "aggressive/confrontational" (Archer & Francis, 2007). Hence different signs in the gender matrix, even those which appear most clearly binarized as expressing masculinity or femininity, are prey to heteroglossic re-signification depending on the local discursive arena and the discursive inscriptions applied to the bodies within it. Understanding of gender as monoglossic and heteroglossic addresses various theoretical challenges that have perplexed feminists: it offers both exploration of gender diversity, but also an account of its editing and erasure via centripetal rewriting through history. The account recognises both structure and deconstruction, constraint and resistance, and it offers a bridge between deterministic structuralism and relativism in gender analysis. It acknowledges the role of the material, and of social structures, while simultaneously identifying and celebrating heteroglossic disturbances—and I assert that both elements remain simultaneously vital to our feminist project.

THINKING FORWARD

For me, finding the right theoretical tools is a necessary precursor to attaining impact for our work in educational policy and practice. Academic work in education is—at least in England—being notably marginalised in policy making, usurped by think tanks, voluntary organisations and charities, businesses, and individuals who have the ear of civil servants and ministers. Yet many education academics seem unaware or unconcerned at this trend. Within gender and education, we seem sometimes to have become more interested in analysing the phenomena than in using our findings to effect change. While we scoff at the naivety and lack of conceptual sophistication of some of the second-wave liberal feminist interventions in schools, our role in educational change has become muted. Contemporary work shows less interest in curriculum and pedagogy, or in the schoolwork produced by pupils.

This returns me to my opening questions. What are the issues for gender and education? Do we still think gender the key issue (or even *a* key issue)? If it is (and I believe this to be so), we need to radically improve our articulation, for at present it certainly isn't seen to be an important issue by mainstream educationalists and policymakers (beyond the resilient concern with "boys' underachievement," which tends to be posited in antifeminist terms). Gender differences tend to be ascribed to family upbringing or consumer culture rather than to education; and education is seen to favour girls. Looking forward, it will be important that we attend to reconnecting theory with educational practice, and giving adequate consideration

to the practical implications of our research, in order to ensure that the field of gender and education remains an engine for social change.

NOTES

[1] And we also need to celebrate the work from the global South (much of which, as Raewyn Connell pointed out in her keynote speech at the 2009 GEA conference, we in the West are not sufficiently familiar with, albeit journals such as Gender and Education are increasingly genuinely international).

[2] These UK-wide research audits seek to assess quality of research outputs from different higher education institutions and are the basis of which government funding is awarded. The current title is the Research Excellence Framework (REF), formerly the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE).

[3] This has recently been somewhat mitigated in the British case, as the Research Excellence Framework (REF) now includes a measurement for "impact." While the credentialist and narrow approach may be problematic, I have argued that contrary to the widespread academic resistance to the "impact agenda," feminist academics ought to see it as an opportunity rather than a threat.

[4] For further discussion, see Francis, 2011.

[5] See Francis, 2008a, 2010 & 2012, for the development of my thinking here, and Francis, 2010, for application to empirical cases.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Francis, B. (2012). Gender monoglossia, gender heteroglossia: The potential of Bakhtin's work for re-conceptualising gender. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *21*(1), 1-15.

Francis, B., Skelton, C., & Read, B. (2011). *The identities and practices of high achieving pupils: Negotiating achievement and peer cultures*. London: Continuum.

Francis, B. (2010). Re/theorising gender: Female masculinity and male femininity in the classroom? *Gender and Education, 22*(6), 477-490.

Skelton, C., Francis, B., & Smulyan, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of gender & education.* London: Sage.

Francis, B. (2006). Heroes or zeroes? The construction of the boys' achievement debate within neo-liberal policy discourse. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(2), 187-199.

Francis, B., & Skelton, C. (2005). *Reassessing gender and achievement.* London: Routledge.

Francis, B. (2000). *Boys, girls and achievement: Addressing the classroom issues.* London: Routledge.

REFERENCES

Archer, L., & Francis, B. (2007). *Understanding minority ethnic achievement: Race, gender, class and "success."* London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Trans.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balbus, I. (1987). Disciplining women: Michel Foucault and the power of feminist discourse. In S. Benhabib & D. Cornhill (Eds.), *Feminism as critique* (pp. 110-127). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Clark, S., & Paechter, C. (2007). "Why can't girls play football?": Gender dynamics and the playground. *Sport, Education and Society, 12*(3), 261-276.

Davies, B. (1997). The subject of post-structuralism: A reply to Alison Jones. *Gender & Education*, *9*(3), 371-283.

de Beauviour, S. (1972). *The second sex* (H. M. Parshley, Trans.). London: Penguin.

Francis, B. (1999). Modernist reductionism or post-structuralist relativism: Can we move on? An evaluation of the arguments in relation to feminist educational research. *Gender & Education*, *11*(4), 381-393.

Francis, B. (2002). Relativism, realism, and feminism: An analysis of some theoretical tensions in research on gender identity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *11*(1), 39-54.

Francis, B. (2008a). Engendering debate: How to formulate a political analysis of the divide between genetic bodies and discursive gender. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *17*(3), 211-223.

Francis, B. (2008b). "Teaching manfully?" Exploring gendered subjectivities and power via analysis of men teachers' gender performance. *Gender and Education*, *20*(2), 109-122.

Francis, B. (2010). Re/theorising gender: Female masculinity and male femininity in the classroom? *Gender and Education*, *22*(6), 477-490.

Francis, B. (2011a, April). Gender & Education in the twenty-first century: Engendering debate? Keynote to the Gender & Education Association Biannual Conference, Exeter University.

Francis, B. (2011b). Increasing impact? An analysis of issues raised by the impact agenda in educational research. *Scottish Educational Review*, *43*(2), 4-16

Francis, B. (2012). Gender monoglossia, gender heteroglossia: The potential of Bakhtin's work for re-conceptualising gender. *Journal of Gender Studies, 21*(1), 1-15.

Francis, B., Skelton, C., & Read, B. (2010). The simultaneous production of educational achievement and popularity: How do some pupils accomplish it? *British Educational Research Journal*, *36*(2), 317-340.

George, R. (2007). *Girls in a goldfish bowl: Moral regulation, ritual and the use of power amongst inner city girls.* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publications

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Jones, A. (2007). Teaching post-structuralist feminist theory in education: Student resistances. *Gender & Education*, *9*(3), 263-269.

McNay, L. (2000). *Gender and agency: Reconfiguring the subject in feminist and social theory*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Paechter, C. (2007, February). Professing ignorance: Women in universities and other playgrounds. Inaugural Lecture, Goldsmiths College, University of London.

Walkerdine, Valerie. (1990). *Schoolgirl fictions*. London: Verso.

Becky Francis
Professor of Education and Social Justice
King's College London

JANE KENWAY

A DEFIANT RESEARCH IMAGINATION

I often think that I became an academic because I was a naughty girl at school. My parents, both teachers, regularly had to deal with the difficult consequences of their defiant daughter's behaviour. Leaving aside occasionally "wagging school," and sporadically disobeying my various "land ladies," my main school transgressions were flouting some usually trivial school rules and "answering back." The school's view seemed to be that good girls get good marks, jobs and husbands. Bad girls get pregnant, no-hoper boyfriends and dead end jobs. To them, I was a bad girl and their expectations for me weren't great. Later when I became a teacher, I met my old headmistress at an education conference. Standing near the coffee machine she said down her nose, "Oh Jane what are you doing now?" She obviously thought I was serving the coffee. When I explained "I am a teacher," she touched her forehead with the back of her hand, raised her eyes skyward and said, "Heaven help the education profession!"

In contrast, I believe that naughty students tend to have a critical sensibility about most things to do with education, often for very good reason. I also believe that wayward students can become very successful and popular teachers; their educational standpoints have often arisen from the "streets" of the school; and they are thus in useful empathy with the everyday life of students—particularly students on the edges. Those I have disparagingly called the educational "accountants" and "cartographers" are not street wise in this way and have little or no such empathy (Kenway, 2008). I also believe that wayward students can become successful researchers precisely because they have a defiant rather than compliant ontology. In *Globalising the Research Imagination* (Kenway & Fahey, 2009), we argued for the importance of a researcher ontology whereby "being is not being determined," and whereby considerable "autonomy" is exercised in relation to the disciplines and institutional authority. We showed how such ontology is evident in the work of some of social sciences' and humanities' best-recognized scholars of globalization. We called for a defiant rather than compliant research imagination.

Usually I have a defiant response to dominant practices of thought and dominant sets of people. If something is an orthodoxy, my almost knee jerk response is disagreement, and many of my research projects have begun this way as will become clear. I critically engage most things. Of course feminism requires a defiant ontology and thus, not surprisingly, feminist research has been an ongoing focus of my work. But defying certain feminist orthodoxies has also been a feature, as I will show.

Other aspects of my biography have also been important. I have always had a strong interest in education and social class. I grew up in small country towns (as

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 103–116.

teachers my parents were regularly transferred to different country school locations). In the country towns of my time, social class was organised around property; property-owning farming families saw themselves as superior to town families who may have owned small businesses and their own homes but were not considered "landed." People in the professions, such as teachers, doctors or lawyers, were somewhat more valued, but, like their town neighbours, they were largely regarded as members of a service class. Amongst the young, class and socializing were organized around schooling—the students who went away to elite private (non-government) schools, the students who stayed at home and went to local state (government) schools, and those who went away to state schools. I was one of the latter, and I was acutely aware of the hierarchies, distinctions and exclusions involved, not just between the classes but also between the sexes. For example, snobby girls from private schools were a bane of my life, as were boys from private schools who thought girls from the state sector must *ipso facto* be sexually available to them. This awareness of the links between gendered class distinction and schooling provoked the main lines of inquiry of my PhD called *High Status Private Schooling in Australia and the Production of an Educational Hegemony* (1988).

My PhD looked at class, gender and elite schooling in Australia. It involved ethnographies in three schools—one boys', one girls' and one co-educational school. It also included analyses of the ways the media secured advantages for certain sectors of schooling, how it constructed advantage as something neutral and natural. In turn, this led to me to consider matters of representation, signification and New Right politics. I was influenced by the work of the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies and particularly that of Stuart Hall, who drew on Gramsci's theoretical oeuvre. A number of people there had been working on the New Right and education in England and had developed some very significant critiques of Thatcherite policies. This helped me to look at the New Right in Australia and the ways that it was linked to the private school lobby and to debates around educational standards and funding. I did my PhD at a time when ethnography was very popular in cultural studies, and there was a considerable body of ethnographic work coming from people at the Centre including Paul Willis and Angela McRobbie. I will return to the matter of ethnography.

I was impressed by the feminist intercessions at the Centre and particularly by McRobbie's culturalist approach to the analysis of class and gender. At the time the big battles in feminism were between liberal, radical and socialist feminists, and within the latter camp the struggles were between the structuralists and the culturalists. Untangling the differences and working out where I fitted was central to my study. I located myself alongside Madeline Arnot and others who were developing a strong materialist feminist analysis of education, gender and social class. But also at that time Foucault and feminist poststructuralism were on the horizon in education, and I brought insights from both into my analysis, reaching for a useful synthesis between Gramsci and Foucault. In the final analysis, though, I have always been more of a Gramscian than a Foucaultian, as I indicated in my chapter in the collection edited by Kathleen Weiler called *Feminist Engagements:*

Reading, Resisting, and Revisioning Male Theorists in Education and Cultural Studies (Kenway, 2001). And when poststructuralism became a sort of conventional wisdom for feminists in education, I felt compelled to write my somewhat satirical piece "Having a Postmodernist Turn" (Kenway, 1995).

Whilst I was doing my PhD, feminist research in education was in relatively early stages in Australia. Two big issues on the agenda were "girls and self-esteem" (they were seen to lack it) and single-sex classes or schools for girls (they were seen, unequivocally, to benefit from them). Being a contrarian but also working with the theories noted above, such notions seemed to me to be naive, essentialist and class blind. Sue Wills and I decided to intervene in both discourses, publishing papers on the single sex debate (e.g., Kenway & Willis, 1989), and securing a Schools Commission Project of National Significance grant to explore the notion of girls and self-esteem from different social, cultural and curriculum perspectives. We gathered together some of the smartest feminist specialists in education to put the idea about girls lacking self-esteem under pressure, ultimately insisting that radical reassessments were needed across the board. Eventually we published an edited collection *Hearts & Minds: Self-Esteem and the Schooling of Girls*, (Kenway & Willis, 1990). Needless to say, none of these interventions made us very popular with the advocates of these causes. As one said to me, "What's your problem Jane? Don't you think girls should be happy?" Being critical was regarded as unsisterly.

In mid-1987, I joined the Education Faculty at Deakin University, and Deakin was central to my formation as an education, as well as a feminist, intellectual. It was a place where intellectuals in the field of education pursued socially and educationally significant projects, where such projects were supported, encouraged and celebrated. I use the term "intellectuals" "to refer to those who, from a recognised basis of knowledge and authority, and with evident commitment and proficiency, demonstrate high standards of reflection, analysis and argument and publicly and fearlessly address major issues facing humanity" (Kenway & Fahey, 2009, p. 1). Such intellectuals are what made Deakin distinctive in the broad field of education; there was no room for intellectual or political diffidence. Inspiring for some, unsettling and confronting for others, we were always demanding and demanding more—of ourselves, each other, our students and our colleagues in schools and education systems. We did not need to be motivated and monitored by such things as league tables and performance indicators.

This was certainly not a space of sameness and harmony. A competitive, adversarial community existed in which epistemological, political and personal differences and even hostilities flourished alongside much cross-border work. The Marxists and neo-Marxists, the critical theorists, the poststructuralists and postcolonialists, the progressives and the feminists of various related hues jostled and jousted—fell in, fell out, fell over. Such divergences were reflected in the range of distance education/open campus monographs written by leading national and international scholars from within and beyond Deakin. These were produced for students, but they circulated far and wide and inspired many beyond the student body. Through them Deakin became known as "the" place in Australia where

conventional educational ideas and practices were put under serious critical pressure, where people were encouraged to move beyond timid and trifling, unjust and unfazed educational thought and practice and towards a rigorous engagement of the ways in which education both constrains and enables, how and for whom and how it might be otherwise. Broadly, they represented what I think of as "the Deakin project," to which I am still very committed.

I brought to Deakin all the arrogance, awkwardness and insecurity of the newly minted PhD graduate. At that time I was a "good blusher," as Stephen Kemmis kindly pointed out, but this did not stop me fearlessly, even brazenly, confronting the fiercely intelligent at the many spirited seminars held in the Faculty. Being brazen was not common amongst women academics at the time. But, it was a necessity for Jill Blackmore (see her essay, this volume) and me, because we were appointed to help lead the Faculty's and the field's gender revolution. Jill and I did brazen with gusto as we developed courses and research projects, formed groups, ran conferences and seminars and produced untold numbers of talks and publications on the countless ways gender, other axes of power and inequality and education are linked and might be challenged. The year I arrived we organized a major conference involving some of the most respected and provocative feminist scholars of the time in and outside of education. (The non-education people were Clare Burton, Anna Yeatman, Karreen Reiger and Hester Eisenstein.) This conference resulted in our edited collection *Gender Matters in Educational Administration and Policy: A Feminist Introduction* (Blackmore & Kenway, 1993), which has sections on reading educational history, contemporary issues, political and administrative theory and feminist praxis. And we also commissioned assorted monographs to be used for our *Gender and Education* teaching unit and other units. Our writers included Patti Lather on feminist research methodologies (1991; see also this volume), Lyn Yates on theory practice dilemmas (1990; see also this volume), and Sue Willis (1991) on girls and mathematics, a very hot topic at the time.

Whilst I was at Deakin, education systems at the state and commonwealth levels were beginning to introduce gender reform (education of girls) policies, programs, practices, materials, workshops and advisors. This was quite remarkable in itself, and I suspect that Australia went further than most countries in its gender reform endeavours (Kenway, 1997). I was involved in many different ways over the years, which included advising various governments, delivering addresses and workshops at conferences, offering professional development programs for teachers and gender reform advisors in regional offices and schools, documenting gender reform practices in schools and conducting research projects in partnership with feminists in education systems and teacher unions as well as with other feminist academics. I worked mostly in teams and have been very fortunate in the people I have worked with. These projects included one on gender and work and another on gender and vocational education and training.

One of these government partnership projects was undertaken with Sue Willis, then at Murdoch University in Western Australia and the Education of Girls Unit in South Australia. Until this point no research had been done on what happens

when you take a feminist reform agenda into schools. This project looked at whether and how gender reform policies were changing things in schools, and it identified strategies that were most successful in particular circumstances and sought to explain why. A related and much more extensive project funded by the Australian Research Council looked at this matter more closely and over a longer time period. The funding was to examine what actually happens in the schools—different sorts of schools, different groups of kids; how do they respond to feminist interventions? Here we considered the many ways in which certain somewhat simplistic feminist educational orthodoxies were received, rearticulated and subverted in schools by students and teachers. This project ended up in a book called *Answering Back*: *Girls, Boys and Feminism in Schools* (Kenway & Willis with Blackmore & Rennie, 1998), which is still being used extensively for undergraduate teacher education programs.

In the late 1990s, I conducted a second major government project, this time with Cherry Collins and Julie McLeod (see also this volume). This was at the height of the boys' debate in education when the education of boys was considered the big issue, not gender and difference, gender relations, gender and power or any of the other myriad themes that had developed since the education of girls became a policy issue. In a nutshell, girls were seen to be out-performing boys—end of story. We were commissioned by the Commonwealth government to inject some sanity into a debate that had become ridiculously polarised. Our report was called *Factors Influencing Educational Performance of Males and Females in School and Their Initial Destinations after Leaving School* (Collins, Kenway, & McLeod, 2000). Simply, our argument was that any approach to gender reform must ask "which girls and which boys?" We pointed to the need to understand the gender jigsaw rather than the gender seesaw. But the problems associated with earlier essentialist gender reform for girls, which many of us had documented and critiqued over the years, came home to roost, as the same logic was now applied to boys. Needless to say, our arguments did not win the day, and the education of boys, as single category, remains the dominant discourse in gender reform programs in Australian schools to this day.

Even prior to the rise of the boys' debate, masculinity had become a strong focus of my feminist work. In the feminist literature this focus was uncommon and to some unacceptable. In the first instance, I explored men's and boys' responses to feminism in schools. My paper "Masculinities: Under Siege, on the Defensive and Under Reconstruction?" (Kenway, 1995) was based on my experiences of watching what various male staff and boys were doing and how they tried to resist and rearticulate feminist agendas in various ways ranging from outright hostility to subtle subversion. My second focus was on the links between gender, masculinity and violence, and my understandings of these links were refined by Lindsay Fitzclarence's work on the psychosocial dimensions of violence in schools and families. He drew on the insights of Alice Millar ("poisonous pedagogy") and Michael White ("narrative therapy"), and these informed our paper "Masculinity, Violence and Schooling: Challenging Poisonous Pedagogies" (Kenway & Fitzclarence, 1997).

My interests in gender continued unabated beyond Deakin to the University of South Australia (UniSA) where I went in 1999. While there another team, Julie McLeod, Alison McKinnon, Andrea Allard and I, undertook a project which looked at what happens to the young women living on the edge of cities who are at risk of leaving school early, likely to have babies very young—those who experience a whole range of factors that mean schooling is very difficult and not usually of benefit to them. We were offended by the manner in which these young women were understood and portrayed in the media and beyond through notion of the "under class," and, amongst much else, the project sought to challenge such thinking (e.g., Bullen & Kenway, 2004). With Bourdieu as one of our conceptual resources, we also sought to contribute to the bourgeoning literature in which feminists have engaged with Bourdieu (e.g., Kenway & McLeod, 2004).

The project was a cross-generational study and included the girls' mothers. I became very concerned about the amount of violence in the mothers' lives—not all of them, but a lot of them—and in the girls' lives at school, in the home and elsewhere. I became interested in trying to explain the cross-generational circumstances where mothers have experienced violence and then the daughters have also experienced violence. I worked with the idea of melancholia and loss. I saw that these mothers who had been subjected to violence often could not get on with their lives; they were locked into a form of loss that they could not let go of. I worked with a wonderful book called *Loss* (Eng & Kazanjian, 2003) which is concerned with melancholia, with how to animate the remains of loss in positive ways, with melancholic agency. I was trying to think about how we might animate the remains of loss to help those young women and their mothers who have experienced violence to move on to something more powerful than being locked into a debilitating loss scenario. That project resulted in a paper called "Melancholic Mothering: Mothers, Daughters and Family Violence," published in *Gender and Education* (Kenway & Fahey, 2008).

Also while at UniSA, I extended my notion of "masculinity under siege" to consider the impact of economic and cultural globalisation on young males outside the cities. Here I was concerned with gender, spatiality and globalization. This was a multi-sited ethnography involving four different rural and regional locations in Australia. We looked at the way globalization was fundamentally changing the economy, at the ways in which these changes were manifest in different places and what they meant both for how masculinity was constructed and for the ways boys were engaging with their schooling. Here we also built on my PhD's critical ethnographic approach and developed a methodology we called "place-based global ethnography." We really couldn't study what was going on in these country areas without trying to develop some sense of how to research spatiality, locality, place, and space. Given that we were also interested in the globalization of these places, we also had to try to understand what flows through them in terms of global economic systems, global media forms, mobile people and global ideologies. The book arising from this project was *Masculinity Beyond the Metropolis* (Kenway, Kraack, & Hickey-Moody, 2006).

Clearly feminists are not the only scholars who are interested in the study of emotionality and the psyche. But more than most, I think, we are interested in the relationships between these and the social, spatial and political. Although I make no claim to be an expert in psychoanalytic theory, I have long been interested in these matters. Whilst at Deakin we explored the role emotion played in gender reform in schools (e.g., Kenway, Blackmore, & Willis, 1996). Further notions of desire and pleasure (e.g., Kenway & Bullen, 2005; Kenway & Hickey-Moody 2009), melancholia and abjection (see below) have been of special interest and ongoing value to my research.

In *Masculinity Beyond the Metropolis* we also worked with the notion of melancholia to try to understand why working class boys in a deindustrialised town resisted attempts to encourage them to adopt new masculine identities, arguing that this related to the wounds of their fathers who had a melancholic attachment to loss and that the boys did not want to reopen the wounds by subscribing to new ways of being male. Also in the same book we showed how, in globalising times, the manner in which certain places and populations are produced as abject is changing. We showed how global scapes of abjection fold into and produce local processes of spatial abjection (see also Kenway & Hickey-Moody, 2012). This was one of a number of our attempts to link emotionality, space and globalization. This eventually led to the idea of global "emoscapes." One related paper considered the emoscapes associated with the global financial crisis. Here we showed how emoscapes are entangled with financescapes, mediascapes and ideoscapes in the broader context of the global capitalist economy, particularly its most recent manifestation in the form of "financialisation" (Kenway & Fahey, 2010).

This interest in emotion and spatiality led to the *Emotional Geographies of Education Symposium* in 2008, which I organized with Deborah Youdell. We saw this as an "agenda setting conference" to explore this relatively unexplored field. While over recent years there has been increasing interest in the insights that geographical perspectives offer educational research, the *emotional* geographies of education is quite a new line of inquiry in education as well as geography. Eventually out of this we published a special issue of *Emotion, Space and Society:* on "The Emotional Geographies of Education" (Kenway & Youdell, 2011), which is an excellent collection of papers drawing on diverse notions of emotion and affect as well as of space and place. The spaces/places discussed include a canal tow-path where a school outing takes place and a sofa in a school, an alternative education programme in a rundown building in an industrial setting, an art and design classroom, the primary school classroom, a school serving very poor "shantytowns" on a city's outskirts, a multicultural elementary school in a conflict-ridden nation and a nation-state in the global field of policy and power. The intersections between space, place and emotionality in education thought about were similarly diverse.

While all of my work has been animated by a concern about the manner in which power is exercised in education, not all has had as its primary agenda a feminist focus, although often a feminist analysis has eventuated from a project that did not begin as such. Much of my other work is concerned with changing

expressions of power by the most powerful and with the implications for education policy and practice including popular and public pedagogies. My work is often driven by my disaffection with dominant discourses and their associated educational dogma. Predictably the various ramifications of neoliberalism in education have been an ongoing concern since the late 1980s.

All universities in the Western world have, in one way or another, been influenced by the wider environment of neoliberalism. In Australia the Dawkins reforms in universities during the late 1980s heralded the way for what became the rationalisation, instrumentalisation, marketization, privatisation and corporatisation of education more broadly. For critical policy and curriculum analysts at Deakin (amongst others of course), this expansive neoliberal project provided the impetus for innumerable publications, presentations and actions addressing matters across the educational spectrum. And certainly feminist critiques were called for and offered. From the start Jill Blackmore and I critiqued the Dawkins agenda in higher education, and Dianna Langmead and I examined the implications of neoliberalism for feminist work in the university (e.g., Kenway & Langmead, 2000, 2002).

Deakin's critical project and its institutional practices were unable to withstand the relentless force of the neoliberal avalanche. It led to institutional amalgamations, funding cuts and job losses—or in the "weasel words" (Watson, 2004) of the corporate university, to "rationalization" and "restructuring." It led to new power configurations, particularly to the rise in power and status of what we have called "the techno-preneur" (Kenway, Bullen, & Robb, 2004) and to the loss in power and status of the intellectual, as described above. I share Raewyn Connell's (2006, p. 69; see also her essay, this volume) enormously important concerns about how and whether the "intellectual workforce is reproducing itself," her concern about the future survival of critical social science in a context where public sector institutions are being run down. We face the pressing issue of how to produce and sustain what I call "spaces of hope" in the neoliberal university.

A central aspect of neoliberalism is the marketisation of everything. And during the 1990s, Lindsay Fitzclarence, Chris Bigum, and I conducted three related projects titled *Marketing Education*; *Marketing Education in the Information Age;* and *Consuming Education: Contemporary Education Through the Eyes of Students*. This research program was particularly generative as it brought together Lindsay's expertise in curriculum theory, Chris's critical perspectives on information and communication technology (ICT) and my socio-cultural angle on education policy. Indeed, Chris's obsessions became mine for quite a while as I sought to bring insights from his field to enhance understandings in mine. One of my best cited papers, "The Information Super-Highway and Postmodernity: The Promise and the Price" (Kenway, 1996), arose from this relationship. Equally, though, it wasn't long before I was bringing a feminist analytic to matters of ICT (e.g., Kenway & Langmead, 2001). We published extensively from these projects on the marketing of education, documenting the diverse and growing manifestations of the market phenomenon in and around education, coining the term "postmodern markets" as a way of describing them (e.g. Kenway, Bigum, &

Fitzclarence, 1993). We identified the problems they caused and the issues they evoked.

During 2000, after I had moved to UniSA, Elizabeth Bullen and I drew from these projects to produce *Consuming Children: Education—Entertainment—Advertising* (2001). This book "offers an eagle's-eye view of consumer kids/consuming culture in the now hybrid worlds of education, entertainment and advertising" and invites "readers to contemplate the purposes of schooling if the distinctions between education, advertising and entertainment diminish" (2001, p. 7). Many of the issues we raised have become more complex, the many problems we identified have gotten worse, and all our predictions in these 1990s projects have come to pass.

My interest in consumption and the pedagogies associated with the media is ongoing. More recent work on consumption with Liz Bullen focuses on the commodification of women's skin through what we call "skin pedagogies" and their practices of female subjection and abjection. Our first paper considers the cosmetic surgery tourist industry and hair, particularly how very young girls are being taught to despise their body hair (Kenway & Bullen, 2009). Our second paper examines how and why women are being persuaded to consume skin whitening products, the promotion of ethnic cosmetic surgery, and ways that different ethnic groups are being targeted—in effect being taught that certain parts of their body are "defective" and should be "corrected" through surgery (Kenway & Bullen, 2011).

After leaving Deakin, I remained haunted by its critical project and also became preoccupied with the power of ghosts. Indeed, Derrida's (1994) "hauntology" become the methodology for our book *Haunting the Knowledge Economy* (Kenway, Bullen, & Fahey, with Robb, 2006). This project looked critically at the knowledge economy policy discourse and dogma and the different ways it has been put to work in policy circles. In the book we show how the knowledge economy is haunted by other economies: the risk economy, the gift economy, the survival economy and the libidinal economy. Each economy permits a particular critique of knowledge economy discourse and offers the potential to challenge its monological pretensions. I also deployed a hauntology methodology in my 2007 Radford Address to the Australian Association for Research in Education conference in Western Australia, entitled "Haunting School Curricula: Past, Present and Future." In both publications we also played with the ghostly figures from Dickens' *A Christmas Carol,* and in the paper I mobilized the idea of the Scrooge state and showed the affinities between this and the educational accountants and cartographers I mentioned earlier.

Another related project, conducted from Monash University, which I joined in 2004, looks critically at education policies on "brain drain and brain mobility" and compares their main premises, such as knowledge transfer, with the actual experiences (travelling intellectual biographies) of mobile researchers. It looks at how knowledge, travel and place are linked. The work on moving ideas seeks, rather boldly perhaps, to build on Edward Said's (1994, 1983) work on "travelling theory" and Raewyn Connell's on "southern theory" (2007). Like their work it

considers the implications of geopolitics for knowledge production and exchange. The papers from the project which illustrate our methodology include *Thinking in a Worldly Way: Mobility, Knowledge, Power and Geography* (Fahey & Kenway, 2010). Jo and I are trying to find the time to write the book called *Moving Ideas and Mobile Intellectuals*.

My most recent team study (2010-2014) is a multisited global ethnography on elite schools, globalization and changing formations of social class. The other non-PhD candidate researchers are Debbie Epstein (see this volume), Aaron Koh, Johannah Fahey, Cameron McCarthy and Fazal Rizvi. This is looking at the ways in which elite schools in nine former British colonies around the world historically and currently respond to globalization, and it examines the implications for the social classes that they serve and help to produce. We have schools in South Africa, Singapore, Hong Kong, Barbados, Argentina (not a British colony but it had a strong British presence), England, Australia, Cyprus and India. All the schools are based on the British public school model.

The literature tells us that the usual social purpose of elite schools is to advantage the advantaged across the generations and, in so doing, to adapt in such a way as to ensure that the schools keep pace with changing social conditions and changing social groupings. So an obvious question for us is how is globalization impacting on the social purposes of elite schools and the social groups that they conventionally serve? Are they involved in securing advantage beyond the nation state on the regional and global stage? If so, how? There is no research on this, let alone direction on how one might best undertake such a study. There is plenty of ethnographic work on the education/class nexus. But even at best it is critical ethnography-as-usual. It doesn't enable one to fully understand the education/class/globalization nexus. Very few scholars are looking at this nexus; Lois Weis and Stephen Ball are rare and important exceptions. But to date few are exploring the possibility that new global class formations are emerging. A question we are asking is Are these elite schools preparing their students not just for national but also for international or transnational global class formations?

A preoccupation for us is whether the conceptual apparatus associated with social class analysis that has been developed and deployed in "Western" studies is appropriate in other parts of the world. For example in *The Elite School as 'Cognitive Machine' and 'Social Paradise': Developing Transnational Capitals for the National 'Field Of Power'* (Kenway & Koh, in press) we explore the suitability of Bourdieu's concepts for Singapore and our Singapore school.

Clearly the issue isn't just if concepts travel but also how class itself travels. How for example did capitalism and colonialism impact on the preexisting structures of power in various locations? And how did the elite British public school model, which was very much a fellow traveler of colonialism and capitalism, intersect with these preexisting structures of power? What are the hangovers in terms of elite schools in differently located postcolonial states? We are fascinated with the manner in which this happens differently yet similarly in each research site.

This project's methodology is informed by the place-based global ethnographic methodology that Anna and I developed for the *Masculinity Beyond the Metropolis* project. We're doing what we call multisited global ethnography, drawing on Marcus (1998) with regard to the multisited aspects of the project and on Burawoy and his colleagues' (2000) notions of global ethnography. We have used their broad concepts of global forces, global connections and global imaginations and are raising questions about how these interact with the schools' identity, curriculum, culture, community and the nation state within which each school is located and its sub-national political configurations. We have developed a matrix involving these concepts to help guide our inquiries. So for example if one thinks about global forces as including colonialism and postcolonialism, modernity and capitalism, then questions arise about how, over time, they are implicated in each school's identity, curriculum, culture, community and its relationship to the educational and other politics of the state.

Many questions related to gender arise in every cell of the matrix—and also with regard to our methodology as we make clear in the first methodology paper arising from the project (Epstein, Fahey, & Kenway, in press). This explores the role of travel in multisited global ethnography and offers a feminist engagement with it. It considers the idea of fieldwork as a travel practice through three different travel registers: the traveller's tale, critical travel studies and travel as exile. In so doing it illustrates the reflexive affordances each register offers regarding the directions of our feminist inquiries into elite schools and our feminist ethnographic practices.

Finally, two projects speak particularly to major issues facing young scholars today. Most universities in the West are becoming more lean and mean, and working circumstances are becoming ever more demanding, difficult and competitive. Another difficulty is the intensification and surveillance of scholars' work across more and more spheres of activity and the amount of time they have to waste on "compliance" activities. Young scholars almost have to be hyper-performative, hyper-entrepreneurial and hyper-accountable. The environment that they work in is not as friendly or mutually supportive as the one I experienced in my early days at Deakin. Debbie Epstein, Rebecca Boden, and I have been very worried about the implications for young scholars. We've been around a while and have learned a great deal about "the secret life of the academy" and how to survive it. So we wrote a collection of booklets to explain this secret life (Boden, Kenway, & Epstein, 2004). The topics include "building your academic career," "getting started on research," "winning and managing research funds," "publishing," "networking" and "teaching and supervision." Sage put them together in what we called the *The Academic Support Kit*. The broad idea is to help people who are starting their careers. We deployed a narrative methodology, using stories from the real life experiences of people we know (anonymously) and related them to all these topics and the issues that people face in the academy today and how they may best be addressed.

Secondly, in the first chapter of *Globalizing the Research Imagination*, Jo Fahey and I developed a set of pedagogical principles for supervising graduate students.

These are designed to help these students to develop a defiant rather than a compliant global research imagination. When I have presented these ideas to young scholars in different parts of the world, many have come up to me afterwards and said, "Jane, we loved that, but it's so hard for us; there is so much pressure, and we can't take the risk of being defiant." I always say, "If you're going to play it safe, if you're not asking interesting questions, if you are not taking risks with ideas, if you're not really pushing yourself and others intellectually, then you will not do well anyway. You won't do very well if your work is timid and uninteresting and if you are not doing the really hard work of thinking. If you develop this sort of defiant research imagination, it is highly probable that you will do very well." Naughty students can make good, and "heaven help the education profession" if enough do.

REFERENCES

Blackmore, J., & Kenway, J. (1989). Rationalisation, instrumentalism and corporate managerialism: The implications for women of *The Green Paper on Higher Education*. *Australian Universities Review, 31*(1), 42-49.

Blackmore, J., & Kenway, J. (Eds). (1993). *Gender matters in educational administration and policy: A feminist introduction*. London: Falmer Press.

Boden, R., Kenway, J., & Epstein, D. (2004). *The academic support kit* [6 volumes]. London: Sage.

Bullen, E., & Kenway, J. (2004). Subcultural capital and the female underclass: A feminist response to an underclass discourse. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *7*(1), 141-153.

Burawoy, M., Blum, J. A., George, S., Gille, Z., Gowan, T., Haney, L., Klawiter, M., Lopez, S. H., O Riain, S., & Thayer, M. (2000). *Global ethnography: Forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Collins, C., Kenway, J., & McLeod, J. (2000). *Factors influencing educational performance of males and females in school and their initial destinations after leaving school*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. (2009). Peripheral visions: Beyond the metropole. In J. Kenway & J. Fahey (Eds.), *Globalising the research imagination* (pp. 53-72). London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx: The state of the debt, the work of mourning & the new international.* (P. Kamuf, trans.). London: Routledge.

Eng, D. L., & Kazanjian, D. (Eds). (2003). *Loss.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Epstein, D., Fahey, J., & Kenway, J. (In press). Multi-sited global ethnography and travelling biography: Gendered journeys. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*.

Fahey, J., & Kenway, J. (2010). Thinking in a worldly way: Mobility, knowledge, power and geography. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *31*(5), 627-640.

Fahey, J., & Kenway, J. (In press). Thinking in a worldly way: Mobility, knowledge, power and geography. In J. Demaine (Ed.), *Sociology of education today*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kenway, J. (1989). Yes Minister, but! Women, research and tertiary education: Before and after Dawkins. In A. Junor, & J. O'Brien (Eds.), *The reshaping of Australian higher education 1988-1989* (pp. 123-137), Forum of Education Monograph Series No. 2. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University.

Kenway, J. (1995a). Having a postmodernist turn. In R. Smith & P. Wexler (Eds.), *After post-modernism: Education politics and identity* (pp. 36-56). London: Falmer Press.

Kenway, J. (1995b). Masculinities: Under siege, on the defensive and under reconstruction? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 16*(1), 59-81.

Kenway, J. (1996). The information super-highway and postmodernity: The social promise and the social price. *Comparative Education, 32*(2), 217-231.

Kenway, J. (1997). Gender reform policies for Australian schools. *British Journal of Educational Research, 23*(3), 239-344.

Kenway, J. (2001). Remembering and regenerating Gramsci. In C. Weiler (Eds.), *Feminist Engagements: Reading, resisting and revisioning male theorists in education and cultural studies* (pp. 47-66). New York: Routledege.

Kenway, J. (2008). The ghosts of the school curriculum: Past, present and future. *Australian Educational Researcher, 35*(2), pp 1-13.

Kenway, J., & Blackmore, J. (1989). Gender and the Green Paper: Privatisation and equity. *Australian Universities Review, 31*(1), 49-56.

Kenway, J., & Bullen, E. (2001). *Consuming children: Entertainment, advertising and education*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Kenway, J., & Bullen, E. (2005). Globalising the young in the age of desire: Some educational policy issues. In M. Apple, J. Kenway & M. Singh (Eds.), *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies and politics* (pp. 31-43). New York: Peter Lang.

Kenway, J., & Bullen, E. (2009). Consuming skin: Dermographies of female subjection and abjection. In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"* (pp. 157-168). New York: Routledge.

Kenway, J., & Bullen, E. (2011). Skin pedagogies and abject bodies. *Sport, Education and Society, 16*(3), 279-294.

Kenway, J., & Fahey, J. (2008). Melancholic mothering: Mothers daughters and family violence. *Gender and Education*, *20*(6), 639-654.

Kenway, J., & Fahey, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Globalising the research imagination.* New York: Routledge.

Kenway, J., & Fahey, J. (2010). Is greed still good? Was it ever? Exploring the emoscapes of the global financial crisis. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(6), 717-727.

Kenway, J., & Fitzclarence, L. (1997). Masculinity, violence and schooling: Challenging poisonous pedagogies. *Gender and Education, 9*(1), 117-133.

Kenway, J., & Hickey-Moody, A. (2009). Spatialized leisure-pleasures, global flows and masculine distinctions. *Social and Cultural Geography, 10*(8), 837-852.

Kenway, J., & Hickey-Moody, A. (In press). Global scapes of abjection: The contemporary dynamics of some intersecting injustices. In L. Weiss & N. Dolby (Eds.), *Social class and education: Global perspectives* (pp. 141-158). New York: Routledge.

Kenway, J., & Koh, A. (In press). The elite school as "cognitive machine" and "social paradise": Developing transnational capitals for the national "field of power." *Journal of Sociology*.

Kenway, J., & Langmead, D. (2002). Is there a future for feminism in the contemporary university? In C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Women and school leadership: International perspectives* (pp. 129-146). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Kenway, J., with Langmead, D. (2000). Fast capitalism, fast feminism and some fast food for thought. In S. Ali, K. Coate, W. wa Goro (Eds.), *Global feminist politics: Identities in a changing world* (pp. 154-176). London: Routledege.

Kenway, J., with Langmead, D. (2001). Cyber-feminism and citizenship: Challenging the political imaginary. In M. Arnot & J. Dillabough (Eds.), *Gender, education and citizenship: An international feminist reader* (pp. 312-330). London: Routledge.

Kenway, J., & McLeod, J. (2004). Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and "spaces of points of view": Implications for the sociology of education and gender. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, *25*(4), 525-544.

Kenway, J., & Willis, S. (1989). Feminist single sex educational strategies: Some theoretical flaws & practical fallacies. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 7*(1), 1-30.

Kenway, J., & Willis, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Hearts & minds: Self-esteem and the schooling of girls*. London: Falmer Press.

Kenway, J., & Willis, S., with Blackmore, J. & Rennie, L. (1998). *Answering back: Girls, boys and feminism in schools.* London: Routledge.

Kenway, J., & Youdell, D. (Eds.). (2011). Emotional geographies of education [Special issue]. *Emotion, Space and Society, 4*(3).

Kenway, J., Blackmore, J., & Willis, S. (1996a). The emotional dimensions of feminist pedagogy. In P. Murphy (Ed.), *Effective pedagogies? Educating girls and boys* (pp 242-260). London: Falmer Press.

Kenway, J., & Blackmore, J., & Willis, S. (1996b). Pleasure and pain: Beyond feminist authoritarianism and therapy in the curriculum. *Curriculum Perspectives, 16*(1), 1-13.

Kenway, J., Bullen, E., & Robb, S. (2004). The knowledge economy, the technopreneur and the problematic future of the university. *Policy Futures in Education, 2*(2), 333-351.

Kenway, J., Kraack, A., & Hickey-Moody, A. (2006a). *Masculinity beyond the metropolis*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Kenway, J., Bullen, E., & Fahey, J., with Robb, S. (2006b). *Haunting the knowledge economy*. New York: Routledge.

Lather, P. (1991). *Feminist research in education: Within/against*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University.

Marcus, G. E. (1998). Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography (1995). In G. E. Marcus (Ed.), *Ethnography through thick and thin* (pp. 79-104). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Marcus, G. E., & Faubion, J. D. (Eds.). (2009). *Fieldwork is not what it used to be: Learning anthropology's method in a time of transition.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Said, E. W. (1983). Traveling theory. In E. W. Said (Ed.), *The world, the text, and the critic* (pp. 226-247). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Said, E. W. (1994). Intellectual exile: Expatriates and marginal. In *Representations of the intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. London: Vintage.

Willis, S. (1989). *"Real girls don't do maths": Gender and the construction of privilege*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University.

Willis, S., & Kenway, J. (1986). On overcoming sexism in schools: To mainstream or to marginalise? *Australian Journal of Education, 30*(2), 136-150.

Yates, L. (1990). *Theory/practice dilemmas: Gender, knowledge and education*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University.

Jane Kenway
Professorial Fellow of the Australian Research Council
Professor of Education
Monash University

PATTI LATHER

AN INTELLECTUAL AUTOBIOGRAPHY

The Return of the (Feminist) Subject?

I was a feminist before I was a Marxist, and that has made all the difference. This came about through some combination of life experience and teaching high school literature and history. The life experience included an M.A. degree at Purdue in American Studies (1970-72), where I hung out around the budding feminist movement, as I had as an undergraduate at South Dakota State University (1966-70). I was very much in the background at both places, not knowing anything about feminism but very attracted nonetheless, largely due to a 1969 abortion, illegal of course, in Mexico—blindfolded, desperate, life shattering.

I emerged fully into feminism as a high school teacher in small town Indiana. There I hooked up with, unknown to me at the time, a strong group of lesbians undercover as school teachers. We read what we could find of the "new" feminist literature, engaged in Wiccan spirituality, and went to the Michigan Women's Music Festival. This was my entry into feminism, this cultural richness that included a "C-R" (consciousness-raising) group of mythic proportions. We drank a lot of wine and read and read and read. We also audited a women's history course offered at the local all-male college and organized a community-based series of evenings on women's history.

As a high school teacher, stepping out on the feminist stage intellectually for the first time, I integrated women's literature and, especially, history into my teaching of American literature and American history, sometimes in a combined two-hour block called American Studies. Those were the days when an individual teacher-designed curriculum was quite welcome, and I spent many an hour at the mimeograph machine and typewriter. These were heady times that reinforced feminism in my high school teaching as well as in my life.

After 4 years, it was clear I had worn out my welcome amongst the administration, who were still recovering from hiring me after I told them I had hitch-hiked through Europe. Curriculum units on communes through history, women's rights and civil rights struggles took their toll on all of us. I remember a big boy crying in the hall when confronted with the idea that U.S. history was not all a story of glory and goodness. I remember parents marching up to the principal for various reasons over various years. I also remember kids alive with excitement to begin to understand American culture in all of its complexity, including kids (the "non-acs" as they were called) who usually weren't overly excited by anything to do with school.

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 117–128.

I quit, quite dramatically as I remember. I wrote "I quit" on the board the last day of year four, after a nasty little assistant principal "forgot" to schedule the two-hour block for American Studies. "You are too smart to be a high school teacher," the principal who had hired me said on my last day, words I am as shocked at now as I was then.

Not knowing what to do, I applied for doctoral work at Indiana University (IU) and the University of Texas (UT) after an amazing opportunity to spend six weeks in Nigeria with a mixed race group of 20 other Indiana schoolteachers. I still have the journal from this trip that I think I might publish one of these days, if I can figure out how to protect some identities that need to be protected, as we were a road show of U.S. race, gender and neo-colonial relations.

Returning a bit of a "ruin" after this 1978 trip, I decided on UT-Austin for doctoral work in social studies education, with IU as backup. I did not know one end of a doctoral program from another, but my fellowship at Texas fell through and IU was close and offered me a graduate assistantship supervising student teachers. I chose "general secondary education" after failing my entry into social studies education. Not enough of a "researcher," I came to find out later—which at that time meant I had no knowledge of or interest in statistics. The general secondary education faculty was comprised of former superintendents that I could never seem to find in their offices, so I looked around for another program, landing in "curriculum" largely because those guys—and they were all guys—were there and quite friendly. They also ran an alternative teacher education program, which was a good match for my hippie leanings.

While being called an "organic Marxist" when I was an early doctoral student was one of the best compliments of my life, I did not know what it meant until I began to learn from other doctoral students what "critical" social thought was all about. I could not rely on my professors who were not conversant with the work of Henry Giroux or Michael Apple, let alone the Frankfurt School, but I could rely on my fellow doctoral students who introduced me to those critical education theorists as well as queer theory, a la Bill Pinar. What I did get more formally was women's studies, and that, too, has made all the difference.

I was among the cohort at Indiana University that was the first to take advantage of a brand new PhD minor in Women's Studies (1980, as I remember). I also benefitted immeasurably from being on the committee to organize the annual National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) conference at IU in, again, as I remember, 1981. Here I was introduced to feminist philosophy of science and nothing was ever the same again.

This feminist work on science, now called feminist science studies, combined with another stroke of luck during my IU years: Egon Guba was offering the first qualitative research courses. Between Guba and feminist science, I was "saved" from positivism and I converted accordingly, gratefully. Maybe I could be an education researcher, after all.

This, then, was my academic training, including, importantly, the Women's Studies minor that Egon Guba, bless his heart, recommended against: "no one will ever hire you with that on your record." That minor was where I found theory,

particularly of the socialist-feminist persuasion, as it was called then, to differentiate it from "liberal" and "radical" (lesbian) theory. Dorothy Dinnerstein was big at the time, Sandra Harding, Donna Haraway: the list is long, but they rocked my world. And I, in turn, like to think I rocked the IU School of Education or at least the curriculum studies corner and maybe the qualitative research corner, too. I remember Guba asking me how I got so smart, and my answer was something about the combination of women's studies and qualitative research and how they interrupted one another.

My advisor, Norm Overly, took me to the Bergamo Curriculum Theory conference in the fall of 1981, and there I began to see a life for myself as a critical feminist scholar. Bergamo was like dying and going to heaven. Critical theorists, phenomenologists, feminists, queers, race conscious white folks with a very sparse scattering of folks of color. There were even Canadians, including Deborah Britzman who then as now helped me entertain the idea of psychoanalysis without having a fit, a psychoanalysis "we could bear to learn from" to use Lisa Weem's felicitous phrase (Weems & Lather, 2000).

Somewhere in the mid-80s at Bergamo, I was introduced to the "posties," first through Jacques Daignault, a French Canadian who spoke "Derrida." I had no idea what he was talking about, but after some years of critical theory it seemed like a breath of fresh air. I first described this as the difference between being hit over the head with neo-Marxist theory and being tickled into awareness by the serious playfulness of French "postie" theory. While by no mean an easy read, poststructuralism was so much less heavy handed and moralistically directive and so much more in tune with my emerging sense that critical theory had its limits in making sense of what was rushing down the road: media culture, postcolonialities, and the blurring of disciplines way beyond the sort of interdisciplinary of American Studies, all in a "post everything moment," to quote Fred Erickson from a 2001 AERA paper. Given feminist discomforts, I had found my own way to a grasp of issues of imposition in emancipatory work. Postmodernism, as well, challenged some of feminism's own blind spots. Especially attractive to me was the postmodern repositioning of critical intellectuals away from either universal spokespeople or academic heroes and toward opening up our privileged spaces in the production of a politics of difference that recognizes paradox, complicity and complexity.

In 1983, I had taken my first academic job in women's studies (so much for Guba's advice!) at Mankato State University where Dennis Crowe, a former student of Gayatri Spivak, was on the faculty, and he and John Edwards, an undergraduate student who both knew the insides and outsides of Frankfurt School critical theory, schooled me. This tutorial included taking me to a 1987 conference, "Postmodernism: Text, Politics, Instruction," sponsored by the University of Kansas and the International Association of Philosophy and Literature. Spivak, Frederic Jameson, Richard Bernstein, Nancy Fraser and a host of others saved me at least a year of reading and helped focus my sense of the issues.

I was teaching a course on Feminism and Postmodern Thought that was also very helpful. We read only women and asked questions like how can liberatory

intentions become part of what Foucault (1972) terms "master discourses?" How can feminist thought and practice escape totalization and dogmatism? Who are all of these French white guys anyway, and why should a group of praxis-oriented feminists care?

After coming out of the gate with a rush around using feminist critical theory to rethink qualitative methods, especially issues of validity, I proceeded to NOT write for about two years. I read and read and read and then, slowly, began to try to write again. Everything was different. I hardly recognized myself in this new space of a less authoritarian sort of knowing. How did one both write oneself into the text and question the text at the same time? What was the ground for teaching in this new space? For political practice?

I still had to publish, so I made some early tentative efforts. These early postie writings were published in *Getting Smart* (Lather, 1991), largely through the kindness of Michal Apple, who included it in his Critical Social Thought series with Routledge Press. He along with several other critical theorists had much appreciated my (pre-post) "Research as Praxis" essay (Lather, 1986) that had started out as a preliminary exam question. I still remember when Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren called me in Minnesota to congratulate me, and I keep a photo of me from that night on my computer: arms wide open, electric with possibility. As upset as I've gotten with male Marxists over the years (see Lather, 1998), this laid down some pretty "sweet on 'em" tracks.

By the time *Getting Smart* was published, I was teaching qualitative research at Ohio State University. This was a fortuitous turn of events as I landed in a job that had advertised for a feminist critical theorist who could teach qualitative research. I call this a dream job where what we read to teach is also what we read to do our scholarly work.

Getting Smart was completed in New Zealand while I was on a 1989 Fulbright Award. This was an especially formative six months for me as New Zealand—including a side trip to Australia, especially the hotbed of critical theory in education at Deakin University—gave me two powerful things. One is the awareness that one could possibly exist in a place/space where critical theory was the norm, and two was to learn to defend the "postie" part of my feminist critical theory. "Down under" was pretty well dominated by a male neo-Marxism quite wary of the French theory of the time. Habermas was much more to their liking. On the other hand, the many feminists I encountered were quite interested in the French guys and girls, and I found that intriguing. Why was feminism so much more open to the intersection of postmodernism and the politics of emancipation than the neo-Marxists were?

In New Zealand I traveled to each of the seven universities to give my little talks and take up the issues in lively Q&A sessions. Here I learned to speak in front of all sorts of audiences and, especially, to welcome thinking on my feet under all sorts of hard questions. I also learned about Maori politics in a way that has stuck with me through the ups and downs of American multiculturalism and, of late, indigenous methodologies or what Spivak terms "the new new" of "the indigenous dominant" (1999, pp. 67-68). This laid some important groundwork for my

engagement with the postcolonial and globalization theories of more recent times as articulated in the work of Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins (2008) and Linda Tuhawai Smith (1999).

And now twenty some years and four books later, I look back at what developed. I more or less fell into a project on women and HIV/AIDS (Lather & Smithies, 1997) that propelled my writing for several years and brought me back to the importance of empirical work in theorizing methodology. I became part of the effort to move OSU's foundational studies in a cultural studies direction. The lack of success of this is documented in two publications (Lather, 2006; Lather & Clemens, 2011). I was part of an effort to bring postie perspectives to the American Education Research Association (AERA). This was an especially fraught affair given the 2002 *Scientific Research in Education Report,* which I made it my business, along with many other critical theorists, to not let go unremarked. We took this on and, actually, had more success than was expected, as evidenced by the 2009 Spencer Foundation Report on the preparation of education researchers based on lessons learned from Spencer Research Training Grants (http://ed.stanford.edu/suse/spencerfinalreport.pdf). I was, as well, part of an effort to bring educational matters to feminist scholarship. Primary here has been participation in a long trajectory of seeking out feminist space in which to work, networking for dear life that began with the AERA Women and Education mid-year conferences. It also included the National Women's Studies conference, a University of California sabbatical residency program in feminist methodology the autumn of 1995 where I got to hot tub with Sandra Harding, among others, and, most recently, the FEMMSS (Feminist Epistemology, Methodology, Metaphysics and Science Studies) conferences.

For the 2012 FEMMSS conference, for example, I organized a "salon" to engage questions of the possibilities and dangers of poststructuralism for feminist policy work, including theories of the subject and agency, after humanism, and the critiques of standpoint theory. I was especially happy to welcome an Irish colleague, Catherine Conlon, to the panel who has done work on the methodology of coming to know Irish women concealing pregnancy. Conlon's work (2010) was part of government-commissioned research that resulted in the formation of a policy office to address the needs of such women and included the sort of "betrayal" of qualitative interpretive work by policymakers that is a not uncommon story in feminist policy analysis (Patton, 2008).

This work takes me beyond my 2010 book, *Engaging Science Policy: From the Side of the Messy,* to the edge of where I am working now: theorizing feminist policy analysis under conditions of post-neoliberalism, post-feminism and the tensions of the intersection of feminist policy and poststructuralism, including a re-engagement with feminist standpoint theory "after" the critiques of identity politics and the humanist subject (Houle, 2009).

As I face retirement, I am engaging in a project I can hardly believe given these interests: the weight of sports on U.S. secondary schools. As the daughter and sister of coaches, I want to investigate the question: Do we hire teachers or coaches? My working title is "The Sports and Schooling (Arcades) Project" and

my model is Walter Benjamin's *The Arcades Project,* an unfinished assemblage that explores the intersections of art, culture, history and politics through the figure of the Paris arcades, a precursor to shopping malls. Drafted between 1927 and 1940, *The Arcades Project* was published in Germany in 1982 (Rolf Tiedemann, editor), over four decades after Benjamin's death. The English version was published in 1999. A study of dominant motifs that concretely immerses the reader in a milieu, the book is a vast montage, a palimpsest, a fragmentary wealth of perspectives and methodological inventiveness, an exemplar of the demand that writing be reinvented for each topic and every occasion. A meditation on an ethos, it works to strip away the lies we tell ourselves—unmaking deceptions, it portrays the demented rationality at work in the construction of early modernism. Its focus is on images of desire, dream factories. Choppy, it is a sort of anti-book assembled across a variety of editorial interventions, particularly those of Theodor Adorno after it was found in the Bibliotheque Nationale de France after WWII, hidden there by Georges Bataille after Benjamin fled Paris to his death on the Spanish border during the German Occupation.

The Arcades Project is a culmination of Benjamin's interests and skills, "a theatre of all my struggles and all my ideas," (1999, p. x) that collects thirteen years of research. Epic and interminable, it is a sort of archive or assemblage of collectibles and interpretive angles, including drafts of early iterations. A patchwork of citations and commentary, rather than a "mere notebook," Benjamin's book enacts the "ruin" of a project that, while a blueprint, is also what it is: a sort of diary of when a research project becomes the "thing itself" and, perhaps, transcends book form.

This is my model as I stand poised on retirement's edge, hoping to produce something that will make use of all my skills and interests and contribute to how we might think in different ways about schools, sports and education research. Finally, I may add an autobiographical element. I like to write "mash up" sorts of texts and I plan to add my father's story (I taped him before he died), as well as my brothers who all went into the coaching/teaching business. All were deeply driven by coaching, invested in using athletics to "save" kids in one way or another—and save themselves, more or less—many "redemption" stories that would bring some complication to my more critical, feminist eye.

I have always liked to work "against myself" and my particular way of looking at things, and this project is ripe for opening up layers of contradiction and complication both personally and professionally. It is, as well, quite timely given the focus on teaching excellence as the new "nut to crack" in reforming American secondary schooling. Bill Gates, for example, is now focusing $4 billion on this. After a decade of work on small schools, his Foundation is investing in "effective teachers in every classroom." Studies are being done in New York City, Charlotte, North Carolina, and Houston, Texas, to see what good teaching looks like and what resources for support might look like. While the focus on using student test data as diagnostic for teacher professional development makes me quite nervous, I have learned from a former student working with a Gates initiative in Houston that qualitative work is increasingly appreciated in this drive to understand what makes

for quality teaching. My study might well be situated in this larger effort in ways both critical and dialogic. My "Sports Project" is also, unfortunately, timely in the wake of the Penn State and Syracuse sex abuse scandals. What is it about "Big Sports" that makes such things possible? What can a feminist perspective add to the analysis?

In all of this, the institutions of higher education in which I have functioned have served as both harbor and tyrant. The harbor part is not too difficult to articulate: what other job pays us to read and provides colleagues and students with whom to think? Here I appreciate my many fabulous doctoral students and my 20 years-running feminist reading group, PMS (Post-Modern Studies). And I continue to think that no one learns more in the room than the teacher. The tyranny part is a bit more difficult to articulate, but I have begun to collect others asking such things as what is the cost of the triumph of the mercantilist university? As Jorge Larrosa argues in a 2010 essay in a special issue of *Educational Philosophy and Theory* on Jacques Ranciere,

> something is taking its course … We knew the old words but now we are no longer sure they mean anything. And we are not keen to learn new ones: we do not trust them, they are irrelevant to us. Moreover, we are sad and tired. All we feel is rage and impotence. Will we be capable of trying all the verbs once again? Reading, writing, conversing, perhaps thinking. (p. 703)

What is the university to come, what is its logic and how is it ruined by what Bill Readings (1997) pointed out some time ago as the "university of excellence," and who could be opposed to that? Larrosa (2010) writes of feeling increasingly tired and "becoming an old grouch" (p. 686), and I have a difficult time separating out the price of toiling in the neoliberal institution and what it means to be near retirement after 40 plus years of teaching.

In an AERA 2012 paper titled "Crabby Theory," I write that we are no longer what we once hoped we would be. I don't know if this is generational or, even more specifically, pre-presidential election recession or a more epochal disappointment. Nietzsche did say most theory arises out of indigestion, so one does not want to assume a certain crabbiness is anything bigger than one's own bile.

But I am crabby. I am crabby about: the explosion of higher education administration and its obscene salaries; the scandals around Big Football, sexual and otherwise; the governmental logics of the state, including a middle-management takeover and its measurement mania; the "combat between stupidity and stultification" that is "a struggle against ourselves" (Larrosa, 2010, p. 680). What does it mean to pay attention to these things, "to be equal to [the something that is happening] and give it time and space" (p. 694) so that we might know how to be and to do within and against it?

Simon Critchley (2010) holds out hope in a view of "teaching as a laboratory for research" (p. 19), if we can break the hold of quality assurance agencies functioning as the new police force. He uses Foucault to explore the "soul destroying" (p. 23) elements of how we discipline ourselves to submit to what the

state demands. "A culture of depression" has arisen, melancholy in the face of—here comes Habermas—"the colonization of the academic lifeworld" (p. 24) where "no one is to blame, no one is responsible, no one can do anything" (p. 25). Calling himself an "old fart," Critchley turns to Lacan and the erotics of teaching as some force against self-certainty, phallic knowledge and universities as factories of knowledge production, while telling a story of the end of the university as he has known it.

But I am crabby about this, too, inadequate as it is. Can I de-identify with the crabby me who feels the university is no longer a place for the likes of me? Is there any way to go but out, and is it such a bad thing to move over for the younger ones? What do we squish by staying "too long" in harness? Maybe following Benjamin into my sports project is quite the right thing to do. Let me end by exploring what that might look like, especially under condition of a ruptured cerebral aneurism that I suffered in December of 2010.

Most noticeable in *The Arcades Project* is Benjamin's use of the future pluperfect: "… the investigations that one would have to undertake in order to illuminate the subject further" (p. 469). Other such phrases that evoke a sort of, "If I were to do this study": to be underlined, still to be established, say something, compare, this work has to develop, outline the story of. Along these lines, I have actually written a "secret proposal" of a study that is more imagined than done. Its components would entail:

A. "No Sports" as Curriculum Policy

B. Benjamin

C. Do We Hire Teachers or Coaches? The Elephant in the Room: An Issue Too Big to See?

D. Pop Culture and the Meaning of Sports

E. A Cultural Studies Methodology

F. …

G. Multiplying CAHS (Columbus Alternative High School): Scaling Up as Policy, with Sara Childers

H. …

I. Effective Teachers

J. Feminist Methodology: In the Afterwards

K. Finland: A Cross-Cultural Comparison

L. A Critical Qualitative Approach to Policy: Policy as a Practice of Power

M. The Pleasures and Politics of Cheerleading—review of *Cheerleader! An American Icon* by Natalie Guice Adams and Pamela J. Bettis (2003), with Lu Bailey

N. Uncertain Objects and Non-traditional Texts: An Ethnography of Things that Are Not Present

O. Academics + Athletics: Student Performance and Sports Participation: In Search of a Fugitive Research Base

P. Sports as Redemption/Salvation Narrative

Q. Deconstruction of Empirical Spaces: A Research Design

R. An Ethos of Self-Erasure: An Autoethnography of a Methodology

S. LeBron James book & movie; *Hoop Dreams* movie

T. Measures of Success: A Validity of Layerings and Foucauldian Rigor

U. *Friday Night Lights*

V. Coaching and the Attraction of Men to Teaching: My Father's Story

W. Necessary Fictions

X. Teachers as Intellectuals

Y. The Afterlife of Works: To Be Freer Than We Think/to Think Freer Than We Be

Z. Bill Gates and the Reform of U.S. Secondary Schooling

a. Smart Mixed Methods?

b. CloudGate: Toward the (Post)Qualitative

c. …

d Working Against Ourselves: Feminist Methodology as the Obligation to Hear Dissensus: Brothers 1-3

e. …

f. …

g. Ranciere: Modifying the Regime of the Visible by Enacting Democratic Equality

h. …

i. Philosophical Ethnography: The Object as a Philosophical Entity

k. Undoing Victory Narratives: A Feminist (Post)Critical Research Imaginary

l. …

m. "To Be in Trouble and Of Use": The Messy Work of Coming to Policy

n. …

o. …

p A Scientificity of Imperfect Information: QUAL 1.0, 2.0, 3.0

q. …

r. Imagining Forward: Toward a Theory of Democratic Agency and the Political Subject/The Subject of Politics

s. …

t. …

We'll see how I do in getting this done and if I can find a sort of "new way of writing" post-aneurism. I have tried NOT to be consumed with reading (and writing) about this "incident," but I have taken comfort in and inspiration from *Under Blue Cup* by the feminist art theorist, Rosalind Krauss, a performance of her recovery where she intends "to disappear into this narrative's commitments to the art of the present" (2011, p. 129). What I particularly value about this book is that she focuses on getting on with her academic theorizing, with enough threads of her recovery work that the reader never forgets the conditions of production entailed in a book that has found a "form" that fits the circumstances of memory loss, problems with cognitive endurance and what Krauss refers to as "the puddles in my brain" (p. 51). In a format that includes alphabetized aphorisms in a "fugal" organization to represent "the master narrative of the brain's remembering and forgetting" (p. 48), Krauss displaces the "wooden and unbearable" writing that she first could manage "after the flood" of the aneurism (p. 64). She wanted "an automatism" that could be "a pattern generated from the rule of remembering" (p. 75) that would, like the work of artist Ed Ruscha, produce out of "a fantasy rule in my mind that I knew I had to follow" (p. 78). This is what she can "summon," this network of twenty-six aphorisms that bring her back to writing after the attack on her powers of scholarly presence.

If, as Krauss says, "being an artist means to question the nature of art" (2011, p.31), then writing an autobiography under the sign of "post" or even "post-post" (McKenzie, 2005) means questioning the nature of autobiography given the dismissal of the "self" in deconstruction. This sort of reflexive presentation of the genre demands a somewhat experimental element to the format, including an engagement with the "return of the subject" to trouble the "contemptuous dismissal [of] essentialist ideas" (p. 95) in poststructuralism. Perhaps, then, this essay is a performance of the "*I*" that is back.

PERSONAL FAVORITES

Books

Lather, P. (2010). *Engaging science policy: From the side of the messy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Lather, P. (2007). *Getting lost: Feminist practices toward a double(d) science*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview/HarperCollins.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.

Refereed Journal Articles

Lather, P. (2008). (Post) Feminist methodology: Getting lost OR a scientificity we can bear to learn from. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 1*(1), 55-64.

Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching qualitative research as a wild profusion. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(1), 35-57.

Lather, P. (2004), This IS your father's paradigm: Governmental intrusion and the case of qualitative research in education. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(1), 15-34.

Lather, P. (2002). Postbook: Working the ruins of feminist ethnography. *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 27*(1), 199-227.

Lather, P. (1998). Critical pedagogy and its complicities. *Educational Theory, 48*(4), 487-497.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3), 257-277.

REFERENCES

Adams, N. G., & Bettis, P. J. (2003). *Cheerleader!: An American icon*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Benjamin, W. (1999). *The arcades project*. (H. Eiland & K. McLaughlin, Trans., based on the German volume by R. Tiedemann, Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Critchley, S. (2010). What is the institutional form for thinking? *differences, 21*(1), 19-31.

Erickson, F. (2001, April). *Qualitative research in the post-everything moment*. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Houle, K. (2009). Making strange: Deconstruction and feminist standpoint theory. *Frontiers, 30*(1), 172-193.

Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Indigenous discourse and "the material": A post-interpretive argument. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 1*(2), 125-144.

Krauss, R. (2011). *Under blue cup*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Larrosa, J. (2010). Endgame: Reading, writing, talking (and perhaps thinking) in a faculty of education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 42*(5-6), 683-703.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3), 257-277.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.

Lather, P. (1998). Critical pedagogy and its complicities. *Educational Theory, 48*(4), 487-497.

Lather, P. (2006). The foundations/cultural studies nexus: An emerging movement in the education field. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, Summer, 25-40.

Lather, P. (2010). *Engaging science policy: From the side of the messy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview/HarperCollins.

Lather, P., & Clemens, J. (2011). Postmodern studies in education. In S. Tozer, B. Gallegos, A. Henry, M. Bushnell Greiner, & P. Groves (Eds.), *Handbook on research in social foundations of education* (pp. 179-194). New York: Routledge.

McKenzie, M. (2005). The 'post-post period' and *Environmental Education Research*. *Environmental Education Research, 11*(4), 401-413.

Patton, C. (2008). Finding "fields" in the field: Normalcy, risk and ethnographic inquiry. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 1*(2), 255-274.

Readings, B. (1997). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, G. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tuhiwai-Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Press.

Weems, L., & Lather, P. (2000). A psychoanalysis we can bear to learn from [Review of Deborah Britzman, *Lost subjects contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*, SUNY, 1998]. *Educational Researcher, 29*(6), 41-42.

Patti Lather
Professor
The Ohio State University

BOB LINGARD

POSITIONS/DISPOSITIONS

Reflections on Engaging with Feminism and Masculinity Politics[1]

The American sociologist C. Wright Mills encapsulated the sociological imagination as demanding recognition simultaneously of the complex, multiple interweaving of the personal/biographical, the social/structural and the historical/temporal—in a sense, individual biography in social structure through time. This is the recursive interplay of agency and structure over or though time, recognizing always, after Raymond Williams, the admixture of the residual evanescence of the past, dominant cultural forms of the present (hegemony in Gramsci's terms) and the emergent or immanent.[2] Pierre Bourdieu, the late French sociologist, in his own brief life narrative, states assertively "this is not an autobiography," but rather a "socioanalysis." In speaking of socioanalysis instead of autobiography, Bourdieu is objectifying or objectivating, to use a term he coined to refer to a necessary step in research, his own habitus and practices, and understanding them as temporal constructions derived from habitus as an effect of structure and history. Habitus, field, capitals and practices are Bourdieu's thinking tools that he developed to attempt to reject both structuralism (objective structures capable of constraining practices) and constructivism (creation of schemes of thought, perception and practices and of the fields that make up social structure) as meta-accounts of human practices and to account for the reproduction of inequality, while not being economically deterministic. For Bourdieu and for my account here, "The socialized body (what is called the individual or the person) is not opposed to society: it is one of its forms of existence" (1993, p. 15).

Of course, habitus is gendered and framed by the overarching social field of power and cut across by the field of gender, or the "gender order" in Connell's (1987) framework. I would say here, though, that Bourdieu's (2001) book on the gender field, *Masculine Domination*, seems very structuralist in its approach and simply applies his thinking tools to gender, rather than extending his framework, nuancing it in relation to specificities, as suggested by feminist scholars (see Adkins & Skeggs, 2004). I note as well that Moi (1999) argued that gender is not an autonomous or overarching field, but rather part of all fields.

Bourdieu's approach, utilizing a "constructivist structuralism" or "structuralist constructivism," is somewhat akin to the intention of Wright Mills' sociological imagination. Habitus is the embodiment in individuals of past social and cultural experiences evident in dispositions (incorporated, embodied or somatized structures) and manifest as different practices in different social fields with their specific logics of practice. Habitus is gendered, but also classed, raced and so on.

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 129–146.

It is an approach aligned with that of Bourdieu and Wright Mills that I will take here in my reflection on the developments in my gender politics. In a sense, what both are struggling with is how to allow for human agency, while simultaneously recognising the significance of social patterns of practices and outcomes. Without recognition of the latter, we descend into explanation of our predicament as human beings as simply psychological and psychoanalytic in character. In classical economics, we descend into *homo economicus*, a construction of human persons as rational actors maximizing their self-interests. This account is of course challenged today by behavioural economics, an emergent approach that seeks to work across and together *homo economicus* and *homo sociologicus.* In rejecting a construction of the human person as *homo sociologicus* as a cultural dope, we need to recognize that sociology at one level is about statistical probabilities; for example, if one is born poor, there is a lesser chance (probability) that one will study law at a high status university compared with one born into a middle class family of professionals. However, this does not mean that amongst those born poor, no one has ever become a lawyer or studied at a prestigious university. Such probabilities work as well across social class, gender and other social structural factors. Ian Hacking's (1990) *Taming of Chance*, a history of statistical reasoning in one sense, is about rejecting a deterministic account of individual practices, and also an argument that probability to some extent sets us free, or potentially sets some individuals free. Here we have the central theoretical conundrum of sociology.

This conundrum is expressed another way in the *long duree* of history and in the great historian A. J. P. Taylor's observation that often great events in history looking backwards appear inevitable, but of course nothing is. This is also what literary critics used to call "intentional fallacy," the production of writing—here an intellectual life—as an expression of the context of writing alone, an expression in Edward Said's (1983) terms of "worlding the word" or here "worlding a life." They are all of those things but also something else, which is what sociologists like me tend to call "agency." As an aside as well, I would not deny the significance of the psychological and the affective aspect of habitus.

Recognising the nature of the sociological will help me overcome my own tentativeness about why anyone would be interested in my specific intellectual journey and positioning in respect of gender issues, specifically gender equity issues in education. The only interest I can imagine that readers might have in this narrative is my attempt to locate my educational and intellectual biography against changing structures and the effluxion of time. Yet, what Stephen Fry (2012, p.3) observes of his own life in his autobiography, I might say as well of mine:

> It is a life, I suppose, as interesting or as uninteresting as anyone else's. It is mine and I can do what I like with it, both in the world in the real plane of facts and objects and on the page in the even more real plane of words and subjects.

MY SCHOOLING

The literature on boys and schooling, starting with Paul Willis' (1977) *Learning to Labour*, through Phillip Corrigan's (1979) *Schooling the Smash Street Kids*, actually constructed working class masculinities as almost necessarily and always in opposition to the academic curriculum of the school, constructed in the lads' accounts as feminine (passive not active) in their emphasis on reading, the written and the thoughtfully articulated. Now, I was a working class boy, one who loved the academic, loved words and writing and the way that opened up new worlds for me, beyond reproduction, but allowed for production of thought and identities, for varying practices of masculinity.

I was raised in an extended family with my brother and sister, with two grandmothers, as well as my parents. We lived for most of the time in two houses beside each other. When I was at primary school, my aunty also lived with us. She had been dux of her primary school and secondary school and was held up as an academic model for us. She was friends with the important Indigenous poet and activist Oodgeroo Noonucal. Born thirty years later, my aunty would have benefitted from the second wave of the women's movement and presumably had a middle class professional career. My family and I always had a sense that she did not have the stellar career she ought to have had, if she had been born middle class and male, and if our society were a meritocracy and a meritocracy for all across class, gender, race and so on. My mother participated in these debates and expressed concern that there was no equal pay for women in Australia as well, which was the case up until the early 1970s—the sixties reached Australia in the seventies. This was just at the dawn of the second wave of the women's movement.

I always wondered about the Willis (1977) construction of working class masculinity (necessary opposition between practices of masculinity and academic curricula), believing through my own experiences that there were other possibilities of the expression, the practices, the performativity, of working class masculinities. At one level, of course, my experiences were located within a different but similar culture from Willis's lads, one turning from derivation from the UK to the US; here I must recognize that I was very lucky to be born at the end of the second world war and grew and developed against the postwar economic boom in Australia, a time when secondary schooling provision was expanded considerably, as was university education. I also came to adulthood with second wave feminism. In opportunity terms, I was lucky. Government scholarships were available for top academic performers from the 1960s in upper secondary schooling and at university. My own educational biography indeed matches the sociological research that documents the social mobility through this expanded educational opportunity for all, but particularly for working class males from skilled working class families across the postwar boom. In a Bourdeuian sense, my own aspirations matched the changing and widening opportunities (enhanced statistical probability, what Bourdieu calls "praxaeological" knowledge) for achieving them. These changing opportunities were also clearly gendered.

Furthermore, I was the oldest child and part of an extended family that pressured us to achieve academically and to be socially mobile. I remember well my motor mechanic father pressing my brother and me that we would not work with our hands, but rather wear suits and ties to work after going to university—a real expression of what Sennett and Cobb (1993) referred to as the "hidden injuries of class." My sister became a teacher; my brother was involved in sales in engineering firms; both married teachers as I did. My dad held himself up as a warning rather than as role model, as is most often the case with middle class fathers. When I gained my PhD, my father was happier than I was: This was his expected educational endgame for me. I must also say that I had a highly literate mother, who read voraciously and across my entire education always knew the meaning of every new word I came across, though, I might add, she never articulated or actually used those words, a stance I also appropriated across my secondary schooling and early years at university. I would use vocabulary in my written work that I would never speak, reflecting a changing and developing habitus.

Politically, my family was a Labor Party stronghold, with my father always telling me the difference between democratic socialism and communism and that we were on the democratic socialist side of that equation. In those Cold War days the third way was social democracy! At the same time, my parents respected the facility with language, capacity to debate and education of Robert Menzies, Australia's longest serving prime minister, while rejecting his politics.

In December 1972, when Labor won the election and Gough Whitlam became Prime Minister, after twenty-three years of Conservative political rule—the "years of unleavened bread" as the great Australian historian Manning Clarke put it—the elation was palpable in my family and amongst all of my friends. The anger at the subsequent sacking of Australia's most progressive government ever in 1975, which brought the sixties to Australia, was also palpable. Whitlam had appointed a women's adviser, Elizabeth Reid, Australia's first "femocrat," with a broad reformist agenda including around women's issues. He also created the Schools Commission that systematized Commonwealth involvement in schooling with a strong equity and social justice focus (needs-based approaches to funding of all schools), which remains ostensibly a State responsibility. The Schools Commission produced the influential *Girls, School and Society* report of 1975, which recognized girls as a group disadvantaged through schooling and was framed by liberal feminism. All of this impacted on me and consolidated the political habitus I had developed from my family and from the times in which I grew up.

The rise of Whitlam, in opposition then in government, was around the time of my first teaching job in 1969 and first academic position in 1973 as research assistant to Professor Betty Watts (the second female professor at the University of Queensland and amongst the first in Australia), working on an evaluation of the Aboriginal secondary grant scheme for the Whitlam government. I have been an academic ever since and in the early stages of my career was sponsored strongly by her through references for access to postgraduate studies and references for academic positions thereafter. I came to that position after teaching Indigenous

students in rural Queensland and teaching in a variety of secondary schools in Brisbane, including at Acacia Ridge State High School, a working class community, where I taught English to the now eminent Indigenous woman artist, Judy Watson. I also remember her mother, a suburban Aboriginal woman, working in the school canteen, which would have been very unusual for the time. In my first couple of years as a schoolteacher, female graduates with the same qualifications as me were paid less. This always appeared deeply flawed and unjust. I had a deep commitment to social justice in education for working class students, Indigenous students and girls, and also for my professional colleagues, perhaps as a reflection of my own life journey via education, yet perhaps in denial of Bourdieu's deep insights about the default functioning of reproduction through schooling, rather than the meritocratic provision of opportunity.

To return to my schooling, I loved school, appreciating all of the academic work and especially sport. Because of my experiences of both primary and secondary schooling, I always thought there were other variables involved in both the construction of aspiring working class masculinities and attitudes to schooling and indeed academic work. Amongst such variables, I would include the culture of schooling. My primary school was very achievement oriented, and I had one teacher in the last two years who suggested I go to Brisbane State High School, the selective government secondary school in Brisbane, because of my academic orientation and success. All Australian states in their capital cities have an old government high school constructed on the British grammar school model (e.g., the two Sydney Boys' and Sydney Girls' Highs in Sydney, Fort Street High in Sydney, University High in Melbourne, Perth Modern in Perth and Brisbane State High School in Brisbane). These schools have provenance and have created social networks and social capital for the students who attended them because of their histories and positions within the pantheon of secondary schooling in Australia and because of their competitive academic approach. When they were established, they were often the only government secondary school and thus competed in sporting terms with the older, elite independent secondary schools. They still do. They also competed, and very successfully, in academic terms with these schools.

These schools have retained their academic status and selective character across the era of the expansion of comprehensive government secondary schools from the 1950s onwards. In the present neoliberal policy moment, they have become even more high status and voraciously sought after by aspiring parents (in terms of my old school, by aspiring migrant parents as well as by others). This enhanced status is set against the contemporary neoliberal policy era of school choice, markets, competition between schools, and league tables of school performance. It is interesting to me that both my old primary school (in a very much gentrified part of the city) and my old secondary school, both sit at the top of the current league tables of performance today.

Brisbane State High School functioned as a mode of sponsored mobility for aspiring families of working class and migrant backgrounds and some middle class families with large numbers of children. This sponsored mobility was manifest in the school's culture, which was that we could do and be anything, and indeed

would be. There was also a sense that because of our privileged positions we had an obligation to give something back to society, a heavy burden for young people, but an important formative element of the school's culture. This also manifested across sport, academic work and all other extra-curricular activities. Assemblies honoured those who had excelled at things academic and those who had excelled at sport and other activities. The school's head and deputy during my time at the school, George Lockie and Cyril Connell, were both leading scholars and leading sportsmen.

At this time there were still public examinations in Queensland at the end of primary school, mid-secondary and the end of secondary as the basis of selection for university. Performance on the scholarship examination at the end of primary school (our version of the British 11 plus) determined whether one could go onto secondary schooling at all and whether or not one was selected to attend Brisbane State High School. Each year the state would publish the top ten students in each of the public examinations and offer "open scholarships" to the university. My secondary school excelled in these terms, across my time being the top performing school in the state. The year before I was in senior, there were four students from Brisbane State High School in the top ten; indeed, they were the top four. In my year, we had the top student in the state, now one of the world's leading research scientists on photovoltaic cells. What struck me about these star academics, though, was that one female in this pantheon of academic performance did a BA and a postgraduate teaching diploma, rather than medicine, engineering and law as all of the males did. Without denigrating the significance of teachers, there were clearly still restricted opportunities in educational terms for females, despite stellar academic performance. This situation has changed in contemporary Australia because of public policy addressing this issue, at least for middle class young women, who now study medicine and law in greater numbers than their male counterparts, but who still earn less in career terms than their male counterparts, for a number of reasons, including the impact of child bearing and rearing and lack of genuinely family-friendly workplaces. One of these top-performing males became a Rhodes Scholar and Head of the Department of Foreign Affairs in Canberra. I also won a Commonwealth scholarship from my junior public examination results and received payment from the federal government in my last two years of high school. At one stage of my academic career at The University of Queensland, there were four other professors from my years at Brisbane State High. When I engaged later as a senior academic with the bureaucracy, and was for a few years the chair of the Governing Board of the Queensland Studies Authority, the CEO of the Authority and the Director-General of Education had gone to my school. The school was very successful at sponsored mobility.

Now, while I did well in the culture of the school, I was also a little wary of the dominant practices of masculinity; there was something about hegemonic masculinity that I found oppressive, restrictive, sexist and claustrophobic. I felt the same about the homosocial reproduction associated with this all-male culture. The school was coeducational, but run as separate girls' and boys' schools. For the boys, and exerted through peer pressure, one had to achieve very highly through

apparently effortless ease, rather than through obvious hard work. Masculinity was policed by the boys. Interestingly, in a study I conducted with colleagues Wayne Martino and Martin Mills for the federal government, *Addressing the Educational Needs of Boys* (2003; also see Lingard, Martino, & Mills, 2009), boys articulated just such policing of masculinities. They suggested as well that they "managed" their performance. Indeed, they were intimately and agentively involved in impression management: They worked to do as well as required, not too badly and not too well. One wonders at times the extent of the changes in masculinities today, set against the impact of second wave feminism on women, especially on middle class young women who today strive to achieve it all (career, romantic love and family).

A study I conducted with colleagues, when I was Andrew Bell Professor of Education at the University of Edinburgh, brought out the academic, career, and family aspirations of young women, and of young men, in respect of academic achievement and careers (Lingard et al., 2012). At one particular boys' school, staff were working diligently to reconstruct a softer, more caring and thoughtful masculinity (despite the school's deep, abiding and historical rugby culture), thought to be necessary for new global labour markets that these boys were destined for in business and other areas. New middle class femininities, framed by liberal feminism, were articulated by the young women in an elite all girls' school: they would have stellar careers anywhere on the globe they told me; with the boys these new (and functionally privileging, it must be added, but also positive) masculinities, were still emergent and a specific focus of school culture and practices. There was an ongoing contradiction at the core of this school's culture between this caring masculinity and the place of rugby in the school's culture.

Now at school, I was good at sport. I was in the rugby first fifteen and the first eleven for cricket. The school magazine reported that I was a very stylish rugby player, but that I needed to be more aggressive. I took that as a compliment. As well as being good at sport, though, my favourite subject was English: prose, novels, poetry, drama and writing. I had a brilliant English teacher who engaged with us through literature and he instilled in me both a fascination with and love of English. A few of my friends were always annoyed that even when I knew little about a topic I could write a good essay about it. I can also remember writing a literary response to a maths problem, for which I didn't know the formula to enable me to do the required calculations. I sat in and across the two cultures at school, but anomalies like me were possible because of the achievement oriented culture across all of the school's activities. My son, a generation later, also went to this school, and like me was school captain, and there was still the valorization of the academic, sport and a wide range of extra-curricular activities (debating, orchestra, public speaking, etc.).[3]

WORKING WITH COLLEAGUES AND MY GENDER POLITICS

To this point I have attempted to provide a succinct socioanalysis of my formation as a political subject and as a person, acknowledging the personal as political. In

this section I want to trace the emergences and framings of my academic work and stance within gender politics. Here I will stress the significance of colleagues and collaborative work to my thinking and developing research agendas. All of this as well, I believe, confirms Roland Barthes' (1977) notion of the "death of the author" as part of his critique of the sovereign subject associated with the Enlightenment. Now I want to be a little loose here in using Barthes' observation in a different way. While accepting the death of the author, in its place I want to recognize the collective and collaborative contributions to one's thinking and one's writing, to recognize the collective author, decentering the individual author.[4] This is often forgotten today in the era of the neoliberal self-responsibilizing individual. When I write and conduct research, I write out of my own "positionalities," always located in the relevant research literatures and engagements and collaborations with others.[5] In a simplistic sense, I have always as well aspired in my interactions with others, research colleagues, writing colleagues and with people I am researching, to adopt, to the extent that it is ever possible to eschew power relations (Foucault's position), Habermas's "ideal speech act," attempting conversations between intellectual equals and rejecting hierarchy.

On moving to teach in universities as an academic after completing an MA in education at Durham University in England, I taught sociology of education to teacher education students and graduate students in education. This was also in the wake of second wave feminism and the new sociology of education. I worked with, researched with and wrote with eminent Australian feminist scholars Sandra Taylor, Miriam Henry, Paige Porter and Jill Blackmore (see her essay, this volume). One of my early significant publications was a joint piece with Sandra and Miriam in the *British Journal of Sociology of Education* (1987) about the anti-feminist policies of the Queensland government during the time of the conservative Bjelke-Petersen government. Queensland refused to participate in the National Policy for the Education of Girls in Australian Schools and included boys in the State's gender policy in schooling well before the "What about the boys?" backlash. All of these women had a significant impact on my politics and my understanding of the various and changing feminisms, as did my friendship with Lyn Yates (see also her essay in this volume), who provided important accounts of developments in Australian schooling policy, set within considerations of feminism and the state. These engagements induced me to think about how men could and should work with feminisms linked to other progressive political movements.

From that time I also engaged with public servants in the bureaucracy who dealt with the Commonwealth's equity program, The Disadvantaged Schools Program founded by the Whitlam government, and gender policies and programs. I was also at one stage appointed to the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Gender Equity in Education. I worked with influential femocrats in the Queensland government bureaucracy, including Lyn Martinez, Kay Boulden, Maree Heedemann, Linda Apelt and Eleanor Ramsay. In the federal bureaucracy, esteemed public servants such as Lyndsay Connors and Georgina Webb also assisted with my education, and I supervised Georgina's PhD on how, why and from where the boys' backlash in

Australian education policy had arrived. My own PhD looked at the work of feminist bureaucrats inside the state and federal bureaucracies and the development of gender policies both nationally and in Queensland.[6] This was a focus on the state as strategic-relational terrain that was gendered, but on which femocrats strategized to achieve a more equal gender order, working with both short-term tactics and longer term strategies (Lingard, 1993). This research demonstrated the strategizing of these femocrats around short-, medium- and long-term goals for policy. Suzanne Franzway's work with Connell (Franzway, Court, & Connell, 1989) on gender and the state was important in my thinking. All of this, in addition to my own biography and academic work, was important to my learning and to my work, which in retrospect I see as pursuing a "principled pragmatism" in respect of social justice policies, gender policies and the state, framed by the traditionally statist character of Australian political culture, which, of course, has been dented somewhat by the rise of neoliberalism and new managerialism. As Eisenstein (1991, 1996) noted, the rise of "femocrats" in the bureaucracy from the mid-1970s was an idiosyncratic feature of Australian feminism, reflecting the traditionally statist character of Australian political culture.

Furthermore, in the early nineties there was the rise of the "What about the boys?" refrain in response to the impact of second wave feminism in schools and more broadly. Pat Mahony (1996, p. 1) suggested that by the mid-nineties that the "What about the boys?" backlash had reached epidemic proportions when viewed internationally. From the outset, I tried to understand this backlash and how in an essentializing way boys were now being constituted as the new disadvantaged. I was aware from the start that patriarchy remained, perhaps challenged, but still in place, and that men and boys benefited from this (the "patriarchal dividend"), but that social class and race (also sexuality) mediated these effects. Because of my sociology background and my intellectual biography, I was always deeply wary of this argument, accepting patriarchal structuring of the gender order and gender regimes within schools. As such, I was part of the emergence of the "Which boys, which girls?" refrain, which was a concerted response to claims of boys (and men) as the new disadvantaged through education. At this time, I also supervised Martin Mills' PhD on masculinity and violence in schools (see also his essay, this volume) and later Joanne Ailwood's PhD on a genealogy of gender policies in schooling in Australia, which introduced me to Judith Butler's theory of gender as performance. At the time, I also taught a Masters subject on Gender and Education with Carolyn Baker and Carmen Luke, my colleagues at the University of Queensland. I was also the Australian connection for Marcus Weaver-Hightower during his year in Australia at The University of Queensland on a Fulbright scholarship, all while he was Michael Apple's doctoral student at Wisconsin. Taking a policy ecology approach, Marcus wrote the significant study of boys' policies in Australian education derived from his PhD, *The Politics of Policy in Boys' Education: Getting Boys "Right"* (Weaver-Hightower, 2008). He documented the features of what he referred to as the "boy turn" and also provided a useful meta-analysis of the various stances in the literature on boys. Weaver-Hightower used the evocative "boy turn" to encapsulate two synchronous developments in gender politics at the

time: the "turn" away from girls in schooling policies and the argument that it was time for boys to have "turn" in policy, funding and attention terms. During this time, I participated in conferences and workshops run by policy makers in the state and federal bureaucracies regarding these sets of issues. Indeed, we actively worked in the media, politically, in professional development workshops and in research to refute the backlash.

Towards the end of this time, Gaby Weiner approached me to write a book on *Men Engaging Feminisms* (Lingard & Douglas, 1999) in the Feminist Educational Thinking Series with series editors Kathleen Weiler in the US, Gaby Weiner in the UK and Lyn Yates in Australia. Peter and I took this as a huge compliment. The series editors' work and that of other feminist scholars in Australia such as Jane Kenway, Jill Blackmore, Brigid Limerick, Julie McLeod, Pam Gilbert, Debra Hayes, Pat Thomson and Paige Porter, as well as Sue Middleton in New Zealand and pro-feminists such as Rob Gilbert, Martin Mills, and Wayne Martino, had been very important in my own thinking. I also participated in productive conversations with Icelandic pro-feminist scholar, Ingolfur Johannesson (Johanneson, Lingard and Mills, 2009). And, of course, Raewyn Connell demonstrated that an Australian sociologist could become a leader in theorizing about gender globally (see also her essay, this volume). Raewyn's work has had a considerable impact on my own, and she sponsored and supported me during the early stages of my academic career. The work of Jim King in the USA also contributed to my thinking.

Men Engaging Feminisms, which I wrote with a mathematics graduate, philosopher, White Ribbon campaigner, and MASA (Men Against Sexual Assault) activist, Peter Douglas, crystallized my thoughts on men and/in feminism and the meaning of pro-feminism. We were thrilled that the book was endorsed by eminent global scholars, Raewyn Connell, Sandra Harding and Miriam David, and that Lyn Yates wrote the preface to our book.

In our book, we considered the various stances within masculinity politics and theorizing and took a pro-feminist stance, while recognizing the complexities surrounding such a politics. We used the hyphen, rather than running the two words together, to signify the attenuated character of and profound issues working across their relationship. This was also in recognition of our view that men could not be feminists. We also sought to work across the tension within pro-feminist theorizing at the time between support for feminism (perhaps most evident in Connell's work) and a focus on the costs to masculinity of patriarchy and sexism (Seidler's [1991] position). We argued that a focus on men's pain without a structural analysis of inequalities in the societal gender order can easily slip into the self-absorbed seeking of deep essentialist masculinity through therapy, as proposed by the mythopoets such as Robert Bly in his bestseller, *Iron John* (1991), and satirized in Hughes's observation that these men "are off in the woods, affirming their manhood by sniffing one another's armpits and listening to third-rate poets rant about the moist, hairy satyr that lives inside each one of them" (Hughes, 1993, p. 5). As Michael Kimmel (1996, p. 324) wryly suggested, we need more Ironing Johns than Iron Johns. Vic Seidler sought to be pro-feminist, supporting the women's movement and also seeking to reconstruct masculinity, a

stance that I have now arrived at as well and one that was expressed in *Educating Boys* (2009), a book I wrote with colleagues Wayne Martino and Martin Mills. I spent time talking with Vic Seidler on sabbatical at Goldsmiths College, University of London. Peter Douglas and I also considered the difficulties of deciding which feminism pro-feminist men were to be pro. Basically our argument was that the "What about the boys?" call was a backlash, "an identity politics of the dominant" (Robinson, 2000, p. 3), seeing small gains for middle class women as signifying the end of patriarchy, and that we needed to consider which boys and which girls, acknowledging the complex intersections between race, class, ethnicity, sexuality and gender (see Yates, 1997). Clearly, for example, the evidence is overwhelming that Aboriginal girls and boys are very disadvantaged through schooling, as too are all young people living in poverty. Middle class boys (and girls) are doing well. This is what Walby (1997) has called "gender convergence" between middle class males and females in terms of educational and career aspirations. However, we also need to recognize that structured gendered inequalities remain.

During the 1990s, I edited a book series for Allen and Unwin, Australia, with Fazal Rizvi. Amongst various books we published in that series, *Answering Back*, co-authored by Jane Kenway and her colleagues (1997) and *Masculinity Goes to School*, co-authored by Pam and Rob Gilbert (1998), made important contributions to feminist and pro-feminist scholarship in schooling and demonstrated the significance globally of Australian feminist scholarship. I would also note the importance of feminist publisher, Elizabeth Weiss, to the commissioning of these books. Jill Blackmore's (1999) *Troubling Women* also made a most significant contribution and assisted in my thinking about the idea of "structural backlash" against women that flowed from the managerialist restructurings of the gendered state and again suggested the global significance of Australian feminist scholarship. Colleagues including Pat Mahony, Ian Hextall, Pat Hextall, Madeleine Arnot, Miriam David, Gaby Weiner, Meg Maguire, Sue Clegg, Christine Skelton, Becky Francis, Jackie Marsh, Debbie Epstein and Shereen Benjamin in the UK also contributed to my thinking about feminism and pro-feminism, as did Pamela Munn, Sheila Riddell and Lyn Tett during my time at Edinburgh.

In the early part of this century, Wayne Martino, Martin Mills and I were commissioned by the federal government in Australia to conduct research that was eventually published in our report, *Addressing the Educational Needs of Boys* (Lingard et al., 2003). The gendered politics involved in the actual conduct of the research, evidence of the contestation within the policy and school fields over boys and schooling, following substantial policy interventions for girls, convinced us of the continuing need for policies for girls in schooling. We took the contract as a way of balancing and countering the right wing, anti-feminist, men's rights masculinity politics groups, which appeared to be in the ascendancy in gender policy debates at the time and encouraged by governments of the day. We have recently written about the gendering of the conduct of research in that project. Our experience demonstrated the continuing volatile politics surrounding gender policy production in education and also confirmed the interior of the state as a strategic-relational terrain for gender politicking (see Lingard, Martino, & Mills, 2013).

Indeed, this research provoked Wayne and me, along with our colleague, Goli Rezai-Rashti, both from the University of Western Ontario, to edit a special number of the *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* on the gendering of the conduct of research and how issues to do with accessing the field and collecting data often provide important data for the research, especially when researching gender.

Furthermore, Goli's research on women and higher education in Iran (Rezai-Rashti, in press) also affirmed my understanding of multiple feminisms, the global character of the women's movement, and also the need to understand the intersection of nationality, religion and other factors with gender and the practices of femininity. Goli's work and that of others (e.g., Connell, 2005) also made me aware of the (re)masculinized world order being reinstated post September 11, especially provoking anew Orientalism towards Muslim women (and men) and Islamaphobia, all located within an enhanced global fear of difference. Here we have seen some retraditionalization of the practices of masculinity and femininity.

With Fazal Rizvi in *Globalizing Education Policy* (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), we pursued the issue of inequalities for girls on a global scale in and through education, referring in passing to the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs) of the UN. We drew on Elaine Unterhalter's (2007) work on gender justice globally in providing our analysis. The MDGs seek to ensure that all girls have full access to basic education in all nations on the globe by 2015. In our book, we situated such concerns with the rise at the meta-discursive level of globalized education policy discourses framed by neoliberalism, which gives priority to individuals over collective good concerns, to markets over the state, and to competition over collaboration, and which work against state-centric, funded government gender equity policies.

My move to the UK and Chairs at Sheffield, particularly, and Edinburgh, and in my continuing academic discussions and conversations with colleague Fazal Rizvi, made me very aware of postcolonial theory and politics. The work of US colleagues Greg Dimitriadis and Cameron McCarthy also contributed to my growing interest in postcolonial theory and its usage in education. I had recognized the challenge to modernist Enlightenment epistemologies from feminism, and now I saw the same from a postcolonial perspective. Gayatri Spivak's (1990) work on "strategic essentialism" was very useful in my thinking in terms of a feminism that saw women collectively as disadvantaged within patriarchy, but which also recognised difference within the category. The former stance was necessary often to make political claims upon the state, while recognition of the latter was central to effective policies and practices. This also made me aware of the way in which certain groups within masculinity politics also utilised such a strategic essentialism in arguing the case about men and boys as the new disadvantaged, while denying societal structures of inequality and the effects of the gender order.

Furthermore, my work in the Sheffield doctoral program in the Caribbean brought to my attention the ways in which the global cultural flows, those that Appadurai (1996) wrote about as a manifestation of cultural globalization, the "cultural circuits of capitalism" as Thrift (2005) has described them, had spawned

a boys' and men's backlash of a particular kind in the Caribbean and in other parts of the Global South. I wrote about this, albeit briefly, with my colleagues Wayne Martino and Martin Mills in our book, *Educating Boys*: *Beyond Structural Reform* (Lingard, Martino, & Mills, 2009).

PSYCHOGEOGRAPHY

I have sketched a socioanalysis of my development as a political citizen and person and also the collaborations central to my development as an academic. Here I want to add something briefly about psychogeography (Coverley, 2006), the specific character of Queensland as an experienced place across my early years as an academic and its effects on me. This is a specific reference to the political situation in Queensland as a lived place during my formative years. Guy Debord, the French situationist, defined psychogeography as, "The study of the specific effects of the geographical environment, consciously organized or not, on the emotions and behavior of individuals" (1981, p. 5). The "poetics of the space" (Bachelard, 1969) of Queensland at this time, the 1960s through the 1980s, was an authoritarian text meant to be read in one way.

Queensland had the first Labor government in the world in the early twentieth century and then had continuous Labor governments from 1915 until 1957, apart from a brief aberration during the depression. These were governments not strongly committed to education and they were in many ways masculinist manifestations of agrarian socialism and protective of the "family wage," which assumed female partners were "dependent" and at home. Set against the Cold War context and McCarthyism in the US, Labor split around issues of communism, links to the trade union movement, ideology and more pragmatic concerns, and so it remained out of power in Queensland from 1957 until 1989, replaced by conservative governments. During the time of the Bjelke-Petersen government (1968-1987), Queensland became known in Australia as the "deep north," expressing still something of a politically gerrymandered version of agrarian socialism, but being very right wing on social issues, including on women's issues—including the right to control their fertility—on Indigenous policies and on matters of civil liberties.

During my time at what is now Queensland University of Technology, Kelvin Grove Campus, I worked with many highly principled academics, who collectively formed the basis of the opposition to the reactionary state government. In a sense this crystallized my thinking politically on a broad spectrum of political issues, including matters to do with women's control of their own reproduction and gender policies in schooling. It also "greened" my politics. The election in 1989 of a Labor government did open up a new space politically and from that time I became much more engaged with the bureaucracy around social justice and gender issues in schooling. I want to stress here, though, how opposition to the Bjelke-Petersen government and its corruption, as well as very right wing politics, helped crystallize a politics for me.

There was a particular Queensland psychogeography. We had to fight the state government and all it stood for, including in street marches each Saturday, against the restriction of the same put in place by Bjelke-Petersen, who banned street marches. We also had to fight conceptions of all Queenslanders held by those in Southern states, which also demanded an articulation and thought-through position on many social policy issues in education, including in relation to gender and schooling. This also helped constitute and confirm my pro-feminist politics.

IN/CONCLUSION

While recognizing the difficulties and complexities of explaining where one's thinking has come from—the production of my habitus—I have attempted to locate this thinking within the historical and social-structural positioning of my life narrative. I have attempted to provide a particular "socioanalysis," not an autobiography, sketching and narrating the impacts of the times in which I grew up, the effects of family experiences and politics and of my schooling and career trajectory. My historical and structural positioning together have produced or at least framed my political and academic dispositions. My schooling and its effects have contributed to my overly optimistic disposition and perhaps too sanguine a view of the possibilities of schooling in social justice and feminist terms in a world growing more unequal across and within nations.

In the aftermath of the global financial crisis and continuing economic difficulties in Europe, the UK and the USA, as well as in other parts of the world, what is very surprising to me is the fact that the neoliberal imaginary, which precipitated the crisis through its policy manifestations and deregulation of everything, appears to remain unchallenged, almost inviolate, despite antiglobalization movements of various kinds, including Occupy. As I have argued elsewhere with my colleague Fazal Rizvi (2010), we need a new social imaginary to drive a new, more collective progressive politics in the context of globalization. Such a politics would work with and across Nancy Fraser's concepts of redistribution (state intervention to ensure more equality and that no one lives in poverty), recognition of difference (an acceptance and enabling of difference in its multiple and intersecting forms), and new modes of representation (more democracy). The latter would demand the re-inclusion of the voices of the many in the framing of such politics, including women's voices. And, of course, today such politics need to be pursued at multiple levels or scales in recognition of the new scalar politics that frame possibilities in the contexts of globalization.

Feminism and pro-feminism need multiple scales of practice to open up opportunities for all irrespective of gender and also to instantiate a more equal gender order at the various scales of new globalizing politics. Such politics would need to be located within the challenges to Enlightenment epistemologies that have flowed from feminist, postcolonial, and queer theorizing, politics and practices at multiple levels. Feminist and pro-feminist politics need to be constituted in relation to such matters as well as in the quotidian, everyday life, always recognizing the personal as political and the politics of affective and emotional relations. Such a

politics would also challenge the deep individualism instantiated in and through neoliberalism. Progressive politics today appear to be linked to a particular individualism, framed by the required self-responsibilizing, self-capitalizing individual of neoliberalism. In my view, more collaborative politics are required, as is the production of more other-focused individuals through schooling. Schools and universities have an important role to play in respect of the production of such citizens and such dispositions.

Implicitly throughout this narrative, I have argued the need for a new politics around feminism and pro-feminism that needs to work at multiple levels in recognition of our globalizing world and the ways in which power now flows almost effortlessly across borders, along with capital of various kinds, while the disadvantaged are buried in place and refugees are restricted in their aspirant border crossings. We need to advance understanding of the gendered effects and impacts of this changing, globalizing world. We need to ask: To what extent are the cultural and other flows of globalization gendered and how do they affect men and women differently? What is and what ought to be the role of education here?

Feminist and other theoretical developments have advanced our thinking about all of these matters, but with their contemporary complexity and nuance they also are perhaps more difficult to convert into a politics which demands reform from the state. This remains necessary of course, but we also need to challenge the gendered disadvantages that still work through the quotidian, recognizing that the personal is deeply political. I am thinking here, for example, of the gender imbalance of sharing domestic labour, the impact of child bearing and rearing on women's career and life opportunities, the lack of family-friendly workplaces, and indeed the need to ensure gender justice in all aspects of interpersonal relations, in our affective relationships. Carolynn Lingard, who still has the same enthusiasm for school teaching many years into her career, reminds me daily of the importance of feminisms and pro-feminisms to frame our everyday, to work politically in the quotidian, as do the many, many teachers and principals who manage the emotional labour necessary to work in schools located in disadvantaged communities. She of course recognizes, as well, the ongoing need to constitute a broader politics aimed at structural change on the various scales of a contemporary politics. We need to challenge today as much as ever what I called in *Men Engaging Feminisms*, "recuperative masculinity politics," which continue to be rearticulated in an ever-changing, complexifying and globalizing world and which, at their most insidious, seek to turn back and resist the effects of various waves of feminist politics and theorizing everywhere, from the everyday to all levels of the political.

NOTES

[1] Sam Sellar and Martin Mills read earlier versions of this chapter. I thank them for their very helpful assistance.

[2] Mills also saw the "sociological imagination" as translating personal troubles into public issues, thus linking personal experience to social structures.

[3] My son was a boy during the time of the boys' backlash in schooling. It would take another chapter to write about the politics of being a father to a son.

[4] For a commentary on my collaboration in writing with Fazal Rizvi, see Chapter 8, "Writing with Others," in Thomson and Kamler (2013).

[5] See Chapter 3 of Rizvi and Lingard (2010) for an elaboration of "positionalities" in policy research in education in a globalized world.

[6] I was supervised by Paul Boreham in politics and Paige Porter in Education.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Lingard, B. (2013). *Politics, polices and pedagogies in education: Selected works of Bob Lingard.* London: Routledge.

Lingard, B., Martino, W., & Mills, M. (2013). Managing oppositional masculinity politics: The gendering of a government commissioned research project. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*, 4.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.

Lingard, B., Martino, W., & Mills, M. (2009). *Educating boys: Beyond structural reform.* London: Palgrave.

Lingard, B., Martino, W., Mills, M., & Bahr, M. (2002). *Addressing the educational needs of boys: Report to the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training*. Canberra: AGPS.

Lingard, B. & Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging feminisms: Profeminism, backlashes and schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lingard, B. (2003). Where to in gender policy in education after recuperative masculinity politics? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 7 (1), 33-56.

Limerick, B., & Lingard, R. (Eds.). (1995). *Gender and changing educational management*. Sydney: Hodder.

REFERENCES

Adkins, L. & Skeggs, B. (Eds.). (2004). *Bourdieu after feminism*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bachelard, G. (1969). *The poetics of space*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text*. New York: Hill & Wang.

Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question* (R. Nice, trans.). London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination* (R. Nice, trans.). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Sketch for self-analysis*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R.W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R.W. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Connell, R.W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Corrigan, P. (1979). *Schooling the Smash Street kids*. London: MacMillan.

Coverley, M. (2006). *Psychogeography*. Harpenden, England: Pocket Essentials.

Debord, G. (1981). Introduction to a critique of urban geography. In K. Knabb (Ed.), *Situationist international anthology* (pp. 8-11). Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.

Eisenstein, H. (1991). *Gender shock: Practicing feminism on two continents*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Eisenstein, H. (1996). *Inside agitators: Australian femocrats and the state*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Franzway, S., Court, D., & Connell, R.W. (1989). *Staking a claim: Feminism, bureaucracy and the state.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus*. New York: Routledge.
Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Fry, S. (2012). *The Fry chronicles: An autobiography*. London: Michael Joseph.
Gilbert, P., & Gilbert, R. (1998). *Masculinity goes to school*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
Hacking, I. (1990). *The taming of chance*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
Hughes, R. (1993). *The culture of complaint: The fraying of America*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
Johannesson, I., Lingard, B. & Mills, M. (2009). Possibilities in the boy turn? Comparative lessons from Australia and Iceland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Studies, 53*(4), 309-325.
Kenway, J. & Willis, S. with Blackmore, J., & Rennie, L. (1997). *Answering back: Girls, boys and feminism in schooling*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
Kimmel, M. S. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York: Free Press.
Lingard, B. (1995). Gendered policy making inside the state. In B. Limerick & B. Lingard (Eds.), *Gender and changing educational management*. Sydney, Australia: Hodder.
Lingard, B., & Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging feminisms*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
Lingard, B., Taylor, S., & Henry, M. (1987). A girl in a militant pose: A chronology of struggles in girls' education in Queensland. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *8*(2), 135-152.
Lingard, B., Martino, W., & Mills, M. (2009). *Educating boys: Beyond structural reform*. London: Palgrave.
Lingard, B., Forbes, J., Weiner, G., & Horne, J. (2012). Multiple capitals and Scottish independent schools: The (re)production of advantage. In J. Allan & R. Catts (Eds.), *Social capital, children and young people* (pp. 181-198). Bristol, England: Policy Press.
Lingard, B., Martino, W., & Mills, M. (2013). Managing oppositional masculinity politics: The gendering of a government commissioned research project. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *26*(4), 434-454.
Mahony, P. (1996). Changing schools: Some international feminist perspectives on teaching girls and boys. *Women's Studies International Forum, 19*(4), 1-2.
Moi, T. (1999). Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist theory and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of culture, *New Literary History, 22*(4), 1017-1049.
Rezai-Rashti, G. (2013). Conducting filed research on gender relations in a gender repressive state: A case study of gender research in Iran. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *26*(4), 489-502.
Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.
Robinson, S. (2000). *Marked men: White masculinity in crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Said, E. (1983). *The world, the text and the critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Seidler, V. (1991). *Recreating sexual politics: Men, feminism and politics*. London: Routledge.
Sennett, R., & Cobb, J. (1993). *The hidden injuries of class*. New York: Norton.
Spivak, G. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues* (S. Harasym, Ed.). New York: Routledge.
Thomson, P., & Kamler, B. (2013). *Writing for peer reviewed journals: Strategies for getting published*. London: Routledge.
Thrift, N. (2005). *Knowing capitalism*. London: Sage.
Unterhalter, E. (2007). *Gender, schooling and global social justice*. London: Routledge.
Walby, S. (1997). *Gender transformations*. London: Routledge.
Weaver-Hightower, M. (2008). *The politics of policy in boys' education: Getting boys "right."* New York: Palgrave.
Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour.* Farnborough, England: Saxon House.
Wright-Mills, C. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Yates, L. (1997). Gender equity and the boys' debate: What sort of challenge is it? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18*(3), 337-347.

Bob Lingard
Professorial Research Fellow, School of Education
The University of Queensland

MÁIRTÍN MAC AN GHAILL

REVISITING *THE MAKING OF MEN* AND OTHER TEXTS

EARLY INFLUENCES

> I entered or anyway I encountered the white world. Now this white world that I was encountering was, just the same, one of the forces that had been controlling me from the time that I opened my eyes on the world. For it is important to ask, I think, where did these people I'm talking about come from and where did they get their peculiar school of ethics? What was its origin? What did it mean to them? What did it come out of? What function did it serve and why was it happening here? And why were they living where they were living and what was it doing to them? All these things that sociologists think that they can find out and haven't managed to do …. (Baldwin, 1965, p. 121)

One of the reasons why sociologists have failed to answer James Baldwin's questions is that they have not asked these questions, concerning the American or English white social world. Rather, white sociologists have made problematic dominated social groups, such as the black community, while deploying their cultural capital to define the latter's social world. My earliest memories of writing that disturbed my social world emerged from fiction, biographies and Irish and black social/political texts. This raises the question: What is the purpose of the social sciences?

Academically, the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham, with its critical engagement with a wide range of philosophical traditions, was an early major influence on me. CCCS mediated new ideas from abroad, including structuralism, post-structuralism, phenomenology, neo-Marxism and new social movement theory. The place merged into my consciousness as a kind of "free school" of teaching and learning. CCCS became an internationally recognised research institution, but for me, in contrast to the current neoliberal corporatist nature of higher education with its highly reductive performative functions, it operated as a critical space of local civic collectivism.

New social movement theory—feminism, anti-racism and gay/lesbian liberation—provided a major theoretical framework for my understanding of the social and cultural world. For example, the "second wave" feminist and gay and lesbian movements of the 1960s and 1970s produced a social vocabulary that included patriarchy, homophobia, sexual politics, and sexual division of labour. At a later stage, post-feminism, AIDS activism and queer theory made popular a language around sexual regulation employing notions of compulsory

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 147–162.

heterosexuality, the heterosexual matrix, heteronormativity and transgender identities. This was part of a number of internal critiques, with old certainties regarding the explanatory power of an earlier generation of scholarly work being called into question by postcolonialist, post-structural feminist and queer theories that shifted the theoretical agenda. These debates were carried out within the context of the continuing impact of HIV/AIDS, in health, social and ideological terms, and the ascendancy of the New Right social authoritarians with an accompanying moral panic against diverse sexual politics. At the same time, the emerging transgressive and disruptive potential of gay and lesbian identities was being emphasised, alongside issues around regulation and normativity. Within an English context, schooling was a central player in this ideological shift with the introduction in 1988 of Section 28 of the Local Government Act that banned "the promotion of homosexuality" by local authorities.

EARLY ETHNOGRAPHIES: A THEORETICAL, CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPRENTICESHIP

I had originally wanted to do doctoral work on the Irish diaspora in England. I was told that it would be difficult to find a supervisor, and it was suggested that I explore the experiences of Black and South Asian migrants and their families. I decided to look for a teaching job. I started teaching in an inner-city secondary school with a high proportion of black and South Asian students. At this time, theoretically, I shared the neo-Marxist social and cultural reproduction position that urban schooling worked against the interests of the working class, both white and black. I was particularly interested in material and symbolic forms of inequality, repression and exclusion. Major influences included Bourdieu's key concepts of habitus, field, capital and symbolic violence; Bernstein's educational codes; and Willis's theory of resistance and cultural production. Alongside this, working within a Freirian pedagogical/political perspective, I believed that deploying a critical pedagogy could make a difference working with students from sub-ordinated social groups**.**

Academically, my interest in gender emerged out of a five-year ethnographic study that I carried out exploring the schooling of black female and male youth of African-Caribbean and South Asian background. At this time, England was an overtly racialised place, where difference was tolerated rather than recognised and supported. The then dominant "race relations" ethnic approach focused upon black students' distinctive cultural attributes, suggesting that social behaviour was to be primarily understood in terms of culture. The hegemonic social images constructed by this approach projected the black community as a social problem. Ethnicity was assumed to act as a barrier to their assimilation or integration into British society, resulting in their relative social subordination. Attempting a synthesis between neo-Marxist and neo-Weberian theoretical positions, I argued that a class analysis was more adequate than the conventional "race-relations" approach in explaining young people's position in the educational system. I suggested that the major problem in the schooling of black youth was not their culture but the phenomenon of racism

that pervasively structured their social world; and racism was mediated both through the existing institutional framework that discriminating against white working class youth and through the operation of "race" specific mechanisms, such as the process of racist stereotyping, which in turn was gender specific.

Researching and writing *Young, Gifted and Black* (1990) served as a cultural apprenticeship in developing my academic sensibility. In this text, I mapped out the range of trajectories of male and female students of South Asian and African-Caribbean background. At this time, minority ethnic students were discursively positioned by the state and educational authorities in terms of a simple dualism of South Asian academic success and African-Caribbean academic failure. I interrogated this reductive dualism by exploring the gender and class dynamics of this official categorisation. So, for example, I found pro-education/anti-school young black working class women offering a sophisticated analysis of the sex/gender structuring of schooling arenas, demonstrating that they were neither "mere victims" or "supergirls" of the then current institutional gender regimes (see Chigwada, 1987). Rather, they recalled a range of responses that were class, "race"/ethnic, religious and age specific, including highly flexible combined forms of negotiation, co-operation, survival and resistance to male (and female) teachers and pupils**.** Hence, my early interest in trying to make sense of gender within an educational site through a notion of the intersectionality of categories, which is further explored below in terms of the imbrication of multiple identity categories of difference and a relational notion of power, was grounded in the complexity of young black women's strategies of resistance within specific material conditions of state and local institutional closure and possibility.

Equally significant, at that time, in making sense of South Asian women's lives was the political mobilisation and organization of the students' mothers and sisters. For example, in one of my classes, an Indian student's father owned a local clothes factory, where another Indian student's mother worked. The latter organized a picket to demand union recognition. The owner of the factory challenged my presence on the picket line, claiming that this was an internal issue among the Indian community. The female worker defended me, responding that this was primarily a labour dispute, in which she and I were politically on the same side. Such instances indicate the hidden histories of female South Asian workers that serve to challenge reductive representations emanating from an imperial legacy of Orientalist discourses that position them as the passive recipients of a racially ascribed recidivist patriarchy (Said, 1978). Hence, this may enable us to read contemporary British images of South Asian, Muslim and black women as not emanating from their embodied social practices. Rather, it suggests the failure of mainstream white organizations, including the trade union and the Labour Party leadership, to support these women's political struggles around institutional discrimination across a range of arenas, including work, housing and schooling. It may be as educational theorists interested in gender that we continue to over-valorize the potential of the academic input in troubling gender/sexual oppression, while failing to acknowledge or continuing to misrecognize the dynamic pedagogical contribution of wider socio-economic, cultural and political

movements among diasporic communities at global, national and local community levels.

The Making of Men (1994) emerged out of this earlier attempt to make sense of young black youths' experiences of state schooling. Of specific importance in researching and writing the text was a methodological starting point. My initial focus overemphasised a neo-Marxist account of gender reproduction with particular reference to class-based male students' future occupational, social and domestic destinies. Gay students made a key intervention and were of critical importance in developing my revised research design, pointing to the need for me to explore male heterosexuality as a dominant but unstable category and as a major cultural resource in the making of modern masculinities. I shifted my focus, so that alongside a concern with examining how external economic and social relations helped to shape local school-based masculine identities, I began to explore more systematically socio-psychological issues around the school's institutional sexual regulation and normalisation, the self-production of subjectivities, identity formations, desire and fantasy. In so doing, I came to see the relative autonomy of methodology from wider theoretical and conceptual issues. More specifically, the creative contribution of critical ethnography enabled a search for alternative representational spaces. These early methodological questions would develop into the deployment of queer methodological explorations of schooling, discussed below (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2012a).

The Making of Men was indebted to Connell's (1987, 1989) body of work on education, gender and social power and her highly acclaimed theorizing of masculinities, including the classic text "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity" (Carrigan et al., 1985; see also her essay, this volume). In carrying out theory-led empirical studies on teachers' work, gender and power, and young men's transgressive schooling practices, Connell "always got there first" in setting the highest standard to produce "the best work." *The Making of Men* involved an attempt to work through a multi-level analysis that incorporated explanations of dominant discourses and representations at the level of state, the institution, social groups and individual subjects. A main argument was that school micro-cultures of management, teachers and students are key infrastructural regulatory mechanisms through which masculinities and femininities are mediated, enacted and performed. The study was a search for the specific material and symbolic conditions within which schools, as deeply gendered and heterosexual regimes, constructed relations of domination and subordination within and across these micro-cultures. In so doing, I critically examined schooling as a major site of regulation and normalisation, including exploring how boys learned to become men in schools, whilst policing their own and others' sexualities. Within this specific field, I focused upon the students' subjectivities, marked by confusions and contradictions in their gendered/sexual experiences, and upon how schools materially and discursively actively produce, through the official and hidden curriculum, a range of embodied masculinities which young men come to inhabit, including diverse transgressive practices. I attempted to do full justice to the complex phenomenon

of male heterosexual subjectivities and the role of schooling in regulating sexual identities.

Young, Gifted and Black and *The Making of Men* gained greatly from the fact that I lived in areas in which they were carried out. This enabled an embeddedness within local communities, which opened up lots of spaces for unexpected social, cultural and political connections and affiliations. This was a specific moment in the history of critical ethnographies of schooling that a new methodological generation might find productive within globally inflected late capitalist conditions. Also, the text was written while I was teaching in a secondary school. One of the effects of the re-masculinisation of public institutions, such as schooling, through neoliberal policies is that currently it is very difficult to combine the "day job" with academic study. This is a serious loss to the profession and to higher education. In response, academics need to rethink how pedagogically to develop postgraduate programmes that will enable the engagement of professionals, including those studying on a part-time basis.

COLLABORATIVE PRODUCTION: WORK WITH CHRIS HAYWOOD

Perhaps the most important lesson from the CCCS, especially as practiced by Richard Johnson, was the productiveness of collective work. Hence, much of what I have published over the last fifteen years has been a joint production with Chris Haywood (University of Newcastle upon Tyne) of a number of books, articles and reports, in which we have contributed to knowledge about the interplay between education and genders and sexualities.

At the beginning of the 2000s, with notable exceptions, research in the field of educational studies often appeared to be disengaged from wider intellectual developments. Simultaneously, social and cultural theorizing of sex, gender and sexuality, within the context of a shift in the production of cutting-edge work from social sciences to arts and humanities, was increasingly disconnected from empirical work located within "old" institutional sites, such as schools, workplaces and families. In response, the texts *Men and Masculinity* (2003) and *Gender, Culture and Society* (2007) were written in an attempt to reconnect public institutions and emerging research across the social sciences and arts and humanities, thus challenging the apparent disinterest of the former and the abstractness of the latter.

Since the early 1990s, we have been provided with theoretical frameworks that have enabled us to analyse systematically and document coherently the material, social and discursive production of masculinities within the broader context of gender relations. These texts revealed a tension between what were referred to as *materialist* and *post-structuralist* critiques of gender identity formation. Hence, sex/gender practices could be seen as being shaped by and shaping the processes of colonization, racism, class hegemony, male domination, heterosexism, homophobia and other forms of oppression. In short, masculinity could be seen as crucial points of intersection of different forms of power, stratification, desire and subjective identity formation (Haywood, 1996). A main argument of *Men and*

Masculinities was the need to hold onto the productive tension between these different sociological explanations of men and masculinity and to build a critical synthesis that brings together feminist frameworks with those of studies of masculinity (Davies, 1993; Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 1997). We suggested that at a time of the conceptual ascendancy of post-structuralism with its focus on the cultural, there was a need to return the social to critical theory, bringing together the categories of *social* and *cultural* as mutually constitutive elements into a productive dialogue. We needed to renew the social and cultural analysis of gendered social relations and identity formations, mapping out some of the more intricate positions as they articulated the shifting boundaries of class, sexuality, ethnicity and generation. For example, there was a need to re-engage with earlier academic and political representations of women, alongside critical explorations of the suggested crisis in heterosexual men's lifestyles within the context of rapid social and cultural transformations at global and local levels.

Men and Masculinities began to question the ubiquity of masculinity as an analytical and descriptive term by exploring its relevance and applicability both within local and global contexts. It highlighted the difficulties of trying to understand the structural formation of gender through institutions such as work, family and education, whilst at the same time explaining that what such structures mean are open to negotiation. The mapping of the field of masculinity facilitated a more critical understanding of how we use gender as a framework to explain differences and similarities. It also enabled us to develop a conceptually sharper approach to making sense of life in schools. For example, we reassessed earlier empirical work we had carried out with male peer groups in producing masculinities. This developed into seeing male group networks as generative of a wide diversity of masculinities in the sphere of education. Using ideas about what it means to be male and informed by school processes, male and female students legitimise and regulate meanings of masculinity. As schools create conditions for the emergence of masculinities, differing meanings of maleness compete for ascendancy. At the same time, some boys are able to define their meaning of masculinity over others. These definitions create boundaries that serve to delineate what appropriate maleness should be within this social arena. Transgression of these boundaries activates techniques of normalization, ranging from labelling through to physical violence, which ultimately act to maintain differences embedded in the ascendant definitions of masculinity.

Working on *Men and Masculinities* reinforced our concern about the importance of education as a site for research and study. The text covered a wide array of areas and highlighted how the study of masculinity in education was a fast developing area. However, its focus underplayed the importance of understanding masculinity as a relational concept, and following on from *Men and Masculinities*, we wrote *Gender, Culture and Society* at a time of fundamental globally-inflected transformations in men's and women's lives that were taking place in Western societies. In response, the text provided a systematic investigation and evaluation of how we might best make sense of social change and contemporary femininities and masculinities. It was about continuing to problematize, contest and interrogate

current popular understandings of femininities and masculinities by engaging with a range of feminist, sociological and cultural studies frameworks. This book was also about a social imagining and its implications for political practice. Informed by our own reading of existing studies and our own empirical research within educational sites, we offered a critical yet constructive diagnosis of the origins and development of current conditions and controversies enveloping gender relations. As we demonstrated, this is a complex area, increasingly conscious of the complicated relationship between theoretical frameworks, methodological strategies and the phenomena subject to examination. For example, notions of what are referred to as decentred forms of performing genders and hybrid (mixing of) sexualities are being constituted within a wider arena of late modernity, which in turn they are helping to shape. From the theoretical investigation emerges an evaluation of past understandings and analysis of implications for contemporary political practice. In social relations, people occupy certain positions simultaneously. We need to think about not the ways social categories accumulate but the ways that they inflect. When we talk about the notion of power, we have to think about it relationally, thinking about power in relation to whom. In this way, we do not look at power as an either/or division but as being much more relational. We can say power is shaped relationally: One group is both powerful and powerless.

Building on our work in *Men and Masculinities*, in *Gender, Culture and Society* Chris and I began to expand upon the tensions within masculinity and expose them further at the level of gender. Furthermore, the book developed a more nuanced understanding of gender culturally. Therefore, whereas *Men and Masculinities* opened up the possibility of different masculinities and how they are lived out, *Gender, Culture and Society* begins to shift the negotiation of structure taking place through cultural representations. Hence, understanding materialist and post-structuralist tensions shift away from identities and identifications, towards temporally specific cultural arrangements within the site of late modern schooling, as suggested by queer studies, post-feminism and postcolonial analysis.

COLLABORATIVE WORK

The collective work practice, referred to above, was also important in working with Birmingham-based gender/sexuality scholars, which included Debbie Epstein (see also this volume), Richard Johnson, Mary Kehily and Peter Redman (Kehily et al., 2002; Epstein et al., 2001). This began as a reading group on the politics of sexuality and developed into us working together on several projects over the years. For example, in the article Redman et al. (2002), we explored the relationship between two primary school boys, Ben and Karl. Described as a close and intimate friendship, we resisted understanding the relationship through hegemonic conceptions of male-to-male relationships. Furthermore, even though the boys used heterosexual discourses, it was not self-evident the meanings that were ascribed to those discourses; we resisted transposing adult definitions of such discourses onto the cultural worlds of children. At the same time, rather than

sexualize the relationship through a sexuality identity framework (i.e., gay; bisexual; heterosexual), we attempted to capture the feelings shared between the two boys without recourse to normative (adult) ascriptions. The importance of such analysis was that we suggested the possibility of "versions of masculinity that might be capable of tolerating difference, ambivalence and complexity around gender and sexuality" (p. 190). We thought that this was significant, as it pointed to a means of understanding masculinity potentially outside a patriarchal dividend.

In another paper, "Schooling Sexualities: Heterosexual Masculinities, Schooling and the Unconscious" (1996), Peter Redman and I discussed a student's experience (Peter's) of "becoming heterosexual" in an all-boys grammar school in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Using an auto/biographical methodology, we explored the meaning of Peter's investment in a particular form of heterosexual masculinity, named as "muscular intellectualness." We argued that Peter's fascination with the muscular intellectualness he identified in his teacher, Mr Lefevre, could be understood in terms of the access it promised to give him to the entitlements of conventional masculinity. The world of ideas and knowledge that Mr Lefevre inhabited no longer seemed effeminately middle class and thus the object of ridicule or embarrassment, but powerfully middle class, a source of personal strength and a means to exercise control over others. Thus, as a source of "real" masculinity, muscular intellectualness "defeminised" academic work in the humanities and refused the label "bit of a poof."

Also important in terms of collective work, Debbie Epstein and I were series editors of *Educating Boys, Learning Gender*. The book series developed as a response to the then-current projected anxieties about boys in schools. Drawing upon a wide range of contemporary theorising, the series authors debated questions of gender and sexual interactions in educational institutions. The aim was to offer teachers and other practitioners grounded support and new insights into changing demands of teaching boys and girls, by placing boys' educational experiences within the wider gender relations across the institution and beyond. The series sought to bring together the best work in the area of masculinity and education from a range of countries. It included Christine Skelton's (2001) *Schooling the Boys: Masculinities and Primary Education*; Martin Mills's (2001) *Challenging Violence in Schools: An Issue of Masculinities*; Leonie Rowan and colleagues' (2002) *Boys, Literacies and Schooling: The Dangerous Territories of Gender-Based Literacy Reform*; Louise Archer's (2003) *Race, Masculinity and Schooling: Muslim Boys and Education*; and Heather Mendick's (2006) *Masculinities in Mathematics*.

Another collective project gave me the opportunity to work with Madeline Arnot on a coedited collection, *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in Gender and Education* (2006). The collection brought together classic pieces of gender theory, as well as examples of the sophistication of the contemporary gender theory and research methodologies in the field of education. This project provided the opportunity to reflect on major scholarly contributions that have informed my thinking on education, and most specifically that of Madeline Arnot, who continues to make a critical contribution in the field.

INTERNATIONAL WORK ON GENDER AND EDUCATION

International arenas have been highly important for me in challenging the cultural specificity of researching and writing about gender and education from a local geographical location, Britain. Alongside discovering how the specificity of writing from a particular location plays out, there is pleasure in finding international scholars working on similar conceptual and empirical issues. Chris Haywood and I have productively worked with scholars within different national settings, including Tuula Gordon and Elina Lahelma in Finland; Blye Frank in Canada; Monica Rudberg in Norway; Bronwyn Davies and Barbara Pini in Australia; Thomas Johansson in Sweden; Jani Da Silva in Sri Lanka; Indre Mackeviciute in Lithuania; and Anne Cleary and Jim Gleeson in Ireland. In 2004, Joan Hanafin, Paul Conway (University College Cork) and I carried out an Irish government funded research project, *Gender, Politics and Exploring Masculinities in Irish Education*. For me, the research challenged both the ethnocentric policy approach to gender equality in the UK that blamed girls for the assumed under-achievement of boys and the accompanying under-theorized reductive accounts emerging from the UK academy.

MOST RECENT WORK: RE-READING THEORIES, CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGIES

Simultaneity of Categories

Perhaps surprisingly, there seems to be a paucity of accounts available for students working in the field of gender and education about how we produce academic writing. On reflection, Chris Haywood and I have revisited a number of themes in our publications and attempted to rework our understanding of key theories, concepts and methodological approaches that we have deployed. For example, the use of the simultaneity of categories has proved productive in opening up conceptual and empirical complexities within different contexts, marked by time and space. Most recently, in response to a queering of gender and masculinity, we have questioned the potential marginalisation of structuring processes that produce social and cultural inequality. The paper "Schooling, Masculinity and Class Analysis: Towards an Aesthetic of Subjectivities" (2011) highlights the retreat from social class within the sociology of education that has been accompanied by the intensification of socioeconomic and cultural inequalities. We seek to draw upon cultural analyses of social class by addressing a classificatory shift of white English working-class males, who have moved from an ascribed primary *socioeconomic* status to an embodied *aesthetic* performance. We examine the reconfiguration of social class within state schools and historical and contemporary shifting images of white working-class males within the education literature. Furthermore, we suggest the need to engage with a multi-dimensional explanatory frame in order to understand how working-class young men now inhabit a new cultural condition in the postcolonial urban space of inner-city schools. We suggest that this shift is best captured by exploring the simultaneous articulations of

multiple categories of difference—including class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality and generation—in relation to contemporary representations of social class.

Suggesting that masculinity can be understood beyond categorical identities may result in a politics of cultural difference that, by letting go of masculinity, risks the loss of the analytical purchase on the structuring processes that support inequalities. A major organising theme throughout our work has been to combine materialist and post-structuralist approaches to gender and within this frame to re-read masculinity through other social categories. More specifically, rather than identify the articulation between cultural resources and maleness to constitute a masculinity or male gender, a recalibration of interpretive strategies opens up the possibility of understanding the dynamics of gender through other social categories. An example of this can be found in my earlier work (1994b, p. 156), in which I attempted to understand the complex interplay between schooling, masculine cultural formations and sexual/racial identities. In my consideration of black gay students in English schools, I identify how racial identities are spoken through sexual and gender codes that are also embedded by generation. This case study revealed the racial/ethnic hierarchies that were ascribed by teachers in their administration and pedagogy. So, for example, in working class schools where there was a majority South Asian student population with a mainly white minority, the dominant representations of South Asian youth tended to be negative, with caricatures of them as sly and "not real men." However, in working class schools that included significant numbers of African-Caribbeans, the students felt that the South Asians were caricatured in a more positive way in relation to the African-Caribbeans, who were perceived as of "low ability," "aggressive," and "anti-authority" (p. 158).

As a consequence, racial/ethnic categories were immediately gendered, classed and sexualised with social relations of ethnicity, simultaneously "speaking" gender and sexuality. The result is a process of subjectification, where masculinity becomes an articulation of multiple differences, and power and powerlessness exist in simultaneous positions. Therefore the argument is not to reify "masculinity" and deselect other social categories, but to return to sites of gendered experience and theorize out of them, as "situated knowledge." For us, this situated knowledge has been located within the interconnecting worlds of education, home, workplace and popular culture.

In our research, focusing on the simultaneity of categories, Chris Haywood and I suggest analyses need to understand how social relations do not articulate *with* one another, but rather how social categories articulate *as* one another. As a result, we need to think about, not the ways social categories accumulate, but the ways that they speak each other at the same time. This conceptual intervention can also be used when trying to establish the implications of educational policy. For example, the concern about boys' underachievement can be read as a cultural anxiety about the fracturing of class relations. We have argued that, counter to a dominant discursive framing of schooling in terms of its feminization, the state restructuring of English schools can be understood as a re-masculinization made evident in institutional restructuring, the changing labour process of teaching, the promotion

of an entrepreneurial curriculum and cultural production of teacher and student subjectivities/identities.

Disconnecting Gender Identity and Sexual Desire

A second theme in our work is that of a concern with late modernity's promise of disconnecting gender identity and sexual desire that has also been driven by queer theory. In early work we explored how male peer group networks are generative of many different masculinities in the sphere of education. Drawing upon the work of Rubin, Sedgwick, Butler and Foucault, in carrying out different research projects with Peter Redman and Chris Haywood on forging "proper" forms of young masculinity through a (hetero)sexual identity, we identified some of the ways in which inhabiting particular forms of heterosexual masculinity enables young males to negotiate wider gender relations within specific institutional gender regimes (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 1995; Redman & Mac an Ghaill, 1996). However, it did not immediately explain why these "proper" forms of masculinity are heterosexual. A question arose: What is it about occupying "proper" forms of masculinity that almost inevitably implies a heterosexual identity? The answer to this seemed to lie in the fact that, in mainstream contemporary Anglo-American cultures at least, heterosexuality and gender are profoundly imbricated (overlapping). For example, Butler (1993) argues that gender is routinely spoken through a "heterosexual matrix" in which heterosexuality is presupposed in the expression "real" forms of masculinity or femininity.

In suggesting that masculinities are "spoken through a heterosexual matrix," however, it was not argued that laddishness, for example, was inevitably coded as heterosexual. Nor was it suggested that everyone who inhabits hegemonic forms of masculinity experiences themselves as heterosexual and that everyone who inhabits subordinated forms of masculinity experiences themselves as homosexual. As the gay men's "clone" style of the 1970s and 1980s demonstrated, highly physical and macho forms of masculinity can be successfully rearticulated so that they signify homosexuality. Equally, as we have found with a younger generation of English males, groups of friends organised themselves around a version of high camp that flaunted characteristics identified as quintessentially "feminine" and "poofy" by the forms of masculinity hegemonic in school life (Redman & Mac an Ghaill, 1996; Redman, 2001; Haywood, 2008). Despite this, not all such groups identified as gay. The existence of gay machismo and heterosexual camp alerted us to the fact that the subject positions made available by discourses of masculinity do not determine subjectivity. Within particular constraints, they can be read against the grain. In the examples given, both hegemonic and subordinate forms of masculinity are deployed as cultural resources and their meanings are rearticulated: gay is macho; "poofy" is superior, more refined. However, while the subject positions of hegemonic masculinities can be clearly subverted or lived in contradictory ways, they more commonly act as resources through which heterosexual subjectivities are produced, lived out, and policed in local circumstances; they provide the social

vocabulary through which heterosexual men are both "spoken" and come to "speak themselves" as heterosexual.

Post-Masculinity and Schooling

Post-masculinity has been a third theme in my writing with Chris Haywood. Research on masculinity has become an important area of gender and education that includes a wide range of empirical concerns and theoretical approaches. The paper "What's Next for Masculinity? Reflexive Directions for Theory and Research" (2012b) identifies a number of studies that are asking questions about the conceptual usefulness of masculinity within educational contexts. The first section explores how educational researchers are beginning to suggest alternative ways that hegemonic masculinity may be configured. The second section draws upon work that interrogates the disconnection of gender from sex. Such work considers the importance of understanding schooling worlds through an untethering of gender categories from physical bodies. The final section suggests the possibility of a post-masculinity position by exploring research that questions the viability of masculinity as a conceptual frame to understand gender. In conclusion, the paper argues that such developments can be used heuristically to inform the critical reflexiveness of future research in the area.

In the paper "Understanding Boys: Thinking Through Boys, Masculinity and Suicide" (2012), we addressed the issue of the UK media attention turning to the greater than ever rates of childhood suicide and the increasing number of preadolescent boys (in relation to girls) diagnosed as mentally ill. In response, academic, professional and political commentators are explaining this through gendered concepts. One way of doing this has been to apply adult-defined understandings of men and masculinities to the attitudes and behaviours of pre-adolescent boys. As a consequence, explanations of these trends point to either "too much" masculinity, such as an inability to express feelings and seek help, or "not enough" masculinity that results in isolation and rejection from significant others, such as peer groups. This article questions the viability of using normative models of masculinity as an explanatory tool for explaining boys' behaviours. More specifically, we argue that the conceptual relationship between boys and masculinity requires greater critical scrutiny. By unpacking the category of "boyness," questioning the homogenizing of masculinity and boyness, and exploring notions of friendships and emotional intimacy, this article provides a conceptual adjunct to studies on boys, masculinity and suicide.

In the book chapter "The Queer in Masculinity: Schooling, Boys and Identity Formation" (2012a), we noted that studies of schooling and masculinity have provided highly productive insights into young men's identity formations, subjectivities and social practices. Such research has identified schools as cultural arenas where masculinity has become an important concept to describe and explain issues such as underachievement, sex education, peer group cultures, language use, sexual violence and pedagogy. This work has contributed to an analytical and political engagement with the field of gender and schooling by disputing the pre-

given nature of social ascriptions of biological sex (male/female) and identifying the importance of social and cultural formations. The chapter argues that although such work has been productive in "exposing" the gendered nature of schooling, a concept of "queering" can identify the theoretical and conceptual limitations embedded in educational research on masculinity. More specifically, it is argued that "queering" is potentially a transgressive intervention that may disturb, contest and challenge some of the basic assumptions that underpin the concept of masculinity. This involves resisting a conventional identity politics logic that secures and approximates identities through the collection of educational experiences, processes and practices. Rather, the chapter conceptually scrutinizes the (commonly ascribed) constituent elements of masculinity and as Sedgwick (1991) suggests, "twists" the concept of masculinity in order to undo it.

THE FUTURE: BEYOND "FAILING BOYS"—GLOBAL MEN AND MASCULINITIES

What appears as an academic industry, focusing upon discourses of failing boys, laddishness, role models and gendered underachievement, has emerged within Britain over the last two decades, serving to distort gender and education as a field of inquiry. This is linked internally within the field to socio-historical amnesia about earlier scholarly work on and in education. At the same time, externally, these reductionist accounts of boys and masculinity are often disconnected from broader (historical and contemporary) social and cultural theorising on gender and masculinity. More specifically, Chris Haywood and I have argued, as outlined above, for the productiveness of synthesising materialist and post-structuralist positions. In order to achieve this, we suggest the need to re-read earlier materialist accounts. There is a long history to how questions of gender, illustrated in second wave feminist and pro-feminist texts, have been at the centre of social change in Britain. Importantly, a socio-historical perspective enables us to trace the structural continuities alongside the discontinuities with reference to the institutional organization of gender within education at a time when there is much talk of globally inflected social and cultural change. In other words, our disciplinary collective memory will highlight local institutional agency in making critical interventions to open up current debates. This is further developed in our most recent writing (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2012c).

My pedagogical experience has always been a central resource in developing my understanding of gender. Over the years, I have been fortunate in working with a range of doctoral students. Most recently, I have worked with a group of East Asian postgraduates at the University of Birmingham. The pedagogical method I learned from Richard Johnson has been transmitted to a later generation within the same institution. The East Asian students organized The Postgraduate Saturday Workshops that acted as a site for the production of collective discussion, writing and publications, with a particular concern about epistemological issues, including the deployment of Western concepts while carrying out empirical work in a "non-Western" context. Two pieces of work that have been particularly important are Po-Wei Chen's writing on filial and family responsibilities amongst Taiwanese

professional men in late modernity and Xiaodong Lin's writing on Chinese male peasant workers and shifting masculine identities in urban workspaces. In September 2011, Yiu-Tung Suen, a doctoral student at Oxford University invited me to a British Sociological Association seminar, "Generational Sexualities." Key figures in the field, including Mary McIntosh, Ken Plummer, Jeffrey Weeks and Jon Binney presented papers. Yiu-Tung Suen's own work on "older men and singleness" resonates with work that Chris Haywood and I have carried out with older Irish men. The future is global; important work on gender/sexuality is emerging beyond the Anglo-American academic space.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1990). *Young, gifted and black: Student teacher relations in the schooling of black youth*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Haywood, C. (2008). Genders and sexualities: Exploring the conceptual limits of contemporary educational research. *International Studies in the Sociology of Education, 18*(1), 1-14.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2003). *Men and masculinities: Theory, research and social practice*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2007). *Gender, culture and society: Contemporary femininities and masculinities.* Basingstoke, England: PalgraveMacmillan.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012a). The queer in masculinity: Schooling, boys and identity. In J. C. Landreau & N. M. Nelson (Eds.), *Queer masculinities: A critical reader in education* (pp. 69-84). New York: Springer.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012b). What next for masculinity?: Reflexive directions for theory and research on masculinity and education. *Gender and Education*, *24*(6), 577-592.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012c). *Education and masculinities: Social, cultural and global transformations.* London: Routledge.

Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2011). De-centred white English working class masculinities: Schooling, a new cultural condition and simultaneity of multiple categories of difference. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 32*(5), 729-744.

Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2012). Understanding boys: Thinking through boys, masculinity and suicide. *Social Science and Medicine, 74*(4), 482-489.

REFERENCES

Archer, L. (2003). *Race, masculinity and schooling: Muslim boys and education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Arnot, M., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (Eds.). (2006). *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in gender and education*. London: Routledge.

Baldwin, J. (1965). *Nobody knows my name*. London: Corgi.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* London: Routledge.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, *14*, 551-604.

Chigwada, R. (1987). Not victims—Not superwomen. *Spare Rib*, *183*, 14-18.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power*. Cambridge, England: Polity.

Connell, R. (1989). Cool guys, swots and wimps: The interplay of masculinity and education. *Oxford Review of Education*, *15*(3), 291-303.

Davies, B. (1993). *Shards of glass: Children, reading and writing beyond gendered identities*. Sydney, Australia: Allan and Unwin.

Epstein, D., Kehily, M., Mac an Ghaill, M., & Redman, P. (2001). Boys and girls come out to play: Making masculinities and femininities in school playgrounds. *Men and Masculinities, 4*(2), 158-172.

Haywood, C. P. (1996). Out of the curriculum: Sex talking, talking sex. *Curriculum Studies, 4*(2), 229-249.

Haywood, C. P. (2008). Genders and sexualities: Exploring the conceptual limits of contemporary educational research. *International Studies in the Sociology of Education,18*(1), 1-14.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (1995). The sexual politics of the curriculum: Contesting values. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 5*(2), 221-236.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (1997). Materialism and deconstructivism: Education and the epistemology of identity. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 27*(2), 261-273.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2003). *Men and masculinities: Theory, research and social practice*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012a). The queer in masculinity: Schooling, boys and identity. In J. C. Landreau & N. M. Nelson (Eds.), *Queer masculinities: A critical reader in education* (pp. 69-84). New York: Springer.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012b). What next for masculinity?: Reflexive directions for theory and research on masculinity and education. *Gender and Education*, *24*(6), 577-592.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012c). *Education and masculinities: Social, cultural and global transformations.* London: Routledge.

Kehily, M., Epstein, D., Mac an Ghaill, M., & Redman, P. (2002). Private girls and public worlds: Producing femininities in primary school. *Discourse, 23*(2), 167-77.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1990). *Young, gifted and black: Student teacher relations in the schooling of black youth*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994a). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994b). (In)visibility: Sexuality, masculinity and "race" in the school context. In D. Epstein (Ed.), *Challenging gay and lesbian inequalities in education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2007). *Gender, culture and society: Contemporary femininities and masculinities.* Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2011). De-centred white English working class masculinities: Schooling, a new cultural condition and simultaneity of multiple categories of difference. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 32*(5), 729-744.

Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2012). Understanding boys: Thinking through boys, masculinity and suicide. *Social Science and Medicine, 74*(4), 482-489.

Mac an Ghaill, M., Hanafin, J., & Conway, P. F. (2004). *Gender, politics and exploring masculinities in Irish education.* Dublin, Ireland: National Council for Curriculum and Assessment.

Mendick, H. (2006). *Masculinities in mathematics.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Mills, M. (2001). *Challenging violence in schools: An issue of masculinities*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Redman, P. (2001). The discipline of love: Negotiation and regulation in boys' performance in romance-base heterosexual masculinity. *Men and Masculinities, 42*(2), 186-200.

Redman, P., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (1996). Schooling sexualities: Heterosexual masculinities, schooling and the unconscious. *Discourse, 17*(2), 243-256.

Redman, P., Epstein, D., Kehily, M. J., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2002). Boys bonding: Same-sex friendship, the unconscious and heterosexual masculinities. *Discourse, 23*(2), 179–191.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1991). *Epistemology of the closet*. Hemel Hemstead, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Skelton, C. (2001). *Schooling the boys: Masculinities and primary education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Máirtín Mac an Ghaill
Professor of Multi-Professional Education
Newman University College, Birmingham

WAYNE J. MARTINO

ON A COMMITMENT TO GENDER AND SEXUAL MINORITY JUSTICE

Personal and Professional Reflections on Boys' Education, Masculinities and Queer Politics

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

I completed my M.Ed. in the early 1990s in Western Australia at a time just prior to what Marcus Weaver-Hightower (2003) has identified as the "boy turn" in the field of gender and education. For example, in Australia, since the 1970s there had been a significant focus on and state engagement with gender equity, with specific attention directed to girls' participation and access to education. The second wave of feminism and the election of the social democratic Whitlam government in 1972 in Australia enabled certain progressive gender equity politics to flourish, which facilitated a particular feminist engagement with the state. For example, at this time Taylor (2003) indicates that the government was supportive of gender equity and appointed "femocrats" within the bureaucracy "to develop and implement policies for women and girls" (Taylor, 2003, p. 53; Kenway, 1990; Yates, 1993; Yeatman, 1990). Such interventions culminated in the *National Policy for the Education of Girls in Australian Schools* (Australian Education Council, 1987). However, while the early 90s still saw a significant focus on girls with a review of the National Policy, *Listening to Girls* (Milligan et al., 1992) and the *National Action Plan for the Education of Girls 1993-97* (Australian Education Council, 1993), there were also shifts in the education policy making agenda that had started to emerge. For example, the federal government established the *Gender Equity Taskforce* and a *Gender Equity Reference Group*, whose mandate was not only to provide "advice on future action for the achievement of gender equity in schools, sectors and system," but also to "report on the implementation of the *National Action Plan for the Education of Girls 1993–97*" (Gender Equity Taskforce, 1997, p. 5).

In February 1995, the Taskforce sponsored a national conference, *Promoting Gender Equity*, "designed to assist it in addressing some central questions about gender and educational disadvantage" (p. 5). Submissions were by invitation only and I was approached by the Taskforce to submit a paper on boys and literacy, which dealt with their achievement and participation in English, and which eventually accompanied the final policy framework, *Gender Equity: A Framework for Australian Schools* (Gender Equity Taskforce, 1997). By that time I had completed my M.Ed. and was in the final stages of my doctoral research at Murdoch University in Western Australia, where I eventually accepted an

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 163–177.

appointment as a faculty member in 1997. The *Promoting Gender Equity* conference was a key moment in Australia, signalling a policy shift from a central focus on girls to include a consideration of boys, one that was facilitated and further consolidated by the election of a conservative government in 1996. The change in government certainly provided opportunities and support for what Lingard and Douglas (1999) identified as an aggressive "recuperative masculinity politics," fuelled by a particular feminist backlash agenda. Such a politics was driven significantly by the public media, and also by the publication of Biddulph's (1994), *Manhood*: *An Action Plan for Changing Men's Lives* (see Lingard, 2003). *Manhood* was seized upon by the media and received a great deal of attention. It was followed by *Raising Boys: Why Boys Are Different—and How to Help Them Become Happy and Well-Balanced Men* (Biddulph, 1997), which also became a best seller. These books seemed to tap into a zeitgeist about a "masculinity crisis," driven by a neoconservative and feminist backlash agenda, which captivated media commentators and journalists, who were only too willing to recast boys and men as victims of increasing feminization. This media frenzy and masculinity politics culminated in the Government's launch of a National Inquiry into Boys' Education, which also had a major impact on debates about boys' education in Australian schools (House of Representatives Standing Committee, 2002).

It was at this time, when the National Inquiry was being conducted, that I also led a government commissioned project with Bob Lingard, from the University of Queensland (see his essay, this volume), and a team of researchers to investigate the factors influencing the achievement of boys in Australian schools. This involved undertaking case study and survey research in 19 schools across the country. Our report, *Addressing the Educational Needs of Boys* (Lingard et al., 2002), was published and still remains on the Australian Government's web site. With my colleagues from the University of Queensland, we have since that time devoted considerable attention to publications which have addressed the polemics of evidence-informed policy making as it relates to boys educational reform, not only within the Australian context (Lingard, Martino, & Mills, 2009), but also in Canada (Martino & Kehler, 2007; Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012a, 2012b) and across the globe (Martino, Kehler, & Weaver-Hightower, 2009).

REFLECTIONS ON MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE POLITICS OF BOYS' EDUCATION

As an English teacher in a Catholic coeducational school at the time of completing my Masters degree in the early 90s, I had always been interested in addressing gender issues, particularly representations of gender differences in a range of literary, media and nonfiction texts. The focus on gender, as well as on race, was a stipulation in official curriculum documents, particularly at the senior level in state-sanctioned English curriculum documents in Western Australia. I also became interested in boys' participation in English because they seemed to be concentrated in the general-level classes at the particular school where I was teaching. For grades 9-10, there was a two-tiered streaming system. At the end of grade 8, all those students achieving an A or B+ grade were admitted to extended-

level classes, where there was a greater focus on the study of literature. Most of the other students were admitted to a general stream, where they were required to focus on a range of different texts and genres, including the media and nonfiction texts, such as newspapers and magazines. The two-tier system was based on the division between the university entrance subjects offered in the senior grades—English Literature and General English. A higher status was always attributed to the English Literature course, which tended to attract the higher-achieving students.

What was immediately apparent was the concentration of boys in the General English classes. In the Extended classes, there were never more than 8 boys out of a class of 30. In the general classes there were always at least 20 boys. In addition, most of the students being withdrawn for special assistance were boys. Clear and sometimes stark differences in how boys related were also evident. However, I understood these differences at the time to be connected to social norms and expectations governing what it meant to be "a proper boy"—issues which had impacted significantly on my own life as a young boy and also as a gay male teacher who felt compelled to embrace the closet to ensure my own safety and employment in the Catholic education system. I felt that examining boys' gendered participation and dispositions, within the context of their involvement and orientation to the study of English, had the potential to create a space for me to unravel the significance of masculinity beyond the confines of the English classroom. However, I didn't quite have the analytic tools or resources to make sense of what I understood to be significant political issues related to the manifestation of a masculinity-related politics within the context of everyday living and schooling. So I began the task of reading Connell's work on masculinities (see also her essay, this volume), which provided me with a useful framework to start naming the political relations involving the *social organization of masculinity* and the interplay and hierarchy of ascendant and subordinated forms of masculinity (Connell, 1987, 1995). Her paper in the *American Sociological Review*, "A Very Straight Gay," addressed the polemic of homosexuality as a negation of masculinity and investigated "how gender operates for those men most vehemently defined as unmasculine" (Connell, 1992, p. 737). Such empirical work disrupted fundamental notions of conflating homosexuality with effeminacy, while drawing attention to embodied and eroticized versions of straight-acting masculinity as tied for some gay men to what I came to understand as the "regulatory apparatus of heterosexuality" (Butler, 1993, p. 12). Engaging with Connell, therefore, became the basis for further reading into men's and boys' lives and engagement with other sociologists such as Michael Kimmel (1992). His chapter "Masculinity as Homophobia" (Kimmel, 1994) became really influential and also fed into my doctoral research into masculinities and schooling. The scholarship of these sociologists continue to shape and inform my research, thinking and engagement with debates about men's and boys' participation in the public sphere and what this might mean for envisioning a more gender just and democratic participatory ethic (Martino, 2008; Fraser, 1990).

What was significant about this scholarship was that it framed masculinity as power relations and provided a *grammar* or discourse for making sense of deeply personal experiences related to the question of what counts as a viable expression of masculinity—questions, which Butler (2004) has shown, have implications for the legitimacy of affirming one's personhood (Martino, 2012a). In fact, by reading the works of sociologists such as Raewyn Connell and Michael Kimmel, I became more literate about issues of masculinity, particularly the politics and the silences at the basis of the recuperative masculinity and men's rights agendas, with their capacity to define the heteronormative limits for setting the boys' education agenda and to determine what was to count as gender equity and social justice. For example, comments from boys who participated in my research indicated that issues of masculinity were clearly implicated in ways that defied proposals to re-masculinize English and schools. Rather, it was the very valorization, legitimation and reclamation of hegemonic versions of masculinity driving such backlash political responses to boys' education that appeared to be at heart of the problem. For example, one particular boy's published response from my M.Ed. thesis came to serve as one of the defining characteristics of this problem of hegemonic masculinity and was cited by many scholars in the field:

> English is more suited to girls because it's not the way guys think … this subject is the biggest load of bullshit I have ever done. Therefore, I don't particularly like this subject. I hope you aren't offended by this, but most guys who like English are faggots. (Martino, 1997, p. 135)

This very perception and nature of English as a gendered learning domain, with all of its implications for the need to rethink hegemonic masculinity as homophobia and flight from the feminine in terms of how it is regulated and policed socially for boys, raises important questions about boys' education reform agendas that continue to be propagated some 17 years later! For example, as I have continued to illustrate in subsequent research, the limits imposed by a particular gender regime for authorizing the production of male/female dualisms in schools (Davies, 1992) strike at the heart of debates between feminist/pro-feminist and recuperative men's rights groups with regards to addressing boys' educational reform in schools (Lingard, Martino, & Mills, 2009; Martino, Lingard, & Mills, 2004; Martino, Mills, & Lingard, 2005; Martino & Meyenn, 2001; 2002; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; 2005; Martino & Kehler, 2007; Martino, 2008; Martino, Kehler, & Weaver-Hightower, 2009; Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012a, 2012b).

COMING TO THEORY AND RETURNING TO THE SPACE OF CHILDHOOD

Some 10 years later reading bell hooks' (1994) ruminations on the use of theory as a means of desperately wanting to comprehend the significance of personal experience resonated with me and took me back to my childhood. In what almost became a process of engaging in therapy, I managed to connect my research and interest in masculinities to memories of a politics of embodied gendered and sexual difference, which had long been suppressed or at least buried through a traumatic

history of fear, shame and silence. In short, by engaging with theory, I was able both to "discover the terms of my belonging" and to come to terms with the oppression that comes from being placed "under the constant careful scrutiny of other men," who "watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of Manhood" (Kimmel, 1994, p. 128). In this sense, as hooks reminds us, "theory emerges from the concrete, from my efforts to make sense of everyday life experiences, from my efforts to intervene critically in my life and in the lives of others" (1994, p. 70). Reading Connell and Kimmel for the first time as a graduate student, memories of my childhood were ignited, enabling me to connect theory to a location of personal struggle and shame experienced as a result of my own embodied gender non-conformity and what it signified to significant others. As a young boy, no more than 9 years of age, for example, I remembered, though many years later, an experience which has remained forever at the forefront of my academic work and current impetus to embrace a transgender and gender queer social imaginary involving a political commitment to "inhabiting gender as a polymorphic fluid set of possibilities" (Cooper, 2004, p. 89; Martino, 2012a).

As a young boy, I recall very vividly now being mistaken as a girl and the terror and fear that it incited in me. The memory of the experience had been erased from my consciousness. I had long hair at the time, which combined with my embodied effeminacy, led to my gender being misrecognized. It happened when I was having a sleepover at my best friend's home. He lived right next door to an outdoor cinema—what we as children called a drive-in—where one of my uncles worked a second job in the evenings. My dad had encouraged me to venture over to the cinema and to say hello to him. I barely knew my uncle because we had little contact with dad's side of the family. He came from a family of seven brothers and my mother didn't really care to attend the annual get-togethers. When he saw me he asked me whether my name was Kathy or Lisa, the names of my two sisters, and I remember the terror and shame I felt as I managed to barely utter my name. What did it mean to be mistaken as a girl? Why was I so afraid? Why did it incite such shame? Did such misrecognition mean that I wasn't a real boy? All I know is that I discussed the encounter with no-one, and the memory of that experience remained buried for many years. It was only much later as a graduate student engaging with theory that I was really able to process this experience and the pain and terror that such misidentification incited in me.

What is interesting is that I had always known that I was different, but that such difference only became an issue, as Kimmel (1994) points out, when it was marked and named by others who watch us and have the power to grant us acceptance. For example, while I grew up feeling different, as a very young child I felt truly loved and accepted. I was not made to feel different at home or that my difference mattered. It was in the outside world where I was Othered and subjected to the gender-phobic scrutiny of those for whom my sensitivity and embodied effeminacy as a boy growing up constituted a threat to the heteronormative status quo. I remember at an early age crawling beneath a small wooden coffee table in front of a huge window in the living room so that I could look out and get a sense of what that world beyond the safety of my home might be like. I must not have been more

than 4 years old. The coffee table was placed between two lounge chairs and I would spend hours in that space beside the cat, Sebastian, who always loved to bask in the warm sun, purring so loudly. I would just lie there and look out onto the street, observing intently the people walking by on the sidewalk. In that reflective space of observing and imagining the world beyond my home I never felt threatened, shamed, or unsafe. I never anticipated that such feelings would come to characterize so overwhelmingly my experience as a boy growing up who eventually as a young man was able to seek refuge and healing in theory as a location from which to name the pervasive homophobia and the policing of masculinity that it incites. It was in this sense that I came to understand both my scholarship as a commitment to gender and sexual minority justice, and my engagement with theory specifically as a basis for imagining and realizing possibilities for self-acceptance and self-determination beyond the gender straight-jacketing, which sets limits to such political projects of inhabiting gender as a polymorphic set of possibilities, unconstrained by dichotomous and binary classificatory systems. Such systems create much pain and confusion for those who do not fit neatly into such gender and heteronormative categories.

I also remember as a boy in grade six, aged 11, my teacher, Mr. Campbell, a gentle, sensitive man in his late 50s whom I loved, asking to speak to me privately about my friendship with one other boy, my "best friend" at the time. He had obviously noticed that I was spending most of my time with this particular friend—we were always together at recess and lunchtime and we always sat together in class. I could sense his concern—the tone of his voice, the expression on his face; he was concerned that I was not socializing enough with the others boys. I remember feeling angry and talking with my friend about Mr. Campbell's concerns and his normalizing surveillance of our friendship. We simply agreed to ignore his advice and continued our friendship. It was only many years later, as a graduate student studying masculinities and queer theory, that I really understood the full significance of Mr. Campbell's concerns. While my relationship with him after that talk was never the same—I felt that he had no right to dictate the terms of my friendships with my peers—I really never gave the incident that much thought after that since nothing in the friendship changed until two years later when we simply drifted apart in high school. However, I came to realize many years later that Mr. Campbell had perceived my friendship to be a transgression of sorts and that it had provoked enough anxiety to lead to him to have that conversation with me. Boys were not meant to have best, male friends and if they did they were not expected to spend that amount of time together, without relating socially to other boys!

Such a transgression, I believed, raised some concern for him about what he perceived to be the cultivation of an illicit form of homosocial intimacy between two boys in its potential for signifying non-heterosexuality and, hence, some sort of developmental deviance. Built into such perceptions are normalizing assumptions, expectations, and judgments about boys' friendships and social development in relation to setting heteronormative limits for defining how boys are to relate to one another and their peer social interaction in school contexts. Butler (1993) for example, highlights how such "identificatory projections are regulated

by social norms" which "are constructed as heterosexual imperatives" governing, in this particular instance, acceptable limits for expressing intimacy and social interaction for prepubescent boys in the context of developing same-sex friendships (p. 17). Of course, the other side to this regulatory monitoring and heteronormative surveillance of friendships for boys also involves the nature and extent of their interaction with girls in school. As one of the boys who participated in my doctoral study, which investigated the impact of masculinities on boys' lives in school, pointed out: "When you only have girls as friends, you got some serious problems" (Martino, 1998).

These narratives and the confessional space that they inhabit have been deployed to draw attention to how my own location and history of embodied masculinity and as a sexual minority subject have impacted significantly on my scholarship, engagement with theory and the direction that my research has taken. Foucault's work has always been useful for me for the interpretive analytic frameworks it has afforded for making sense of the policing, disciplining, regulation and surveillance of gendered bodies and the historical contingencies of such practices and technologies of the self (Foucault, 1972; 1980; Martino, 1999, 2000). Butler (1990; 1993; 2004) and her queer feminist perspective has also been very influential in my developing understandings about the politics of gender embodiment and in my own thinking about gender hierarchies and what it means to be a *gendered outcast* in my own community (Kendall & Martino, 2006; Martino, 2006, 2012a).

PRODUCTIVE ALLIANCES AND COLLABORATION WITH FEMINIST SCHOLARS

As I look back over the past 20 years since I first entered the field, what is striking to me are the productive partnerships and collaboration with feminist scholars that have come to characterize much of my contribution to the field. I first worked with Bronwyn Mellor, Director of Chalkface Press, upon completing my M.Ed. to produce a textbook or resource for English teachers, *Gendered Fictions* (Martino & Mellor, 1995; 2000), which in effect was an attempt to translate into practice the feminist poststructuralist theories and research that I had conducted into gendered participation in English. Through working closely with Bronwyn I learned about how to work with theory in ways that spoke directly to the English classroom as a space for deploying texts and developing reading practices designed to incite students to interrogate gender binaries and dualisms. This critical practice was about addressing questions of gender and sexual minority justice related to the homophobic policing of masculinities and femininities, but it was also about equipping students with the skills and capacities for interrogating the politics of embodied difference in terms of its addressing intersections of gender with race, ethnicity and social class. The activities we developed and the texts we selected for interrogation were informed by a political commitment to interrupting and deconstructing the familiar discursive practices and the narratives through which readers are incited to learn what it means to be male and female and how they

might be encouraged to position themselves outside of gendered binary frames of reference (Davies, 1992).

Such a political feminist project, however, proved to be at odds with what emerged as a masculinity politics committed to remasculinization in the face of the perceived assault of feminization, which came to define the central tenet of the boys' education agenda in Australia and elsewhere at the time. In many ways, this conservative politics continues to plague the reform agenda here in North America and the United Kingdom, where single-sex schooling, the call for more male teachers as role models and the "boy-friendly" curriculum are still being promoted as a basis for the realization of a project of remasculinzation designed to address the problem of the feminization of curriculum and schooling for boys (Martino & Kehler, 2007; Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012a; Skelton & Francis, 2009). In fact, as my feminist colleague at Western University and I have recently illuminated, neoliberal forms of accountability in the form of high stakes testing have been used to reignite a recuperative masculinity politics and a competing victim syndrome by drawing attention to failing boys in the Canadian context and as a global phenomenon (Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012b).

My collaborative research with Maria Pallotta-Chiarolli has also been significant, particularly in terms of drawing on postcolonial feminist theories in conjunction with a Foucauldian interpretive analytic perspective to investigate boys' borderland existences and hierarchies of masculinities (Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2001, 2003). We always felt that drawing on boys living on the borders—those *minoritized* boys with disabilities, sexually diverse boys, boys from diverse cultural backgrounds, Indigenous boys—was key to addressing the fundamental problem of homogenization and normalization, which struck at the recuperative masculinity politics driving debates about boys' education and schooling. The political potential of authorizing student voice (Cook-Sather, 2002) as a basis for both defining the terms of the discussion and for speaking back to policymakers concerned with setting the terms for a "boy-friendly" educational reform agenda in schools did not elude us. We understood the use of boys' voices as a powerful means by which to address the politics of difference on the basis of race, ethnicity, disability and sexuality and how these perspectives could be potentially mobilized as an empirical source for addressing the limits set for defining what is to count as equity and social justice, particularly in relation to the designation of boys as essentialized and normalized subjects. Such empirical work became even more important in the period following the release of the Australian House of Representatives' inquiry report into boys' education (2002). This government-sanctioned report served as a proxy for a gender equity policy and further fuelled a feminist backlash politics, which persisted into the millennium with millions of dollars continuing to be pumped into educational reform agendas for boys. Under the government sponsored projects such as the *Boys' Education Lighthouse Program* and the *Success for Boys* initiative, the latter involving a commitment of a further 19.4 million dollars for school-based research, the terms for gender equity continued to be set by a recuperative masculinity politics. As I pointed out at the time, in the absence of an official gender equity policy, the

parliamentary inquiry report, *Boys: Getting it Right*, functioned as a de facto policy which served both to justify the allocation of such funds and as a basis for framing boy-friendly pedagogical and curricular reform initiatives in schools (Martino, 2006).

Such a political project also motivated us to write a book that included the voices of girls and their perspectives on schooling. With the publication of *Being Normal Is the Only Way to Be* in 2005, and with a broader audience of educators in mind, we wanted once again to strategically address the fundamental exclusions of a policy drive designed to serve the interests of certain boys and a certain masculinity politics, while excluding the perspective of girls and minoritized boys. We surveyed over 900 students in a range of different schools and brought the voices of girls to the table, alongside those of boys, as a matter of gender justice. The mobilization of such perspectives and their pedagogical potential, I believe, is still necessary as neoliberal agendas and the tendency to rely narrowly on standardized tests score data, disaggregated solely on the basis of the singularity of gender, continues to fuel a recuperative masculinity political agenda with its potential to detract attention from a serious consideration of equity and social justice in the field of education (Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012b).

More recently my research in Canada with feminist postcolonial scholar, Goli Rezai-Rashti, has also been significant in addressing policy related matters regarding the call for more male teachers as role models within the context of boys' education (Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012a). Such an alliance has led to the infusion of a focus on race and questions of intersectionality in terms of their potential to further inform and deepen our understanding of masculinities and sexualities as social justice matters in education. Once again, the particular theoretical perspectives that we draw on—the critical sociology of masculinities literature in conjunction with queer feminist and postcolonial perspectives of Stuart Hall (1992) and Cameron McCarthy (1998)—has yielded productive insights into the limits of role modelling as a particular regime of truth which sets limits to antiracist, queer and antisexist reform agendas. In our most recent book, *Gender, Race and the Politics of Role Modelling: The Influence of Male Teachers*, we see ourselves as addressing a theoretical impasse in the legitimation and valorization of role modelling as a grid of intelligibility and seductive regime of thought, which has come to define the foundational basis for both a populist and policy response to male teacher shortage within the context of boys' education. In addressing this impasse, together we worked hard to signal a way forward and to articulate a theoretically informed empiricism capable of disentangling or disarticulating role modelling from a discourse about representation. Foucault, as well as Connell, once again emerged as significant in enabling us to draw attention to the disciplinary and regulatory function of knowledge/power relations that inform dominant conceptions of male teacher influence which, through recourse to role modelling, gets reduced to a pedagogical affiliation and identification on the basis of the singularity of gender and race.

Ultimately we were able, through our empirical investigation and engagement with theory, to reject a fundamental rationality underscoring a politics of

substitution at the heart of role modelling as a regime of truth. Simply substituting male teachers for female teachers as a basis for educational reform garners its impetus precisely because it relies on fixed, idealized and heteronormative conceptions of imagined selves, particularly as they relate to the representational capacity of the embodied signification of race and gender. The answer lies not so much in the appropriation of role modelling as a policy frame for addressing the educational needs of boys, but in understanding the potential of a politics of representation as it relates to the implications of making available a social imaginary that attends to the significance of all students seeing themselves represented in the teaching profession—a matter which requires addressing a fundamental politics of access and structural inequality. Our empirical work with teachers and students in schools in Canada and Australia continues to point to the need for further critical engagement with policy frames that define educational reform agendas committed to addressing gender and sexual minority justice, as well as to antiracist education.

SOME CHALLENGES

Despite the extensive body of empirical work that challenges dominant policy frames regarding the disadvantaged status of boys, such discourses continue to be endorsed by the media and policymakers. What is still needed is a necessary focus on *which boys* and *which girls* are most at risk, with attention being paid to questions of how gender intersects with other social factors such as social class, ethnicity, race, disability, sexuality and geographical location. Such work needs to address key questions of globalization, immigration and the impact of neoliberal reform agendas, as well as issues related to an alignment of neoconservative forces in terms of the materialization of re-traditionalizing tendencies leading to the morphing and reinscription of hegemonic masculinities. In short, hegemonic masculinities continue to be reconstituted, with the full force of the residual effects of familiar patriarchal and heteronormative regimes of power. This assertion is particularly significant in light of emerging scholarship by queer scholars in the United Kingdom who posit that diminishing homophobia in men's and boys' lives has led to more equitable and inclusive masculinities as manifested in a willingness to embrace same-sex expressions of intimacy (Anderson, 2009; McCormack, 2011). Some caution is needed, I believe, in accepting too readily such post-gay assertions about the diminishing influence of homophobia. For instance, while there have clearly been major changes in the increasing visibility, representation and acceptance of queer subjects in the popular culture and within the context of the media, as well as legislative changes regarding same-sex marriage and human rights protection for sexual minorities, it is important not to forget that the heteronormative policing of gender and the institutionalization and privileging of heterosexuality, with all of its implications for inciting hate and oppression, continue to have a major impact on sexual minoritized populations. Simpson (1996), for example, who uses analytic categories and conceptual frameworks derived from queer theoretical perspectives to make sense of the queering of

masculinities, notes that the "cross-over of gayness into the mainstream," with the accompanying onslaught of consumerism in late capitalist economies, does not necessarily mean that homophobia and discrimination against homosexuals has decreased (p. 18; see also Janoff, 2005). In addition, the tendency for many straight men to transgress hegemonic masculinity, Simpson argues, is still "adamantly presented as something that is not homosexual, and in fact proof of their heterosexuality—I'm so secure in my masculinity that …" (p. 7). A sense of such adamant assertions of heterosexuality by men in Anderson's study, in response to literally embracing gay men, however, are presented as examples of straight men "undoing" their homophobia as a result of decreasing cultural homohysteria.

McCormack (2011) in his study into the declining significance of homohysteria in three high schools in the south of England also agrees with Anderson that many young men "no longer fear being homosexualized" (p. 351). He claims that characteristics of marginalization and physical domination associated with hegemonic masculinity were not present in these schools and that, while levels of homophobia in schools settings need to be "understood as temporally and spatially situated," it is important to understand that not all male students can be presented as "uniformly homophobic" (p. 352). While this is a valid point, my concern is that the effect of such research is to detract from producing a more theoretically informed understanding of the mechanisms and operations of homophobia in terms of its spatially and situationally specific manifestations, as well as of the institutionalization of heteronormativity and compulsory heterosexuality, which continues to be tied to a widespread form of homophobic regulation and policing of gendered, queer and trans bodies.

In addition, as already illustrated in the field of equity and social justice education more broadly, notions of inclusivity and their association with celebrating and accepting cultural difference, are limited in their capacity to address the complexity of power relations and the persistent influence of new forms of racism. This applies equally to notions of inclusivity as they relate to the persistence of homophobia, despite the increasing visibility and acceptance of homosexuality within the popular culture. In this sense, a more thorough engagement with theory, as well as literature that highlights the persistence of hegemonic masculinities and homophobia in schools and within the context of fraternities, needs to be incorporated into a discussion about the apparent reduction of cultural homohysteria, as it pertains to the undoing of homophobia and violence against women and gay men. Kimmel (2008), for example, documents the persistence of homophobia, antigay sentiments and femiphobia, as well as the impact of gender nonconformity on boys and men in high school and university contexts and specifically comments on hazing initiation rites as they pertain to the sporting arena and fraternity membership. Reading such literature raises serious questions about the extent to which inclusive masculinities are being embraced by straight men.

TOWARD A TRANSGENDER IMAGINARY

Such post-gay scholarship highlights the need for further engagement with queer, feminist and critical masculinity perspectives that enable us to make sense of social change, while also addressing key questions related to emergent dominant and residual effects of hegemonic heterosexual masculinities. I also believe that the transgender scholarship poses some important challenges for gender and queer studies within the field of education (Martino, in press, 2102a, 2012b). For example, I think that the disciplining and normalization of gendered bodies as a basis for addressing the particular significance of queer theory for envisioning pedagogical possibilities that resist the issue of the pathological in relation to expressions of gender variance and embodied gender non-conformity is crucial. I am concerned at this particular point to examine the specific significance of gender queer and trans theories in terms of their pedagogical implications for educating towards critical consciousness as it relates to interrupting the rigidity of entrenched binary sex/gender systems. However, tensions between transgender and transsexual theories of sex and gender need to be taken into consideration in such a political project, and these must serve as a basis for drawing attention to the limits of some feminist and queer pedagogical interventions for building a deeper understanding of the ethical and political implications of the desire to become and live as the other sex. Ultimately, a political project of gender democratization, as a basis for embracing a transgender imaginary that recognizes both the significance of queering and the ontological intelligibility of an embodied gendered personhood is one that I see myself as embracing (Martino, in press).

CONCLUSION

The field of boys' education continues to be a fraught and fractured one plagued by a persistent recuperative masculinity politics, and with the media continuing to influence, in significant ways, policy frames for educational and school-based reform agendas. The influence of neoliberal regimes of accountability and the global phenomenon of a policy field that cuts across nations have had a profound impact on the politics of boys' education, serving to grant failing boys a reinvigorated legitimacy. In reflecting on my contribution to this field over the past 20 years, I am convinced that a commitment to gender and sexual minority justice is as important today as it was then. As I have demonstrated in the reflections included here, central to such a political commitment is the need to continue to access the voices and perspectives of those subjects who inhabit the borderlands in terms of multiple and intersecting locations of gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, geographical location and disability. Such voices are needed to serve the building of a necessary empirical base that is required to address the limits of current conceptualizations of "failing boys" as an undifferentiated category. Moreover, in times of late capitalism, we still need to attend to economic disadvantage and the reproduction of the elite within the context of globalization, where there is evidence of an intensification of class inequalities and the persistence of certain

forms of gender inequities and other inequities in terms of ensuring the safety and human rights of sexual and gender minorities in school communities (Martino, in press). I realize that my embodied experiences of masculinity and my own sexual minority status have played a major role in informing my empirical and theoretical work, but the explication of such positionality, I believe, is central to establishing the integrity and ethical basis for a political project that continues to be central to the realization of a commitment to gender and sexual minority justice, particularly for those youth in school communities who inhabit gender in non-normative and more fluid, polymorphous ways.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Martino, W. (1999). 'Cool boys,' 'party animals,' 'squids' and 'poofters': Interrogating the dynamics and politics of adolescent masculinities in school. *The British Journal of the Sociology of Education, 20*(2), 239-263.

Martino, W., & Meyenn, B. (2002). 'War, guns and cool, tough things': Interrogating single-sex classes as a strategy for engaging boys in English. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 32*(3), 303-324.

Martino, W. (2003). "We just get really fired up": Indigenous boys, masculinities and schooling, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 24*(2), 158-172.

Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). *So what's a boy? Addressing issues of masculinity and schooling*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Martino, W. (2012). **"**Undoing" gender and disrupting hegemonic masculinity: Embracing a transgender social imaginary. In B. Down & J. Smyth (Eds.), *Critical voices in teacher education: Teaching for social justice in conservative times*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Martino, W., & Rezai-Rashti, G. (2012). *Gender, race and the politics of role modelling: The influence of male teachers*. New York: Routledge.

REFERENCES

Australian Education Council. (1987). *National policy for the education of girls in Australian schools*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service

Australian Education Council. (1993). *National action plan for the education of girls 1993–97*. Carlton, Australia: Curriculum Corporation.

Anderson, E. (2009). Inclusive masculinity: The changing nature of masculinities. New York: Routledge.

Biddulph, S. (1995). *Manhood: An action plan for changing men's lives* (2nd edition). Sydney, Australia: Finch.

Biddulph, S. (1997). *Raising boys: Why boys are different—and how to help them become happy and well-balanced men*. Sydney, Australia: Finch.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex.* New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. W. (1992). A very straight gay: Masculinity, homosexual experience, and the dynamics of gender. *American Sociological Review, 57*, 735-751.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Cook-Sather, A. (2002). Authorizing students' perspectives: Toward trust, dialogue, and change in education. *Educational Researcher, 31*(4), 3-14.

Cooper, D. (2004). *Challenging diversity: Rethinking equality and the value of difference*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, B. (1989). The discursive production of the male/female dualism in school settings. *Oxford Review of Education, 15*(3), 229-241.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish.* London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text, 25/26*, 56-80.

Gender Equity Taskforce for Ministerial Council for Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs. (1997). *Gender equity: A framework for Australian schools.* Canberra, Australia: MCEETYA.

Hall, S. (1992). New ethnicities. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), *'Race,' culture and difference* (pp. 252-259). London: Sage.

House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Training. (2002). *Boys: Getting it right.* Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth Government.

Janoff, D. (2005). *Pink blood: Homophobic violence in Canada*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Kendall, C., & Martino, W. (2006). *Gendered outcasts and sexual outlaws*. New York: Routledge.

Kenway, J. (1990). *Gender and education policy: A call for new directions.* Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Kimmel, M. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland*. New York: HarperCollins.

Lingard, B., & Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging feminisms: Profeminism, backlashes and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Lingard, B., Martino, W., & Mills, M. (2009). *Boys and schooling: Beyond structural reform*. London: Palgrave.

Lingard, B., Martino, W., Mills, M., & Bahr, M. (2002). *Addressing the educational needs of boys*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education Science and Training.

McCormack, M. (2011). The declining significance of homohysteria for male students in three sixth forms in the south of England. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 337-353.

Martino, W. (1999). 'Cool boys,' 'party animals,' 'squids' and 'poofters': Interrogating the dynamics and politics of adolescent masculinities in school. *The British Journal of the Sociology of Education, 20*(2), 239-263.

Martino, W. (2000). Policing masculinities: Investigating the role of homophobia and heteronormativity in the lives of adolescent boys at school. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 8*(2), 213-236.

Martino, W. (2006). The 'Right' way to educate boys: Interrogating the politics of boys' education in Australia. In C. Skelton, B. Francis & L. Smulyan (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of gender and education* (pp. 350-364). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martino, W. (2008). The lure of hegemonic masculinity: Investigating the dynamics of gender relations in male elementary school teachers' lives. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 21*(6), 575-603.

Martino, W. (2012a). Queering masculinities as a basis for gender democratization: Toward embracing a transgender imaginary. In C. Greig & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 205-236). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Martino, W. (2012b). "Undoing" gender and disrupting hegemonic masculinity: Embracing a transgender social imaginary. In B. Down & J. Smyth (Eds.), *Critical voices in teacher education: Teaching for social justice in conservative times* (pp. 125-138). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Martino, W. (In press). Masculinities, gender variance and the significance of queer and transgender perspectives in education. In E. Meyer & D. Carlson (Eds.), *Handbook of gender and sexuality in education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Martino, W., & Kehler, M. (2007). Gender-based literacy reform: A question of challenging or recuperating gender binaries. *Canadian Journal of Education, 30*(2), 406-431.

Martino, W., Kehler, M., & Weaver-Hightower, M. (Eds.). (2009). *The problem with boys' education: Beyond the backlash*. New York: Routledge.

Martino, W., Lingard, B., & Mills, M. (2004). Issues in boys' education: A question of teacher threshold knowledges? *Gender and Education, 16*(4), 435-454.

Martino, W., & Mellor, B. (1995). *Gendered fictions*. Cottesloe, Western Australia: Chalkface.

Martino, W., & Mellor, B. (2000). *Gendered fictions*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Martino, W., & Meyenn, B. (Eds.). (2001). *What about the boys? Issues of masculinity and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Martino, W., & Meyenn, B. (2002). 'War, guns and cool, tough things': Interrogating single-sex classes as a strategy for engaging boys in English. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 32*(3), 303-324.

Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2001). *Boys' stuff: Boys talk about what really matters*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). *So what's a boy? Addressing issues of masculinity and schooling*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2005). *'Being normal is the only way to be': Adolescent perspectives on gender and school*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.

Martino, W., & Rezai-Rashti, G. (2012a). *Gender, race and the politics of role modelling: The influence of male teachers*. New York: Routledge.

Martino, W., & Rezai-Rashti, G. (2012b). Neo-liberal accountability and boys' underachievement: Steering education policy by numbers in the Ontario context. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(4), 423-440.

Martino, W., Mills, M., & Lingard, B. (2005). Interrogating single-sex classes as a strategy for addressing boys' educational and social needs. *Oxford Review of Education, 31*(2), 237-254.

McCarthy, C. (1998). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affiliation*. New York: Routledge.

Milligan, S., Thomson, K., Ashenden, D., & Associates. (1992). *"Listening to girls." A report of the consultancy undertaken for the review of the National Policy for the Education of Girls conducted by the Australian Education Council, 1991*. Carlton, Australia: Curriculum Corporation.

Simpson, M. (1996). *It's a queer world*. London: Vintage.

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2009). *Feminism and "the schooling scandal."* London: Routledge.

Taylor, S. (2003) Discourses of difference in gender equity policy in Australian education: Feminism and marginalisation. *Melbourne Studies in Education*, *44*(2), 49-67.

Weaver-Hightower, M. (2003). The 'boy turn' in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(4), 471–498.

Yates, L. (1993). What happens when feminism is an agenda of the state?: Feminist theory and the case of education policy in Australia. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 14*(1), 17-29.

Yeatman, A. (1990). *Bureaucrats, technocrats, femocrats: Essays on the contemporary Australian state*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Wayne J. Martino
Professor
University of Western Ontario

JULIE McLEOD

HISTORY, PLACE AND GENERATION

Working in Gender and Education from Australia

I broached the writing of this essay with some trepidation, and not just with the usual worries of whether the writing will come together. There was also some hesitation in reflecting directly and publicly on the trajectory of one's work, despite the injunctions of the autobiographical turn and the knowledge that the personal is political, and epistemological, and methodological, and because intellectual autobiography can also often be indulgent and monotonous. I have had an uncertain journey across the field that is known as gender and education, even before my time as a secondary school teacher, but certainly then, during my time as a lecturer in Women's Studies, through the process of completing my PhD and then onto work in university schools of education. I have recently become joint editor of the international journal *Gender and Education*, an appointment that in itself prompts an introspective assessment about the field of gender and education today and about the type of research and writing that does or should or could fall within the journal's remit.

In this essay, I offer some reflections on my engagement with changing intellectual and reform agendas in gender and feminist research in education, and I reflect on how I have attempted to make sense of those, including some of the persistent questions that have animated my own work. This is, in part, an historical endeavour, recalling the problems and issues that first grabbed my attention and then reconstructing an intelligible narrative from what was, at the time, a series of often-difficult collisions between biographical experiences, political and educational reforms and theoretical tensions within feminism. In this task, as across much of my work, one of my overriding interests has been in building historical perspectives on feminism in education. This has encompassed writing on the history and effects of feminism in education and on the history of ideas about gender in education and associated curriculum and other reform discourses, historicizing what might seem to be the common senses about feminism and its object of enquiry. I have also explored how gender relations and identities are mediated in the educational experiences of young people, especially in the school and out-of-school lives of socially marginalized young women and men. I have wanted to understand how processes of subjectivity intersect with schooling and with relations of difference and inequality; this research has encompassed qualitative, historical and theoretical studies. Given the time at which I began academic work (1990s), it is perhaps not surprising that these historical interests developed in conjunction with a critical engagement with Foucauldian scholarship

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 179–191.

(Foucault 1982, 1984, 1988). While at times I have been frustrated by certain Foucauldian fashions and the rigid and unimaginative ways in which some of these ideas have been "used" in educational research, their formative imprint on my thinking remains evident. This is most clear in a continuing interest in the history of subjectivity and the history of ideas about education. Through my more recent work on the history of adolescence and citizenship education, I have been looking at the state of contemporary history of education. In the context of declining institutional support for and scholarly interest in the history of education, at least in Australia, I have been advocating a renewal of historical enquiry and greater attention to fostering historical sensibilities and questions in education research in general, as well as more specifically in feminism and gender studies in education. This invites reflection on the work of memory and forgetting in educational research, and these motifs are returned to below.

At an early stage in my doctorate in the 1990s, I came across the phrase "the autobiography of the question," used by the English educational researcher Jane Miller (1995). Independently of what Miller meant by the phrase, I found it provocative, and helpful for thinking about the history of ideas in feminism and education. It urged, it seemed to me, a focus on the histories attending the questions we posed, or on understanding why something emerged or was perceived as a problem demanding attention at a particular time; it also urged a focus on why certain ideas and theories become popular or recede from view. No doubt this phrase stayed with me as it resonated with a persistent question from my doctoral supervisor, Lyn Yates (see also this volume): "Why is this a problem now?" she would ask, as I tried to formulate a response to her other questions about what was this thesis about. These pedagogical exchanges shaped my thinking profoundly, and in ways that have gone far beyond what we were talking about at the time. Thinking about the "autobiography of the question" was a helpful antidote to the then-dominant call to personalize one's research questions, to tell the story of why the question mattered to you or how you came to study the topic. Particularly among qualitative and feminist researchers, this was a favoured way then—and even now—of framing introductions to books and theses. Such work is not unimportant and can produce insightful reflexivity. However, the seemingly simple notion of an "autobiography of the question" encouraged me to look afresh at the intersection of the history of ideas with individual biographies. It is this space of intersection—between subjectivity and history—that intrigues me. Much of my work, in one way or another, seeks to better understand this, mostly in relation to gender, young people and schooling.

Looking back, such concerns about the personal turn may now seem all rather overblown and probably self-evident. Yet at that time, issues of how research narratives are told in the full light of debates about the partiality and contingency of knowledge claims, alongside the insistence to bring forward feminist insights into the very conduct and representation of research, felt very pressing indeed. This not only tells something about the history of feminist thinking in education, but it also points to ways in which apparently personal and autobiographical responses

are fundamentally interwoven with generational moods, with the zeitgeist of the times.

ON NOT BEING A TEACHER

I never really wanted to be a teacher, despite knowing others thought it would be a good job for me—a clever girl from the country. I was marked out as a feminist in my high school, not a particularly flattering identification, not so much because of the blue-stocking association but because by then feminist meant cranky, full-of-herself and a bit extreme. I was determined to go to university, in the classic narrative of escape and dreams of fulfillment. I really did not know much about life at such a place; it seemed magically seductive and I simply desired to go, to be there. I had so very little idea of what I would do there or indeed what would happen afterwards. Mostly it was a series of negatives: I would not get married, I would not live out some tedious existence doing a meaningless job, I would not learn for instrumental reasons but only for the sake of it, and mostly I would not teach; nothing surprising in those romantic yearnings, for a girl of my class background and generation. Yet, the combination of certain circumstances—historical, material and accidental—meant that I applied for and was offered a "studentship" from the Victorian state Department of Education. The year I applied for it, the second year of my Bachelor of Arts at the University of Melbourne, was the last year that these scholarships were offered. I was on the cusp of a generational shift, but I did not realise that then, and nor did I realise what taking that scholarship would inaugurate for me, despite all my protestations to the contrary.

The studentship scheme was a form of contracted labour, whereby the Education Department paid you a living allowance while you completed your studies (I found it a relatively generous allowance at the time), and in return you were "bonded" to the Department to teach for three years after you graduated. The Department could send you anywhere, and especially to hard-to-staff schools. The studentship scheme arose at a time when there was a need to attract more people into teaching to staff the expanding post-war school system. It made it possible for many young people from families who had no or limited experience of tertiary education to go to teachers college and some to university—this too was part of my story. This opened enormous opportunities, especially for young women who could leave home and support themselves. It also transformed the teaching service, offered modest class mobility for a generation, and created a cohort of well-educated women coming into teaching at the time of second-wave feminism. By the time I took the studentship, the scheme was at the end of its life, but its legacies remained powerful. I decided to apply for the studentship as I was trying to fund myself living away from home, trying to make a life for myself as an independent young woman, and I could not work out a better way to do so. I did not really believe that the future would happen in the way the terms of the studentship supposed. I imagined further escape, or endlessly deferred teaching because of my absorption in ever more study. I was by turns overwhelmed and engrossed by my studies in

history and English, specializing in women's history and twentieth century literature and literary theory. Things went relatively smoothly—well, in some respects—for a few years, and I extended my BA into an honours year, travelled overseas, made plans for an MA, and thought no more of the dim prospect of classroom teaching. However, my plans were thwarted when a terse letter arrived from the Education Department, advising me that I needed to enroll in a teacher training course or repay the funds.

I reluctantly began a Diploma of Education, easily cowered by the threat of bureaucratic punishment, and commenced classes with a regrettably dismissive and, I suspect, supercilious attitude, privately sure that it really was not for me. It was the early 1980s, and the Diploma of Education program at the University of Melbourne had on offer several streams. I chose the program focused on teaching in disadvantaged schools—not simply as an expression of political virtue but because it offered a seminar-based program with about 30 students, had an interesting looking reading list and did not seem to have much to do with actually teaching students; that suited me perfectly. The course had been shaped by a group of sociologists influenced (I can now see) by scholarship in the new sociology of education, ideas coming from the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (BCCSS) and the work of Pierre Bourdieu. Against my firm intentions, I was riveted. Over the first few weeks of classes, and before we were sent out on teaching practicum, I read and discussed and queried and argued, and I began to think of education and schooling differently: I began to imagine myself having a different kind of future relation to it. From that intense time of new experiences, including negotiating the shifting identity-position from student to teacher, I recall reading Bourdieu's (1976) essay on "School as a Conservative Force". This jolted me into understanding my own experience of schooling and university in a new light, helped me to see the ways in which I had diligently tried to acquire cultural capital, to mimic but never quite succeed in getting right the habitus of student-at-elite-university: I'd tried too hard, betraying my fringe status. The BCCCS work introduced me to new ways of thinking about cultural reproduction and resistance, to the romance of subculture and also to the feminist critiques of those oppositional yet still heroically masculine narratives; even if the feminist critiques were presented as a bit on the side, they nevertheless unsettled the authority of certain ways of seeing and not-seeing.

Today, with teacher education programs framed on skills and diagnostic techniques and desires for evidence-based interventions, it is hard to imagine that such a course would get accredited. But it worked for me. It turned me into someone interested in schools and wanting to teach in them, at least for a while, and it created a longer-term passion for understanding the cultural, historical and subjective contexts that frame and make possible educational projects—biographically and collectively.

FEMINISM AND FEMININITY IN EDUCATION

My early forays into feminist research in education were shaped by poststructural discussions about subjectivity and the meaning of the category "Woman." Even then, it was familiar enough to register the ways in which Woman (or Man) had been a dangerous and exclusionary category, presenting an illusory collective and subjective unity, obscuring differences between and among women (e.g., Hirsch & Fox Keller, 1990). In much of this work, the construction of identity—historically, discursively, psychically—was emphasised. This interrogation of subjectivity did not, of course, go unchallenged. Many feminists feared that such a skeptical approach to identity risked undermining the political efficacy of feminism because it obliterated (once again) women's agency and denied the continuities and commonalities in women's experiences (e.g., Nicholson, 1990).

Such questions about gender identity were not only contested at the level of high feminist theory. They were being confronted and worked through in many domains of public and private life, and in many forms of feminist politics. When I began my doctoral research, I wanted to examine how questions of identity and gender difference had been taken up by feminists in the domain of state education. I did so by investigating the history (from 1975) of feminist educational reforms in Victorian state schools and the ideals of gender difference articulated in these reforms. I focused particularly on developments in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the period immediately preceding my own first experiences of classroom teaching.

During the mid-1980s, I began teaching in a working-class state secondary school in a deindustrialising part of the western suburbs of Melbourne; the school had a bad reputation and a self-conscious identity as a tough school. My early teaching years coincided with a period of significant policy development in Victorian state education, with inquiries into all levels of the secondary curriculum and the organisational structure of schools. It was an exciting, if often confusing, time for teachers. New guidelines and professional literature, it felt at the time, were being distributed almost weekly. There was a strong emphasis on equity and access, and many innovations looked to ways of making the curriculum more democratic and participatory. The popular shorthand for such approaches was "inclusive curriculum," an approach to curriculum which sought to *include* the experiences and values of previously excluded and marginalised groups, specifically girls and students from working-class and ethnic minority backgrounds (Yates, 1993).

A commitment to inclusive curriculum rapidly became orthodox in progressive and feminist educational discussions in Australia during the mid 1980s (McLeod, 2001). The notion of a curriculum as "inclusive" was drawn from discussions in the early 1980s about sexually-inclusive curriculum, that is, a curriculum which was sensitive to girls' values, learning styles and interests. As a young and enthusiastic teacher, I had worked hard to persuade my colleagues that we had a responsibility to work against sexism. I was a classroom teacher as well as the school's equal opportunity coordinator, so I spent a considerable amount of time working through all the "advice literature" on non-sexist education and sexually-

inclusive curriculum. With the support of two or three teachers, I organised in-services, guest speakers, and curriculum resources on non-sexist education and established an equal opportunity committee for the school. I was committed to the feminist project in schools, and much of my identity as a teacher was tied up with being recognised as a feminist teacher. Most of my colleagues were at best indifferent or often hostile to these feminist reforms and to exhortations to monitor and change their teaching practice. This was a frustrating and disheartening experience, but it also started me thinking more critically about what feminist reforms demanded of teachers. How were teachers expected to change their attitudes and their practice? How were teachers to treat and regard girls and boys? What did the new feminist norms of professional conduct involve? Feminist teachers, and the equal opportunity advice literature I endorsed, seemed to have taken on supervisory and disciplinary roles, yet then I had no language for analysing this suspicion, or for understanding why I found it unsettling. Much later, I began to understand this as an example of how feminism itself has disciplinary effects, even as it fulfills its emancipatory project. This paradox about feminism struck me first as a feminist teacher, and examining it seemed to me a crucial part of any attempt to understand the recent history of feminism and schooling.

During my time as a secondary teacher, I was also unsettled by the rhetoric of sexually-inclusive curriculum and its assumptions about feminine characteristics—girls' styles of learning. Girls, the professional literature then advised, were more likely than boys to prefer the collaborative, non-competitive, discussion- and process-based learning that occurred in a democratic classroom that was sensitive to the social context and production of knowledge. I found such formulations about curriculum and girls troubling: They reiterated conventional qualities of femininity—despite their positive inflection—and risked reinscribing girls and women as other to rationality.

These feminist truths about girls also produced an unsettling professional conflict. Although I was expected to encourage my colleagues to teach in sexually-inclusive ways, I simply did not believe that girls were intrinsically more cooperative, affective and intuitive than boys. As a theory-fed feminist, I elaborately rejected the essentialist assumptions underpinning this approach to feminist educational reform. I was struck, as well, by how these feminist reforms were (in retrospect, perhaps not surprisingly) indifferent to then contemporary debates in feminist and social theory about the "discursive construction of subjectivity" and the "decentering of subjectivity," debates which to my mind made the sexually-inclusive curriculum project politically and intellectually suspect. By night, in reading groups, in endless discussions and doses of high theory, subjectivity and the category of "Woman" were being contested, made problematic and "de-essentialised." Yet, in my day-to-day teaching practice, I was expected to believe and to act as if women and girls were stable, commonsense categories and knowable entities with inherent and essential characteristics, which were a repetition of those qualities that, conventionally, had made women marginal and powerless. Out of this collision and disjunction of ideas the groundwork was laid for much of my subsequent research on feminism in education.

I began thinking about feminist educational reforms in terms of the truths they constituted about gender identity and difference, and I started to explore the different form these truths had taken. The problem for me was how to understand gender identity and gender difference—as it confronted both feminist theory and feminist educational practice. I was influenced in this early work by an essay from Teresa de Lauretis (1987), which explored the idea of "a technology of gender." Influenced by Foucault, de Lauretis proposed that gender is "the product and process of a number of social technologies," "such as cinema [or schooling], and of institutionalised discourses, epistemologies, and critical practices, as well as practices of daily life" (1987, pp. 2-3). I argued that educational reforms and pedagogical practices were technologies that help produce gender and that feminism itself is part of this process. Feminism does not simply critique particular ideals and gender relations or liberate people from narrow roles—it too (re)constructs gender and establishes normative subject positions. "Paradoxically … the construction of gender is also effected by its deconstruction," wrote de Lauretis (p. 3). Extending this line of argument, I wanted to understand feminist educational reforms *and* feminist theorising as having effects on thinking and practice, to see both of them as deconstructive and also constructive of gender. These early thoughts turned into a series of genealogical studies of feminist regimes of truth about gender identity and gender difference, with a focus on feminist educational reform as a governmental project (McLeod, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2006).

Following this, my work went in two main directions—a longitudinal study of young people and a focus on contemporary gender differences in educational experiences. Both were more focused on qualitative research and on trying to grasp the process and experience of subjectivity in formation, and in interaction with schooling. These projects also led me to engage with a different yet I think complementary range of sociological theory, notably the work of Bourdieu and feminist debates about justice and inequality. But, before detouring to that part of the story, I want to say a little more about feminism and regulation, hand-in-hand with its emancipatory promises.

FROM WOMEN'S STUDIES TO EDUCATION

My early work developed into a continuing interest in the history and effects of feminist and other progressive ideas in education. In telling this story of my coming to knowledge about the paradoxes of feminism and the history of ideas, I have so far excluded any mention of my concurrent work as a lecturer in a university department of women's studies. Yet this was very formative in shaping my genealogical and governmental analyses of feminism, though I did not fully grasp this at the time. After teaching in secondary schools and language centres for a few years, I returned to study an M.Ed, holding down various casual academic teaching and research jobs, culminating in part-time, then full-time and finally a tenured lectureship in women's studies. While finishing my doctorate, I was straddling two academic worlds—education and women's studies—seeing how and why they belonged together, but encountering some difficulties in working out

how to place my work in institutional contexts and in the machinations of disciplinary specialization. I could call this an interdisciplinary endeavour and in a way it was, but practically it was also hard trying to juggle the two, on top of having a new baby.

The really hard part, though, was a kind of crisis of faith in the mission of women' studies, provoked by the convergence of local feminist and essentializing identity politics and my concerns about the epistemological and methodological claims of this new area of study (McLeod, 2009). This was exacerbated by working in a women's studies department in which the dominant ethos was a deeply skeptical view about poststructuralism, a philosophy that came down on the side of women's studies as an empowerment project, seeing it as the "educational arm of the women's liberation movement" and all-powerfully confident ideas about what constituted the proper politics of feminism. I was clearly on the wrong side, and often I needed reminding about what the good feminist looked like and believed. It was no simple co-incidence that I was intrigued by the normative and regulatory dimensions of feminism, as a body of ideas, as a movement for change. The opportunity arose for me to take a postdoctoral fellowship in the Faculty of Education at Deakin University, and in the late 1990s, I made the switch. This was not a matter of leaving feminism behind. On the contrary, I had moved to a place where feminism, gender relations, and social theory were centre stage, and where, simultaneously, I was able to rethink feminism and its history in education from a different vantage point—when it was not the default point of view, and when many interesting, if troubling, developments were underway in schools and education policy regarding gender; this was a very rich and exciting time in my intellectual development.

Much has been written about what Weaver-Hightower (2003) terms "the boy turn" in education during the 1990s. My new position in education coincided with this, paradoxically opening up new opportunities for me, as much as I was frustrated and disturbed by its antifeminist discourse and simplifying assessment of gender inequality. The backlash against prioritising the education of girls was at a fever pitch in Australia, fuelled by the conservative federal government whose influential members were convinced that boys were missing out and that schooling—assessment, curriculum, the teaching service—had been completely "feminised." In 1999, with my colleagues Jane Kenway and Cherry Collins, I was awarded a consultancy from the Australia Commonwealth Government to investigate *Factors Influencing the Educational Performance of Males and Females at School and Their Initial Destinations after Leaving School* (2000). The recommendations from this report were not well regarded by the commissioning body, among them that boys as a group were not the new disadvantaged and that the gender equity initiatives needed to take account of the salience of class and other social differences, and to ask "which girls and which boys" rather than universalize the experience and consequences of gender (dis)advantage in education. This was simultaneously frustrating and galvanizing work, my first major encounter with directly trying to influence national policy—and a different type of encounter with forms of governance and governmentality.

One striking finding from this report was the unequivocal evidence that girls who left school early were among the most economically and socially disadvantaged groups of young people. This spurred for me a series of projects with colleagues on marginalized young people and the biographical and socio-spatial dimensions of their educational experience and (imagined) futures. This included (with Jane Kenway, Alison MacKinnon and Andrea Allard), a cross-generational study of young women and their mothers living on the socio-spatial fringes of two Australian cities (McLeod & Allard, 2007); and a comparative study (with Jo-Anne Dillabough) of young people living in inner urban public housing in Canada, Australia and the UK (McLeod, 2012). These studies were informed by my explorations of feminist engagements with the work of Pierre Bourdieu (McLeod, 2005; Kenway & McLeod, 2004). Bourdieu's analyses had played a large role in enticing me into educational research, particularly his notions of cultural capital and habitus.

In returning to these ideas some time later, in the midst of a massive revival of interest in Bourdieu's work among sociologists of education and feminist scholars, I tried to distinguish between habitus as a resource for theorizing gender identity formation, and the relevance of the habitus/field relation for developing a feminist analysis of transformations in gender. In many adaptations of these concepts, there is a tendency towards reproductionist versions of "gender socialization" (McLeod, 2005). Influenced by Lois McNay's (2000) rethinking of these concepts in relation to gender, I wanted to understand the "instability of gender norms" and the contradictions, rather than alignments, between different social fields; for example the effect on gender identities as women cross different fields—the labour market, domestic worlds—and experience varying degrees of autonomy and subordination. I was equally interested in scrutinizing the renewed interest in Bourdieu, "to see it not as signaling a return to 'truth' [against poststructural indeterminacy, for example], but as a significant and contested issue in the history of ideas in educational and gender research." I understood this as part of what Bourdieu described as the task of reflexive sociology, "one that attempts to understand and reflect upon the systems of reason … that govern our enquiries, the questions we ask, and the readings we make" (McLeod, 2005, p. 26).

GENDER AS PROCESS AND PROJECT—*MAKING MODERN LIVES*

Some related problematics were explored in a project that spanned the better part of a decade, a qualitative longitudinal study of young people from the ages of 12 to 18 as they moved through secondary school. This was conducted with Lyn Yates and the major book from the project is *Making Modern Lives: Subjectivity, Schooling and Social Change* (McLeod & Yates, 2006). In the mid 1990s, when Lyn and I began work on this longitudinal study, I had been immersed for a while in theoretical debates about subjectivity and gender. I wanted to approach these issues from another angle, to research subjectivity in formation, to gain insight into the process of becoming someone through an empirically and theoretically driven

project. The opening paragraph of our book captures the mix of theoretical, methodological and substantive questions that motivated us:

> This book is about young women and men shaping their lives as they move through the years of secondary schooling and into the world beyond. It is also a discussion about how both the personal and the big picture are significant in researching and theorizing social change and an ongoing reflection about how one researches subjectivity. The book is framed by concerns about education and about inequalities, differences and changes in education. The stories we tell and the arguments we make are an attempt to foreground things we think matter both in education and in understanding subjectivity, schooling and changing times. (McLeod & Yates, 2006, p. 1)

We wanted to explore how gender relations and gender identities were changing in a particular historical period, after the impact of feminism on schooling in the 1970s and 80s, and at time when many social reforms associated with feminism were a familiar part of public discourse. While inequality was a major focus, our questions were not only "who gets what" in terms of retention, success rates, entry to higher education and so forth, but "What kinds of people and agendas are formed by particular school environments?" We examined the formation of gender over time, in student biographies and in cohort experiences, as a project of the self, and as a process of becoming. At the same time, we were examining the theories then widely adopted to account for gender, subjectivity and social change. We argued that on the whole they were of limited value for capturing the complexity, unevenness and double-edged character of gender changes underway; it was not, for example, simply a story of late modernity and risk biographies, nor was it a straightforward story of de-traditionalisation of gender norms. Reflections on methodology—how do you research subjectivity in process, and over time—and theoretical resources were central to the study. We saw value in keeping different theoretical approaches in view, to set against each other—for example, psychological insights into identity and sociological accounts of schooling, or cultural studies scholarship about social change. Obviously, this produced tensions and contradictory ways of seeing, but it was precisely this that we wanted to highlight and explore—the ways in which accounting for subjectivity in interaction with schooling exceeds a single paradigm or theoretical solution.

METHODS, MOTIFS AND MEMORY

An interest in methodological and theoretical approaches to understanding social change and subjectivity also led me to a collaboration with Rachel Thomson. Our work together resulted in the book *Researching Social Change: Qualitative Approaches* (2009). When Rachel and I first met, we were struck by what seemed an uncanny coincidence in the type of research projects we were undertaking. We were both doing qualitative, longitudinal studies of young people—Rachel in the UK, me in Australia—and similar theoretical and methodological dilemmas preoccupied us. We began to develop an idea for a book

on researching change in personal and social life, alert to the possibilities afforded by a focus on temporality, and the challenge of trying to capture dual processes of change and continuity, mediated across biographies, generations and history. Informed by our own involvements in feminist projects, many of the case studies and examples we drew upon and the problems we attempted to illuminate privileged relations of gender, family dynamics, and the crossovers between personal and public worlds. We wanted to show the ways in which research methods (such as oral or life histories) can both document and effect change, the historical context for the emergence of methods (such as ethnography or memory work) and the complex and non-linear relations between past, present and future in situating the research and the researcher, and in the doing, constructing, and interpreting of research. In the course of thinking, writing and talking together, we developed a much keener sense of the ways in which our individual and shared interests were part of a larger generational mood. This in itself invited reflexive historical attention, especially in terms of research memory—of what ideas and methods we take forward from earlier times, what we forget and what we might want to think we reinvent.

More recently, I have been working on an historical study of Australian adolescence, 1930s–70s, with my colleague Katie Wright. Our study combines work on documentary and archival sources and oral history interviews with former students, teachers and education reformers. Themes of memory and forgetting resonate throughout this project. We are investigating what is recalled about schooling and what has been forgotten—or how it is has been recollected—about earlier educational reform efforts. Throughout the project, I have continued to explore this thing called subjectivity, in seeking to understand processes of change and continuity across generations, in the detail of personal stories and in the rhetorical claims of self-conscious reform discourses. Gender is of course always there, in that hard to pin down space at the intersection of subjectivity and history.

New questions and interests have also emerged for me, in part coming from a heightened sense of the context of working in and writing from Australia, a colonized and a colonizing nation, connected to the metropolitan North yet also peripheral to it. Examining the history of educational provision for Indigenous youth is one new line of research that has developed from my earlier studies of youth identities and schooling. This in turn has opened up a focus on transnational and postcolonial studies of educational reform, taking my interest in the history of educational ideas to explore shifting understandings about the educability of Indigenous and non-Indigenous young women and men: What counts as necessary knowledge and knowing for the ideal citizen? My forays into historical and comparative research have made me acutely aware of some of the silences, omissions and limitations that have marked my own work. They have also underlined the challenge of fully acknowledging the socio-spatial situatedness of research, the different national and political contexts in which knowledge about the gender and education field is defined—its exclusions and inclusions—and the complex transnational currents and histories that connect and disconnect us across time and space.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

McLeod, J. (1998). The promise of freedom and the regulation of gender—Feminist pedagogy in the 1970s. *Gender and Education*, *10*(4), 431-445.

McLeod, J. (2000). Subjectivity and schooling in a longitudinal study of secondary students. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *21*(4), 501-521.

McLeod, J. (2001). When poststructuralism meets gender. In K. Hultqvist & G. Dahlberg (Eds.), *Governing the child in the new millennium* (pp. 259-289). New York: Routledge.

McLeod, J. (2005). Feminists re-reading Bourdieu: Old debates and new questions about gender habitus and gender change. *Theory and Research in Education, 3*(1), 11-30.

McLeod, J., & Yates, L. (2006). *Making modern lives: Subjectivity, schooling and social change.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

McLeod, J., & Thomson, R. (2009). *Researching social change*: *Qualitative approaches*. London: Sage.

McLeod, J. (2009). What *was* poststructural feminism in education? In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. A Gandin (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 137-149). New York: Routledge.

McLeod, J. (2003). Why we interview now: Reflexivity and perspective in a longitudinal study. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *6*(3), 201-211.

McLeod, J. (2002). Working out intimacy: Young people and friendship in an age of reflexivity. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 23*(2), 211-226

McLeod, J. (2012). Vulnerability and the neo-liberal youth citizen: A view from Australia. *Comparative Education*, *48*(1), 11-26.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P. (1976). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In R. Dale, G. Esland, & M. MacDonald (Eds.), *Schooling and capitalism: A sociological reader* (pp. 110-117). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul with The Open University Press.

Bourdieu, P., et al. (1999). *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (P. P. Ferguson, Trans). Cambridge, England: Polity Press in association with Blackwell.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Collins, C., Kenway, J., & McLeod, J. (2000a). *Factors influencing the educational performance of males and females at school and their initial destinations after leaving school.* Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Collins, C., Kenway, J., & McLeod, J**.** (2000b). Gender debates we still have to have*. Australian Educational Researcher, 27*(3), 37-48.

De Lauretis, T. (1987). The technology of gender. In T. de Laurentis (Ed.), *Technologies of gender: Essays on theory, film, fiction* (pp. 1-30). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dillabough, J., McLeod, J., & Mills, M. (Eds.). (2008). Troubling gender and education [Special issue]. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(3).

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49). London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Chicago, IL: Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1984). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76-100). New York: Pantheon Books.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Couze, C., & Walkerdine, V. (1984). *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity.* London: Methuen.

Hirsch, M. & Fox Keller, E. (Eds.). (1990). *Conflicts in feminism*. New York: Routledge.

Kenway, J., & McLeod, J. (2004). Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and "spaces of points of view": Whose reflexivity, which perspective? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 25*(4), 525-544.
McLeod, J. (1998). The promise of freedom and the regulation of gender—Feminist pedagogy in the 1970s. *Gender and Education*, *10*(4), 431-445.
McLeod, J. (1999). Incitement or education? Contesting sex, curriculum and identity in schools. *Melbourne Studies in Education*, *40*(2), 7-39.
McLeod, J. (2001). When poststructuralism meets gender. In K. Hultqvist & G. Dahlberg (Eds.), *Governing the child in the new millennium* (pp. 259-289). New York: Routledge.
McLeod, J. (2005). Feminists re-reading Bourdieu: Old debates and new questions about gender habitus and gender change. *Theory and Research in Education, 3*(1), 11-30.
McLeod, J. (2006). Citizenship, schooling and the sex role in Australia—Making up students for the future. In T.S. Popkewitz, K. Petersson, & U. Olssen (Eds.), *The future is not what it appears to be* (pp. 220-241). Stockholm, Sweden: University of Stockholm Press.
McLeod, J. (2009). What *was* poststructural feminism in education? In M. W. Apple, W. Au, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 137-149). New York: Routledge.
McLeod, J. (2012). Vulnerability and the neo-liberal youth citizen: A view from Australia. *Comparative Education, 48*(1), 11-26.
McLeod, J., & Allard, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Learning from the margins: Young women, social exclusion and education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
McLeod, J., & Thomson, R. (2009). *Researching social change*: *Qualitative approaches*. London: Sage.
McLeod, J., & Yates, L. (2006). *Making modern lives: Subjectivity, schooling and social change.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
McNay, L. (2000). *Gender and agency: Reconfiguring the subject in feminist and social theory*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
Miller, J. (1995). Trick or treat? The autobiography of the question. *English Quarterly, 27*(3), 22-26.
Nicholson, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminism/postmodernism.* New York: Routledge.
Scott, J. W. (1988). *Gender and the politics of history*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Riley, D. (1988). *"Am I that name?" Feminism and the category of "women" in history.* London: MacMillan.
Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(4), 471-498
Yates, L. (1993). *The education of girls: Policy, research and the question of gender.* Melbourne, Australia: ACER.

Julie McLeod
Professor and Australian Research Council Future Fellow
Melbourne Graduate School of Education, University of Melbourne

MARTIN MILLS

MEN, FEMINISM AND EDUCATION

Personal Reflections

This has been extremely difficult chapter to write, more difficult than I had imagined when asked to make a contribution. I have written and rewritten it many times. I have wondered what could be of interest to readers I do not know. Auto-ethnography has never been a research methodology that appealed. What I have sought to do in this chapter is to provide a personal account of my background; it takes up much more space than does the account of my contributions to the education literature; it is my own experiences of schooling, my political past in civil liberties and anti-war movements, and various personal histories that have shaped my academic output. This is especially the case in relation to my use of feminist theory in my work. I hope that some of it is of interest.

Time and place are important in this personal reflection on my engagement with feminism and education. I want to begin in 2011 in Exeter, at the Gender and Education conference. I once knew Exeter reasonably well, as it was on the route I used to travel on many a school holiday between my home in Gloucestershire and my grandparents' home in Devon. That had been many years prior, and much had happened in the meantime. As I faced the conference on the first day, a few hours after arriving in the UK on a flight from Australia, my mouth was dry and I was far more nervous than I am usually when giving a presentation. I had been asked with my colleagues Jo-Anne Dillabough and Julie McLeod to address the conference that had been named after a special issue of Discourse that we had co-edited (see Dillabough et al., 2009). I began my presentation something like this:

> To some extent I am troubled by own presence at this conference. My mother was a feminist activist who worked in rape crisis centres, was arrested on numerous occasions at peace demonstrations and at anti-nuclear and civil liberties rallies, and was heavily involved in lesbian politics. She was once imprisoned for contempt of court for refusing to recognise the patriarchal construction of the court and turning her back on the magistrate. She went to university two years after I did, and some 15 years later completed her PhD, a year before me. It was on women who kill men in the public sphere (R. Mills, 1997). Through my mother, I have been in a privileged position in that I have been exposed to feminist politics through discussions with her and her friends since my late teens. In the process I was also exposed to many of the debates occurring amongst feminists about the place of men *in* feminism. My mother's position in the 1980s and early 90s, would have been that I should not be here. The legacy of that time still lingers with me.

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 193–204.

My mother had in the 1980s and 90s been a lesbian separatist feminist and had been scathing of men who wanted to participate in women's spaces. In accepting the invitation to speak at the conference I had wondered if there would be many women in the audience feeling that way. This moment at the conference was very confronting for me and, given its location, facilitated the reminiscing that forms the basis of this chapter.

What will become apparent in this chapter is that my mother is central to the development of my politics. She, the daughter of a Marks and Spencer store manager and a clerical worker, married my father, the son of a Welsh coal miner and theatre usher, at 17. I was born a year later just outside Brighton. I had my first experience of schooling in Sussex, not a particularly positive one; I was kept down in the first year for poor behaviour. Over the next few years, with a largely absent father, I spent time in several different primary schools, in Sussex, Gloucestershire, Devon and back to Gloucestershire. It was only in my last primary school where I finally felt settled. It was a tiny little three-teacher school in the Cotswolds. Here the teaching headteacher treated us with respect, although, on reflection, I don't think we engaged with any formal curriculum. I remember doing lots of reading and playing a lot of chess with the headteacher, Mr. Ridderford. It was the late 60s after all, and child centred education was starting to achieve some popularity (Lowe, 2007). It was here that I passed the 11 plus, an English exam used to stream children at age 11 within a highly differentiated schooling system. I learnt many years later, thanks to Pat Mahony, that boys entered grammar schools as a result of this test with much lower scores than did girls.

The next three years at a boys-only grammar school were not particularly glorious. I spent most of them on behaviour cards that had to be signed after every lesson, in detention for not doing homework, and being abused by male teachers who thought it was funny to lift students up by their sideburns. I remember that there were 33 students in my class in each of those three years, and, when they used to give place in class, I rarely made it out of the 30s. On very odd occasions, I would get into the top three for an English or history exam without any study. If it hadn't been for sport or the social aspects of schooling, I probably wouldn't have bothered going. My education was occurring at home. We couldn't afford television, so I read voraciously, and our family group had the kinds of discussion at home that I was to later have in university philosophy and politics classes about, for example, the existence of God and of evil, and about the merits of communism, trade unionism and equal pay for all. Many of my views of schooling began to take shape in those days, a dislike of authoritarianism, of elitism, of uniforms, of boys-only schools, of mindless rules, of boring classrooms, and of teacher authority without accountability. There were some good times at this school, but in the main it was an oppressive institution. Likewise, the England that I and my family were experiencing was oppressive.

Elsewhere in the country, the 1960s and early 70s were possibly being experienced as a time of optimism and hope, but not in our town. By the late 60s I had three other siblings, we had very little money, no car, my mother worked long hours in a pub, and my stepfather had to walk several miles to work, often in snow.

It was with great excitement in the new decade that brochures started appearing on our kitchen table, left surreptitiously by my mother, about assisted immigration programs to Canada, New Zealand and Australia. In late 1972 we joined a well-established Australian category of immigrants: the Ten Pound Pom. A new world. A new life. And Brisbane sunshine. Our arrival occurred almost simultaneously with one of the most significant periods in Australian political history: the election of the Whitlam Labor government after 23 years of conservative rule. This time we shared in a country's optimism. This does not mean that those early days were not hard; they were. But school improved (although it took me two goes at year 12 to make it to university), and we had a small house with a pool, a car and a TV. We did not miss England at all.

University was an eye opener. In the late 1970s The University of Queensland was still a site of radical political activity. Queensland at the time had a highly conservative government (which lasted 32 years, from 1957 to 1989). At various times during this period, including much of the time I was at university and for the decade following, the government attacked civil liberties in multiple ways, one of which was to ban political street marches. As a consequence, many people took part in illegal street marches and demonstrations, often overfilling the city's watch houses. Over the next few years I developed an interest in various movements that had engaged in civil disobedience and became increasingly involved in various non-violent political protests. During this time I began to read books critical of contemporary organisations, including schools, for example Illich (1973) and Goodman (1964). Up to this point, I had considered entering teaching, but these and other readings changed my mind, for at that time I had no intention of become part of the "ideological state apparatus" (Althusser, 1971). I became a committed deschooler and was involved in setting up seminars debating the merits of schooling and attempting to create (not very successfully) a "learning exchange" as an alternative form of education.

Whilst the Queensland government was highly conservative, various programs to improve university access had been set up by the recently deposed Labor Commonwealth government. My mother, who had left school at 15, was able to complete a senior school program externally and then obtained entry into, at the time, Queensland's newest university, Griffith. This too was a radicalising experience. Griffith was constructing itself as an "alternative" university, one where, amongst other things, the old discipline boundaries were challenged, where former well know student radicals were hired as tutors, and where dominant forms of assessment practices were challenged. My mother also became involved in various protest groups and we often found ourselves at the same demonstrations, in the same watch houses, and later in the same political action groups.

In 1981, I did what many young Australians do and headed overseas for a two year backpacking adventure in Europe. I arrived in London not long after the Brixton riots and was there during the Falklands War. It was here that I had some of my first experiences of engaging in conversations around radical and eco-feminism. There were discussions about the extent to which riots were a justifiable form of protest. Many of the women involved in the same protest groups I had

been working with were highly critical of the ways in which these riots reflected a masculinist form of protest. Many of these same women began making their involvement in the women-only Greenham Common protests their priority and, along with debates about the relationship between gendered violence and the military, were raising questions about the need for space free from men in their lives.

When I arrived back in Australia in late 1983, my mother was attending a women's peace camp at a US base in central Australia. Over the next few years we spent a lot of time together, even briefly sharing a house, often being arrested together, along with my other siblings, and attending the same political meetings. However, during most of the 80s she mainly lived in women-only houses and worked in separatist organisations and women's shelters. She became a well-known figure in Brisbane feminist and lesbian circles, which, perhaps undeservedly, gave me access to many of the conversations that radical feminists were engaging in at the time. For example, my mother often talked about some of the conversations that had occurred in meetings on, for example, who should be allowed into women's spaces and who not (boy children? transsexuals?), the extent to which all men should be viewed as potential rapists or not, and whether or not women who slept with men could be considered feminist. Sometimes these conversations went on around me. When I moved to Alice Springs in central Australia in the mid 80s, where I stayed for two years working for a local peace group, many of the same debates were occurring amongst those opposed to the nearby US base, Pine Gap. On many occasions I found myself echoing my mother's words at various protest camps organised at the base by the peace group as we were forced to justify the inclusion of designated women-only spaces at campsites.

Whilst living in Alice Springs I began an external postgraduate diploma in education to enable me to teach. I was in my late twenties and had still not entered the formal economy in any way (I had dropped out without dropping in) and my first daughter was about to be born. During this program I read Bowles and Gintis (1976), Postman (1980), Corrigan (1979), Willis (1977), Connell et al. (1982) and Apple (1982). It became apparent that the field of education was filled with people whose views were not too dissimilar from my own. However, it was also apparent that very few feminist writers had been in my set course readings. Upon completing my diploma, I enrolled in further education studies at The University of Queensland and discovered the writings of feminists such as Pat Mahony (1985; Jones & Mahony, 1989), Madeline Arnot and Gaby Weiner (Arnot & Weiner, 1989; Weiner & Arnot, 1987; Weiner, 1985) and Rosemary Deem (1984). Many of these works were foundational to my later scholarship.

In the early 1990s, after my second daughter was born, I began my first full time teaching job, in a government high school that had a reputation for being a bit "alternative." The alternative was perhaps an exaggeration, but because the school was the only government high school in Queensland to have an optional uniform, it attracted many young people who sought to express themselves through their dress. It was an interesting place to work. Not least because of the times. Queensland was

emerging from nearly three decades of conservative rule, during which time there had been serious corruption in both the police force and government.[1] As indicated earlier, the denial of civil liberties had been widespread and many who opposed the government were arrested, imprisoned and a secret police special branch file was kept on them. As one of those who fell into that category, I was in good company; they included future premiers of the state, sitting politicians, academics and trade unionists. In that context the new Labor government used language reflective of a commitment to social justice. My mother, for example, was hired as an advisor to the newly formed Women's Social Policy Unit. In education the government introduced a social justice strategy that sought to address many of the concerns raised by opposition to the previous regime. Many of the discourses that had been shaping my politics in the 1980s thus became legitimate in the climate in schools at that time. Thus, I was able to be involved in setting up both a staff and a student social justice group within the school at which I was teaching.

It was at this time that I began my academic writing. As part of my studies at The University of Queensland, I completed an honours thesis with Bob Lingard (who would later become a close friend and colleague; see also his essay, this volume) on the social justice groups at the school where I was working. Three publications eventuated from this thesis (Mills, 1995, 1996, 1997). For me the timing had been perfect; Queensland had a government that was articulating a concern with social justice (in government schools those seeking promotion had to demonstrate what they had done in their work to promote social justice, some schools created positions called Head of Department Social Justice, and an Equity Directorate was created within the education bureaucracy), thereby legitimising the creation of the student and teacher social justice groups at the school, which I later called Greenwall.[2] However, as became apparent through my experience, and that of others at Greenwall (see for example, McGregor, 2001), attempts to create more socially just forms of schooling often conflict with dominant schooling practices. Thus, when students attempted, for instance, to challenge teachers' understandings of gender equity (especially in relation to dress) and to raise issues of concern about homophobia in the school, they were constructed as troublemakers, as were the teachers who supported them (see Mills, 1996, 1997).

Towards the end of my five years of teaching in the mid-1990s, the boys debate was starting to surface in Queensland. As a result of my engagement with feminist politics and growing out of my role as a year nine coordinator, my interest in this debate related to the issue of boys and violence. This was the subject of my PhD and my first book (2001). In this work I sought to argue that the concerns being expressed in policy and the media about violence in schools were failing to address issues of masculinity and that any way forward had to take into account feminist and profeminist accounts of the way in which certain masculinities were being valorised within schools and the broader community. However, as the boys debate intensified and a men's rights (Farrell, 1993; Sommers, 2000) and, perhaps to a larger extent, a mythopoetic politics (Biddulph, 1997; Gurian, 1999) began to shape the debate, suggesting that there was a feminist "war on boys," I became more involved in critiquing this debate than working

around issues of violence (see for example, Mills, 2000, 2003; Lingard et al., 2009). In so doing I joined a growing number of academics who were concerned with the direction that the boys debate was going and were applying feminist and profeminist critiques (see for example, Epstein et al., 1998; Lingard & Douglas, 1999; Francis, 2000; Martino & Meyenn, 2001; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; Collins et al., 2000; Skelton, 2001; Francis & Skeleton, 2005; Jackson, 2006; Keddie, 2003, 2006; Weaver-Hightower, 2003, 2008). Many of these people became close friends.

During my PhD candidacy I was extremely lucky to have worked with Bob Lingard, the person who has had the greatest impact upon my academic career, and someone to whom I will always be grateful for his ongoing advice, intellectual input into my work, support and collaborations. Upon finishing my PhD, I was invited to work with him on a large consultancy that had been obtained from the state department of education; it was from this work that the concept of productive pedagogies was developed (see for example, Lingard et al., 2003; Hayes et al., 2006). In this work we sought to argue that whilst context, such as socioeconomic factors, racism, sexism, homophobia and other forms of discrimination, had an impact upon young people's experiences and outcomes from schooling, teachers did make a difference. I had travelled some distance from my very structuralist youth where I had once constructed teachers as, even if unwillingly so, "agents of the state." Finding spaces within schools and policy to further a social justice agenda had become critical in my work. For instance in my work with Amanda Keddie, we brought together our theorising of gender with productive pedagogies to highlight teacher practices that supported gender justice in schools (e.g., Keddie & Mills, 2007).

The boys debate in Australia also opened up other opportunities for raising important social justice issues. For example, whilst the claims about boys' underperformance at school are clearly exaggerated, there are valid concerns about how some boys are faring in schooling. For instance, in Australia, Indigenous boys face severe disadvantage at school and homophobia works to make some boys' experiences of schooling extremely unpleasant. Thus, whilst recognising that schools have also not worked well for Indigenous girls and that misogyny makes many girls' school lives miserable, there is a need for a language that enables us to talk about multiple differences at the same time as gender. For instance, as the boys debate has been problematised by those concerned with promoting gender justice, an increasing concern about "dangerous" boys has been surfacing (Archer, 2003; Francis, 2006). I have recently sought to engage with these concerns, with Amanda Keddie, by problematising various constructions of young men from marginalised racial, ethnic and religious backgrounds, particularly in the context of the "war on terror" (Mills & Keddie, 2010a, 2010b).

My most recent work is also grounded in my history. I have a lot of sympathy for those who do not find schooling a particularly positive experience. With my long term colleague and partner, Glenda McGregor, who I met on the first day of my very first permanent teaching job, I have returned to the field of alternative education (see for example, Mills & McGregor, 2010; McGregor & Mills, 2012). I

am still not convinced that schools, as they are currently conceived, can provide an appropriate form of education for young people. However, rather than critiquing current systems of schooling, my work has begun to focus on what can be learnt from schools and learning sites that operate on the margins of mainstream education. In this work, the feminist theory I have engaged with, along with other critical education theorists, will be central to understanding the ways in which many young people have been marginalised from or damaged by schooling (Francis & Mills, 2012).

SOME CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Out of this piecemeal personal history, I want to return to the opening and to the Exeter Gender and Education Conference, primarily to address and consider what it means for men to engage with feminist research and to use feminist theories. How men have been exposed to feminism, and how they have responded to this exposure, has been a source of some interest in the gender literature. There are the stories of men who claim to support women's rights whilst attacking feminism as going too far. For instance, there are men like Warren Farrell who in the 1970s argued that he supported the women's liberation movement, but later in 1993 went on to write the classic men's rights text, *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men are the Disposable Sex*. The anger in Farrell's work is palpable. For instance, throughout the book he provides examples of how women get away with murdering men, and he uses data to indicate that more men are in prison, die at work and die earlier than women. He suggests that these are all indicators of oppression, and that men are the new oppressed. This men's rights perspective was supplemented by the mythopoets who saw men as having been damaged by the feminist movement. For example, Robert Bly, a key figure in this movement, who also indicated that he once supported the feminist movement, later said of modern men: "If his wife or girlfriend, furious, shouts that he is 'chauvinist,' a 'sexist,' a 'man,' he doesn't fight back, but just takes it" (1991, p. 63). Men with views like Farrell and Bly are not uncommon. In seminars and workshops that I have given in schools on the boys and schooling debate, there have nearly always been men who argue that feminism has gone too far and that boys in schools, along with men generally, are suffering as a consequence. I once was told that "feminism" could be defined as the "opposite of misogyny: the 'hatred of men.'" Such men's relationship with feminism is obvious. However, the relationships that men who support, recognise and value feminist theorising have with feminism are more complex.

There are a number of difficult issues in relation to men engaging with feminist debates. For example, there is an understandable resentment by some women in the academy of men using feminist theory in ways that can get them promoted or, for example, appointed to women's or gender studies departments. There are also a number of women who argue that men have no right to use feminist theory. For example, a number of the feminist contributors to *Men in Feminism* (Jardine & Smith, 1987) took exception to the term *in*. "What do men think they are doing *in*

feminism?" some contributors asked (Braidotti, 1987; Jardine, 1987; Morris, 1987). When men work with feminist theory there are also decisions to be made that put them in opposition to some feminists. Feminism is not a unitary body of theory. Consequently, there are often divisions and tensions within feminism. Hence, profeminist men often have to make decisions, as Lingard and Douglas (1999) have indicated, about which feminisms to be "pro" in relation to particular issues. In my work on gender and violence, and later the boys debate, this involved trying to engaging with diverse forms of feminism in respectful ways.

In my view such respect can come through the recognition that a critical engagement with issues of social justice would be incomplete without an engagement with feminist theorising. It also means that that engagement recognises the tensions and debates within feminism and makes an attempt to understand these differences, whilst understanding that there are some debates in which men have no place, for example in relation to lesbian politics. However, to suggest that men cannot engage with feminism in supportive ways seems to me to suggest that it is not possible for anyone who benefits from a current system of oppression to act in ways that potentially undermine that privilege. History would suggest that this is not the case—for example, white South Africans who opposed apartheid, and middle class UK students who joined the miners' picket lines in the Thatcher years. However, why men, or others who are concerned about their own privilege, might be prepared to sacrifice some of that privilege, or what Connell (1995) called the "patriarchal dividend," is an important question.

Raewyn Connell has indicated in various places reasons why this might be (e.g., 1995; see also her essay, this volume). She suggests that these include both personal and political reasons. For instance, she claims that men who are close to their daughters, sisters, mothers, partners and other significant women in their lives have a "relational interest" in tackling gender injustices; that some heterosexual men can see how maintaining the present system of oppression can come at a cost to themselves in terms of health, relationships and emotional well-being (it is of course a cost some men are very willing to pay); and that men, like all human beings, have the capacity to develop the abilities to care for others and to develop a commitment to the principles of social justice. Some of these reasons are potentially problematic, and I have commented on them elsewhere (Mills, 2001). However, the important point made by Connell (1994, p. 5, original emphasis) is that: "Support for women's emancipation is always a *possible* stance for men."

This does not mean that I think men should be advocates *for* women or *in* feminism; that seems potentially patronising, a type of "white knight politics." Instead what seems to be important to me is for men to work out ways in which they can become allies of a feminist politics. When my daughters were in school, one asked me, "Why, when you have two daughters, do you write so much about boys?" I can't remember my answer. But if I was giving it today, it would be that, it is important for everyone to reflect upon their own privileges and to consider how, and at whose expense, such privileges have accrued. It is thus necessary, for example, for men and boys to question those privileges that have been acquired as

a consequence of the injustices faced by girls and women. My work on masculinities and schooling has been intended as a contribution to such questioning. This includes my more recent gender work that has been addressing the ways in which some boys have been oppressed by "war on terror" discourses. The work I have done and the contributions that I have sought to make to addressing inequities and social injustices by questioning privilege would not have been possible without an engagement with feminism. This essay has in part been a personal reflection on how I came to this position.

There are perhaps too many complexities involved in the acquisition of a politics to fully understand how any one person arrives at their particular position. My own experiences of schooling have had an influence on my views of education, these have been further shaped by my work in schools and in readings and work with colleagues in universities. My understanding of feminist theorising has been supported by many important friends and colleagues in the academy to whom I am very grateful and feel privileged to have worked. Having two daughters has also deepened my commitment to feminism. However, I would suggest my stance in relation to feminism is the product very much of my early personal engagement with the feminist politics of my mother and a broader engagement with the politics of social justice in various community organisations.

NOTES

[1] A number of politicians and police officers were later imprisoned, including Queensland's police commissioner, on corruption charges.

[2] Derived from Greenham Common and Stonewall as a consequence of the gender and sexuality issues raised by the different groups.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Mills, M., & Keddie, A. (2010). Gender justice and education: constructions of boys within discourses of resentment, neoliberalism and national security. *Educational Review, 62*(4), 407-420.

Mills, M., & Keddie, A. (2010). Cultural reductionism and the media: polarising discourses around schools, violence and masculinity in an age of terror. *Oxford Review of Education, 36*(4), 427-444.

Keddie, A., & Mills, M. (2007). *Teaching boys: Classroom practices that work*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Charlton, E., Mills, M., Martino, W., & Beckett, L. (2007). Sacrificial girls: A case study of the impact of streaming and setting on gender reform. *British Educational Research Journal*, *33*(4), 459-478.

Mills, M., Martino, W., & Lingard, B. (2007). Getting boys' education 'right': The Australian Government's parliamentary inquiry report as an exemplary instance of recuperative masculinity politics. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 28*(1), 5-21.

Mills, M., Martino, W., & Lingard, B. (2004). Issues in the male teacher debate: Masculinities, misogyny and homophobia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 25*(3), 355-369.

Mills, M. (2003). Shaping the boys' agenda: The backlash blockbusters. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *7*(1), 57-73.

Mills, M. (2001). *Challenging violence in schools: An issue of masculinities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mills, M. (2001). 'Pushing it to the max': Interrogating the risky business of being a boy. In W. Martino & B. Meyenn (Eds.), '*What about the boys?': Issues of masculinity and schooling* (pp. 53-65). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mills, M. (2000). Issues in implementing boys' programmes in schools: Male teachers and empowerment. *Gender and Education*, *12*(2), 221-238.

REFERENCES

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. (B. Brewster, Trans.). In L. Althusser, *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127-186). London: New Left Books.

Apple, M. (1982). *Education and power*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Archer, L. (2003). *Race, masculinity and schooling: Muslim boys and education*. Maidenhead, England: Open University press.

Arnot, M., & Weiner, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Gender and the politics of schooling.* London: Unwin Hyman

Askew, S., & Ross, C. (1988). *Boys don't cry: Boys and sexism in education*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Biddulph, S. (1997). *Raising boys: Why boys are different—And how to help them become happy and well-balanced men*. Sydney, Australia: Finch.

Bordo, S. (1998). My father the feminist. In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 17-32). New York: Routledge.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Braidotti, R. (1987). Envy: Or with your brains and my looks. In A. Jardine & P. Smith (Eds.), *Men in feminism* (pp. 233-241). New York: Methuen.

Collins, C., Kenway, J., & McLeod, J. (2000). *Factors influencing the educational performance of males and females in school and their initial destinations after leaving school.* Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs.

Connell, R. (1994). *The politics of changing men*. Reproducktion und Wandel von Mannlichkeit, 27-28 September, Munchen.

Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities.* St Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R., Ashenden, D., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, G. (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, families and social division*. Sydney, Australia: George Allen & Unwin.

Corrigan, P. (1979*). Schooling the Smash Street kids*. Basingstoke, England: MacMillan.

Deem, R. (Ed). (1984). *Co-education reconsidered.* Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Dillabough, J., McLeod, J., & Mills, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Troubling gender in education*. London: Routledge.

Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V., & Maw, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Failing boys? Issues in gender and achievement.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Farrell, W. (1993). *The myth of male power: Why men are the disposable sex*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Francis, B. (2000). *Boys, girls and achievement: Addressing the classroom issues*. London: Routledge

Francis, B. (2006). Heroes or zeroes? The discursive positioning of "underachieving boys" in English neo-liberal education policy. *Journal of Educational Policy, 21*(2), 187-200.

Francis, B., & Mills, M. (2012). Schools as damaging organisations: Instigating a dialogue concerning alternative models of schooling. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 20*(2), 251-271.

Francis, B., & Skelton, C. (2005). *Reassessing gender and achievement: Questioning contemporary key debates.* London: Routledge.

Goodman, P. (1964). *Compulsory mis-education.* New York: Horizon.

Gurian, M. (1999). *A fine young man: What parents, mentors, and educators can do to shape adolescent boys into exceptional men*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Hayes, D., Mills, M., Christie, P., & Lingard, B. (2006). *Teachers making a difference.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Illich, I. (1973). *Deschooling society*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Jackson, C. (2006). *Lads and ladettes in school: Gender and fear of failure.* Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Jardine, A. (1987). Men in feminism: Odor di uomo or compagnons de route? In A. Jardine & P. Smith (Eds.), *Men in feminism* (pp. 54-61). New York: Methuen.

Jardine, A., & Smith, P. (Eds.). (1987). *Men in feminism*. New York: Methuen.

Jones, C., & Mahony, P. (Eds). (1989). *Learning our lines: Sexuality and social control in education*. London: Women's Press.

Keddie, A. (2003). Little boys: Tomorrow's macho lads. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 24*(3), 289-306.

Keddie, A. (2006). Fighting, frustration, anger and tears: Matthew's story of hegemonic masculinity. *Oxford Review of Education, 32*(4), 521-534.

Keddie, A., & Mills, M. (2007). *Teaching boys: Classroom practices that work.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Lingard B., Martino, W., & Mills, M. (2009). *Boys and schooling: Contexts, issues and practices*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lingard, B., & Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging feminisms: Profeminism, backlashes and schooling*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D., Mills, M., & Christie, P. (2003). *Leading learning: Making hope practical in schools.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Lowe, R. (2007). *The death of progressive education: How teachers lost control of the classroom*. Abingdon, England: Routldege.

Mahony, P. (1985). *Schools for boys? Co-education reconsidered*. London: Hutchinson.

Martino, W., & Meyenn, B. (Eds.). (2001). *What about the boys?: Issues of masculinity and schooling*, Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). *So what's a boy? Addressing issues of masculinity and schooling*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

McGregor, G., & Mills, M. (2012). Alternative education sites and marginalised young people: "I wish there were more schools like this one." *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(8), 843-862.

McGregor, G. (2001). Towards a sociology of youth in new times. Unpublished PhD Thesis, The University of Queensland.

Mills, M. (1995). Setting the gender agenda: Doing too much or doing too little, an administrative dilemma. In B. Limerick & B. Lingard (Eds.), *Gender and changing educational management* (pp. 212-215). Rydalmere, Australia: Hodder Education.

Mills, M. (1996). Homophobia kills: Disruptive moments in the educational politics of legitimation. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 17*(3), 315-326.

Mills, M. (1997). Towards a disruptive pedagogy: Creating spaces for student and teacher resistance to social injustice. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 7*(1), 35-55.

Mills, M. (2000). Troubling the 'failing boys' discourse. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 21*(2), 237-246.

Mills, M. (2001). *Challenging violence in schools: An issue of masculinities*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Mills, M. (2003). Shaping the boys' agenda: The backlash blockbusters. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 7*(1), 57-73.

Mills, M., & Keddie, A. (2010a). Cultural reductionism and the media: Polarising discourses around schools, violence and masculinity in an age of terror. *Oxford Review of Education, 36*(4), 427-444.

Mills, M., & Keddie, A. (2010b). Gender justice and education: Constructions of boys within discourses of resentment, neoliberalism and national security. *Educational Review, 62*(4), 407-420.

Mills, M., & McGregor, G. (2010). *Re-engaging students in education: Success factors in alternative schools*. Brisbane, Australia: Youth Affairs Network Queensland.
Mills, R. (1997). In public places: The trials of Aileen Wuornos and Tracey Wiggington. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Griffith University.
Postman, N., &Weingartner, C. (1980). *Teaching as a subversive activity*. New York: Dell.
Skelton, C. (2001). *Schooling the boys: Masculinities and primary education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
Sommers, C. H. (2000). *The war against boys: How misguided feminism is harming our young men*. New York: Touchstone.
Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(4), 471-498.
Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2008). *The politics of policy in boys' education: Getting boys "right."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Weiner, G., & Arnot, M. (Ed). (1987). *Gender under scrutiny: New inquiries in education.* London: Hutchinson.
Weiner, G. (Ed). (1985). *Just a bunch of girls.* Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.
Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs.* Farnborough, England: Saxon House.

Martin Mills
Professor
The University of Queensland

DAVID SADKER

PIONEERING GENDER EQUITY IN EDUCATION: A LOVE STORY

(Or, Marrying into a Revolution)

My new wife Myra had been busily washing the floor when she eyed me sleeping peacefully on the couch. As she washed, she marvelled at how I could sleep through the noise, commotion and splashing sounds she was making. Her wonder matured, simmered, and morphed into action; that's when a pail of less than pristine water forever changed my life. That literal and figurative wake-up call would be one of many (although definitely the wettest) that I would receive over the decades alerting me to the sometimes hidden, sometimes obvious world of male privilege. But my story is our story. As a husband and wife team, we learned to share experiences and nurture insights, to discover the subtle but pervasive sexism that infected society and school. Today, that exploration continues. This chapter explores how that awareness has matured in recent years into more profound questions, as I examine not only sexism but the unseen world in the classroom

THE BRONX

I grew up in the Bronx, which at the time seemed like the luckiest break imaginable. After all, we were New Yorkers, the center of the universe, the place where all sorts of wondrous things happened. We simply call our home "the city," so central to our existence that no other noun is required. Museums, Broadway shows, the 42nd Street Library, 5th Avenue stores, Central Park, all you need in life is in Manhattan. But it did not take long for me to realize that I had missed that special island by just a few miles, but a distance greater than miles. Visit my Bronx neighborhood today and you would see a poor ghetto populated by working class families (at least the lucky ones are working), mostly immigrants speaking Spanish and dreaming of a better life. When I lived there more than half a century earlier, the setting was much the same, a poor community of immigrants dreaming of a better life, but in my time those dreams were in Yiddish.

My mother did the best she could, but parenting was not her skill, and alcohol her soft spot. My dad was hard working and devoted to me and to education, but he died when I was eight years old. My mother did not work outside the home, often slept in and was not very responsible getting me to school. In fact, I hold the distinct indignity of being expelled from kindergarten due to my less than stellar

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 205–216.

attendance record. Once that pattern of staying home was established, the next four school years were marked by excessive truancy, and my report cards reflected my absence. I was a Jewish kid in academic trouble, an anti-stereotype at a young age.

When I was ten, Mr. Fleischaker became my fifth grade teacher. He was not only a man (was a man allowed to teach?), but a man with an idea: even little ghetto kids can learn to play musical instruments. I was given a clarinet, and for reasons I never fully understood, my mother bought into the idea of music lessons. By this time, my mother had remarried and our financial security no longer rested on the profits of her parents' candy store. Now we had the additional income of my stepfather, a New York City taxicab driver. I had a stepfather at home and a surrogate father at school, and music in my life; my academic world was no longer a disaster. Music teachers took an interest in me, and ever so slowly, I was discovering a way out of the ghetto: music and school.

My challenge in high school was not surviving the academics; it was surviving the walk to and from school. My neighborhood was no longer a Jewish ghetto. In as long as it takes to load furniture on a truck and move elsewhere, it had become an even poorer African American and Puerto Rican ghetto, and crime had become more frequent. But music continued to be my life preserver. I had been admitted to the Manhattan School of Music (MSM), was concertmaster of the James Monroe High School orchestra, and had college in my sights.

CCNY AND HARVARD

Paying for college was another story. My fall back position was the same as every poor kid in New York, the almost free city colleges. I was accepted at City College of New York (CCNY), a school that in 1960 charged the stunning sum of $14 per semester (not $14 a credit, which would be darn good, but $14 a semester). My four years at college cost me a little more than one hundred dollars in fees, the price of my books, subway fare, and lunch money.

The City College of New York was founded in 1847 by Townsend Harris to offer higher education to the children of the working class and immigrants. It predated even the Midwestern state land-grant colleges. For me and countless others, CCNY was the ticket out of the ghetto. CCNY was Jeffersonian and echoed Horace Mann, for it nurtured "the natural genius" in the common man. And it was a success story. An extraordinary proportion of CCNY alumni went on to earn advanced degrees, and several won Noble Prizes, successful contributing citizens connected by a common thread: poverty. What talents, insights, inventions, and medical breakthroughs have we lost by not providing higher education to bright but poor students not growing up in New York at that time (Newfield, 2011)? Today, even quality public elementary and high schools are at risk (Ravitch, 2010). I did not need Jefferson, Mann, Newfield or Ravitch to explain to me my debt to quality public schools: I am here because public education was there.

In the early 1960s, I don't remember anyone using the term "affirmative action," but if they did, City College would have been an affirmative action magnet. Ivy League recruiters would visit to find students who "deserved a break." My senior

year I was interviewed by a representative of Harvard's Master of Arts in Teaching program, and admitted with enough funding to enable me to attend.

It is not surprising that I was drawn to teaching. Teachers turned my life around, and I felt more at home in a classroom than I did at home. As I think back, if my family were middle class, they likely would have pushed me toward a more prestigious career. Here's where being poor worked in my favor. For my family, teaching was prestigious.

In June 1964, I met Myra. We were teaching in neighboring classrooms in the Harvard-Newton Summer Program, and we were about to be introduced to sexism. I was nominated for membership to the honorary education fraternity, Phi Delta Kappa (PDK). Myra, who had a higher grade point average than I did, was not nominated—PDK was a fraternity. There was no corresponding prestigious honorary sorority at Harvard. Myra was hurt, and so was I. The early seeds of a future rebellion were sown: Myra being short-changed on the basis of gender, and me feeling her pain. A few years later, I nominated Myra for membership into the Harvard chapter of PDK as an alumna. Harvard approved her membership, even though she was female, and was promptly suspended by the national PDK organization. It would be years before PDK changed its rules and accepted women, but these actions began paving a new path for PDK, and us.

As graduation approached, we turned our attention to what was next. My plans were beyond negotiation: I had been in R.O.T.C. at CCNY, and was due to report to Fort Lee, Virginia, as a newly minted second lieutenant. Myra could move anywhere, teach anywhere. She chose another path. On July 4, 1965, Independence Day, we lost our independence, were married, and found 30 years of happiness together. Although we didn't know it at the time, that was also the beginning of our professional collaboration and our shared lessons in sexism, American style.

FROM THAILAND TO UMASS

To our delight, I was assigned to "train" instructors for the military (something I loved doing), and Myra found a position as an English instructor at Virginia State College, a historically black institution in nearby Petersburg. There was just one other white instructor at Virginia State, a Woodrow Wilson scholar. Virginia State taught us what segregated education had done. These African American students were woefully unprepared for college work, and their failure rate was astronomical. This culture of failure weighed heavily on Myra. She considered teaching somewhere else, but we soon discovered that was now impossible. Having taught in a black institution, Myra was now disqualified from employment in any of the neighboring white school systems in Virginia. After work, Myra came home exhausted, yet there was housework to do, and as everyone at that time knew, housework was women's work. Yes, we are back to the beginning of this chapter when a pail of water woke the napping lieutenant. After that lesson, we began doing the housework together, and in the 1960s, even that was unusual.

As the Vietnam War grew, I was reassigned to a unit going overseas, and Myra went to Maine to teach in The Job Corps, one of President Johnson's Great Society

programs. Luckily, my unit was not assigned to Vietnam, but to a B-52 support airbase in Thailand. My official duties ranged from education officer to managing the Post Exchange; my unofficial duty was finding a way to get Myra to Thailand. I visited local communities and recruited students for a new school, and when I had enough students (and enough tuition), Myra flew to Thailand as the school's teacher and administrator. When my tour was over, we applied for teaching positions in the Boston area. I was offered a job at Brookline High School, and Myra at Winchester Junior High School, where another lesson in sexism awaited our return.

Both Massachusetts school districts each gave us salary credit for our master's degrees, but I was given an additional two years of teaching credit and a still higher salary for my military service. Myra, who actually taught during those two years—at Virginia State, the Job Corps in Maine, and at her own school in Thailand—was given no credit. Because they were not public K-12 schools, they did not count. Many women who follow their husbands' careers teach where they can and are penalized as a class. I no longer needed a pail of water to awaken me to this injustice.

THE UMASS REVOLUTION

We loved teaching. I remember how I looked forward to going to school, how the joy of teaching filled my heart. But after many late hours of planning and grading, we were ready to explore other options. We had heard exciting stories of an amazing innovator with a coterie of colleagues and graduate students from Stanford University who was coming to the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. His name was Dwight Allen. I had stumbled upon a dream academic opportunity. I applied to the doctoral program.

I spent my first week in the doctoral program in the Rockies. The entire School of Education—doctoral students, faculty, administrators and support staff—was flown there, thanks to the Kettering Foundation, to plan our ideal school. I went on sunrise horseback rides, played touch football, survived discussions that went late into the night, and tried (often unsuccessfully) to distinguish faculty from students from support staff. While I was brainstorming our brave new education world, Myra was back in Amherst, attending classes in her English Ph.D. program, where she had won a full scholarship.

I returned home from the Rockies, excited about endless possibilities, and I eagerly told Myra about my week of dreaming new ideas. Then Myra told me about her Middle English course, where her professor announced that "By the end of this course, you will speak Middle English so well that Chaucer will look down from heaven and smile." She candidly confided to me that she did not much care if Chaucer smiled or not. My program sounded exciting, and hers did not. When she switched out of the English program and into the far less prestigious education doctoral program, people in the registrar's office were shocked. She gave up her fellowship and we had to make do on mine and the GI Bill. But her decision was the right one for her, and for all the students she would help to find their voice.

Our UMass revolution was in full swing. Visualize a school that abandons all courses and programs, and rebuilds from the ground up. Picture a school where five students can decide on a topic, issue, or skill that they want to learn, and the school would provide an instructor, a course, and credit for them to learn it. Imagine a school where parliamentary procedures, viewed as an impediment to democracy, were replaced by a Quaker-style meeting. Dream of a school where bureaucracy itself was targeted, departments replaced by centers that would automatically disappear in five years (our sunset rule) unless the center could convince the school community of its usefulness. Aesthetic, international and neonatology education centers operated alongside urban and teacher education centers. People wore buttons that proclaimed "The Right to Fail," and "No is not the right answer." Rich new ideas blossomed alongside terrible new ideas, the telltale signs of a thriving, vibrant place.

When the *Saturday Review* sent a reporter to Amherst to do a story on the school, he promptly enrolled in the doctoral program. When comedian Bill Cosby visited, he too decided this program rivalled show business and became a student. When was the last time you heard about a creative, effervescent school of education that rivalled journalism and show business? Our graduate students came from the Ivy League and historically black colleges, underscoring the school's commitment to racial equality. During our three-year doctoral program, Myra never discovered if Chaucer was smiling, but we were.

But there were times when the smiles disappeared. When Betty Friedan wrote *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), she referred to sex bias as "the problem that has no name." But that nameless bias was impacting both of us. At our community meetings, racism and multicultural issues were always on the front burner. Although sexism was rampant, no one seemed to notice. The most *avant garde* school of education in the nation was treating males and females quite differently. We would co-author proposals and articles, and people would refer to them as "David's article," and "David's proposal." When Myra mentioned her concern about her work being ignored to a faculty member, he assured her that when he said "David's article," he of course meant "David and Myra." Classroom life was similar. We would sit in the same class, listen to the same instructor, raise our hands to answer a question or make a comment, and I would be the one called on far more often. We were in the same doctoral program, and we were receiving two very different educations.

The School of Education had a weekly mimeographed newspaper (those were the days of messy purple ink copies) and unsurprisingly, the paper was called *Tabula Rasa*. We had rotating editorship and, when Myra was editor, she wrote an editorial entitled "The Only Acceptable Form of Discrimination," describing how it felt to be female and invisible in a doctoral program. As chance (or fate) would have it, her editorial was read by a professor serving as an editor for Harper and Row. He asked Myra if she would like to co-author a book with his journalist friend, Nancy Frazier, about what happens to girls in school. She did.

Myra's first book, *Sexism in School and Society* (1973) helped define the field. Before her book was published, any gender concern about schools was about society's prized gender, boys. *Why Johnny Can't Read: And What You Can Do About It* (1953) and *The Feminized Male: Classrooms, White Collars, and the Decline of Manliness* (1969) represented the way people viewed gender in schools. America's future depended on what kind of men our nation would produce. People thought then (and many do now), that well-behaved girls, who were already receiving good grades, were being groomed for their future roles as secretary, nurse, teacher, and eventually full-time mothers. But Myra and I had experienced what most had overlooked: an emerging intellectual current in America that would revolutionize women's roles.

It is difficult for people today to understand how challenging an issue this was. First, it had no name; without a name, you have no cause. When Myra used "sexism" in her book's title, it was a new word, coined just a few years earlier, and many people had no clue what *Sexism in School and Society* even meant. The publisher told us that more than a few customers were demanding their money back, having bought what they thought was a pornographic book.

While Myra was writing her book, we began researching and coauthoring articles about sexism. I focused on how gender role expectations limited boys' futures as well as girls, and we both continued working on our dissertations. In case you were wondering, gender was not considered an appropriate topic for dissertations, even at UMass, so dissertations had to be written on other topics. As we approached graduation, we began interviewing for teaching positions, and once again, sexism found us.

In 1971, Myra and I attended the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) conference, a major university job market. We were naïve enough to believe that with our growing list of publications, we had as a good a chance as anyone to be hired. But in interview after interview, we were told, "We don't hire married couples. We have a nepotism clause that prevents that." One school told us, "We would hire either one of you, but not both. You can choose." I can remember waiting my turn for yet another interview in the hallway of Chicago's Conrad Hilton Hotel, sitting on the floor, and writing my first article for *Phi Delta Kappan:* "Nepotism, A Clause for Concern" (Sadker & Sadker, 1972). Evidently, we had shown foolish judgment in getting married. What were we thinking? Like so much of our work, that article came from the heart.

We asked our professors what to do, and most suggested that I find a job first in an urban area, and then Myra could start job hunting in that same area. The idea that the rule against hiring married couples might be tackled head on was seen as impractical, and the notion that perhaps Myra find a position first and me second never entered the realm of possibility. That's how thinking was then. Worse yet, we were told that our research in gender bias would likely work against us in the job market, frightening away some potential employers.

In 1971, we eventually did find two positions at a new campus of the University of Wisconsin–Parkside in Kenosha. The University of Wisconsin did not prohibit married couples from working there. No, not because it was a progressive institution, but because the university had tried to fire a female professor a decade earlier when she married a member of the faculty, and it lost the court case. As a result, Wisconsin could no longer prohibit married couples from joining the faculty, and so, thanks to an early legal precedent, we were both working at the same university. Two years later we were recruited by American University in Washington, D.C., becoming the first married couple AU ever hired. In our interview, the Dean at American University offered us lower salaries than other new faculty recruits, explaining that we would be a two salary couple. We responded that we were two professors, for the price of two professors.

PROMOTING GENDER EQUITY

We spent the next two decades researching how sexism manifests in school life, from the earliest years through graduate school. We pointed out that if anthropologists were fish, the last thing they would discover would be the water. We are all like those fish, swimming in a sea of sexism. Sexism exists in urban, suburban, and rural schools, in wealthy and poor, diverse as well as homogeneous communities. In short, gender is a demographic that challenges all educators. In our three year study of over 100 fourth, sixth and eighth grade classrooms (1980-83), we discovered that teachers gave boys more attention, more lower- and higher-order questions, more praise, more help, and more criticism. Girls, on the other hand, were being rewarded for docile, conforming behavior with teacher gratitude and better report card grades. We found that sex segregated seating patterns were common, that textbooks and school displays either rendered females invisible or less important than males. We wrote that about 80 percent of school leaders were male, supervising the 80 percent of schoolteachers who were female. And these patterns existed not only in K-12 settings, but in higher education as well. Males outperformed females on high stakes tests, like the SATs and GREs, but trailed girls on report card grades, and no one asked why. One of our first studies in the 1970s was to content analyze teacher education textbooks. We discovered that they were more likely to promote than inhibit gender bias behaviors and attitudes in school. Stereotyped advice and prescriptions were commonplace, so teacher education had become part of the problem. (A replication of that study twenty years later showed some, but only limited, progress.)

I also provided training for teachers and wrote about the challenges encountered by males. In school, boys were being punished more frequently and more publicly than females, even when their misbehavior was no worse. The “boy code” of stoicism, toughness, competitiveness, power, and unemotional and aggressive behavior was a bravado that clashed with school culture. For boys of color, this boy-school conflict led to grade repeating or dropping out of school entirely. We spoke to audiences around the country on these issues and wrote scores of articles in both popular journals and academic outlets, but change was slow. We decided to

write a trade book for the general public, detailing how sexist behaviors and beliefs were limiting all our children. We thought if we could enlist the public, change was inevitable. But when we sent our book proposal to publishers in 1988, there was an underwhelming response.

Timing is critical in publishing. Four years later, the American Association of University Women published *How Schools Short-Change Girls* (1992), and it received national media attention. We had co-authored a chapter describing our research documenting bias in classroom interaction, and NBC's Jane Pauley was fascinated. She decided to feature our research on her new television show, *Dateline*. After the segment was broadcast, our new book agent once again sent our book proposal to publishers, but this time including a videotape of the *Dateline* show. The book that no one would publish four years earlier now went to auction: everyone wanted to publish it.

We were fortunate. *Failing at Fairness* (1994) made a big media splash, from Oprah Winfrey to the multiple appearances on the *Today Show* and *Good Morning America;* the first popular book about gender bias in schools was making its mark. We were overjoyed with the public reaction. Then Myra discovered a lump on her breast. She died nine months later; my darkness lasted many years.

During Myra's cancer treatment, and after her death, our work and our reputations were attacked by "backlash" critics (Faludi, 1991). This fierce opposition to gender equality shocked us. Critics, mostly women and all far right of the political center, began writing articles, books, and making media appearances accusing us and virtually all advocates of gender equity of falsifying data. They denied that gender bias even existed while accusing feminists of waging a "war" on boys. If the media had investigated these backlash opponents, they would have found very checkered backgrounds indeed, with little if any peer-reviewed research, numerous factual errors, and a history of support for some very bizarre right-wing ideas. In fact, Scaif, Carthage, Olin and other ultra-conservative foundations funded many of these attacks. But the press did not investigate; quite the contrary, the media seemed to enjoy the fray.

With today's perspective, I see how the backlash against feminists was a harbinger of a much greater assault on progressive ideas. Gender equity was an easy target, setting the stage for an all out assault on affirmative action, public funding of political campaigns, national public radio, the concept of global warming, reproductive rights, and affordable health care. Feminists were the first of a growing list of progressive targets.

THE INVISIBLE CLASSROOM

Sexism taught me to look beyond the obvious and not blindly accept conventions. So in our materialistic culture, where most believe that what you see is what you get, I am learning a new skill: to once again look to the unseen. Seventy years into the quantum mechanics age, we are slowly learning to accept the idea that what appears to be physical is actually energy. Science asserts that 96 per cent of reality is beyond our senses (Walker, 2009; Hanson, 2009). If 96 per cent of what goes on

in the world is invisible to us, then 96 per cent of what goes on in the classroom is invisible as well. We educators are consciously working with only four per cent of classroom reality; what else is going on?

If quantum physics is correct, our notion of teachers and students as entirely separate entities needs to be reconsidered. Traditionalists describe learning as the transfer of information from teacher to student, but I believe much more is going on. I believe, as did William James over a century ago, that we are all connected in ways we do not completely understand. Late in life, James (1909) wrote:

> We with our lives are like islands in the sea, or trees in the forest. The maple and the pine … comingle their roots in the darkness underground, and the islands also hang together through the ocean's bottom, just so a continuum of cosmic consciousness, against which our individuality builds but accidental fences, and into which our several minds plunge as into a mother-sea of reservoir.

I now look at teaching and learning as an interconnected energy field, not just a room of separate minds, but a field of collective consciousness (Elgin, 2009). Some studies suggest that as individuals learn, the entire species benefits, even those not directly involved in the learning. Many traditional spiritual belief systems have declared for centuries that "we all are one"; now science is catching up.

We already have glimpses of the invisible classroom. For example, consider how you feel when a class really goes well: it is a "high" that lingers through the day. Conversely, when a class is a dud (there must have been at least one, right?), it is a downer for both teacher and students. Physicists might describe both cases in terms of energy: the wonderful class causing all to vibrate at a high level, the dud of a class causing lower vibrations. What teacher has not experienced these invisible classroom energies?

When I teach now, I consider what is beyond my senses in the classroom, what cannot be seen or heard but is very real. I can feel (and I honor "feeling" as much as "knowing") that when I use creativity and humor in a class, we are all nurtured. Grading and competition saps the morale of my students—and myself—but class projects, group goals and discussions enhance a culture of cooperation. Just as habits of classroom separation reinforce separation, habits of classroom connection reinforce connection. And our connections to each other, not our competing against each other, are what strengthen authentic learning and our collective consciousness.

For me all this starts before I enter the class. I now meditate on the kind of class I would like to be a part of. Like an Olympic coach who trains athletes to envision their effort and their victory, I image a class where we are all connected and working toward shared goals. I believe that meditation before and during class can shape physical reality. I also recognize that intuitive insights can be both powerful and meaningful, and I share with my students that Western logic is not the only path to learning. I am reminded of Albert Einstein's comment: "The intuitive mind is a sacred gift and the rational mind is a faithful servant. We have created a society

that honors the servant and has forgotten the gift." The bright beacon of the Age of Enlightenment may have blinded us to other ways of knowing (Bache, 2008).

The energy that a teacher brings to the classroom helps create that class environment. Part of my work today is helping teachers bring their positive, authentic selves to teaching. Educators are drawn to teaching through their heart, but we live in a disheartening time for teachers. The endemic poor pay is now joined with an anti-education climate that can drain a teacher's soul. For the strength to carry on through these difficult times, teachers need to learn how to access their inner resources, how to build their resiliency. This is where Courage & Renewal work comes in.

Originally developed by Parker Palmer (1998), Courage & Renewal work invites teachers to journey beyond life's turmoil and find their inner resources. In a sense, this work provides a quiet, reflective rest stop where teachers can explore their inner landscape. Through the use of poetry and other tools, we work to remove the isolating and alienating walls that society has built around us, and rediscover our core, our authentic selves, the souls we were when we came to teaching. It is both a spiritual and an energetic journey, an opportunity for teachers to take heart in what they do, and who they are. As Palmer writes, "Here is a secret hidden in plain sight: *good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher*" (1997, p. 16, emphasis original).

This effort to unite the teacher's role and soul is filled with exciting possibilities. It also represents a natural intellectual progression for me. I began my work uncovering the external sexist forces that reduce our humanity; now I focus on reconnecting us to our souls, to our inner resource that restores humanity. How exciting to be once again on the frontier of new understandings.

RECOMMENDED FROM MY WORK

Sadker, D., & Sadker, M. (1972, February). Nepotism: A clause for concern. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 53*, 376-377.

Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (1980). Sexism in teacher education texts. *Harvard Educational Review, 50*, 36-46.

Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (Eds.). (1982). *A sex equity handbook for schools*. New York: Longman.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1985). The treatment of sex equity in teacher education. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving sex equity in education* (pp. 145-217). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.

Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (March, 1985). Sexism in the schoolroom of the eighties. *Psychology Today, 19,* 54-57.

Sadker, M. P., Sadker, D. M., & Klein, S. (1991). The issue of gender in elementary and secondary education. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of Education* (pp. 269-334). Washington, DC: AERA.

Sadker, D., Sadker, M., & Zittleman, K. (2009). *Still failing at fairness: How gender bias cheats girls and boys in school and what we can do about it*. New York: Touchstone.

Sadker, D., & Zittleman, K. (2013). Gender bias: From colonial America to today's classroom. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 107-123). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

SOME BOOKS THAT MADE A DIFFERENCE FOR ME

Bache, C. (2008). *The living classroom: Teaching and collective consciousness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Doidge, N. (2007). *The brain that changes itself: Stories of personal triumph from the frontiers of brain science.* New York: Penguin.
Eliot, L. (2009). *Pink brain, blue brain: How small differences grow into troublesome gaps—And what we can do about it*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Anchor.
Lipton, B. H. (2008). *The biology of belief: Unleashing the power of consciousness, matter & miracles*. Carlsbad, CA: Hay House.
Palmer, P. J. (2000). *Let your life speak: Listening to the voice of vocation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Palmer, P. J. (2004). *A hidden wholeness: The journey toward an undivided life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Pollack, W. S. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Women. (1992). *How schools shortchange girls: The AAUW report: A study of major findings on girls and education.* Washington: AAUW Educational Foundation.
Bache, C. (2008) *The living classroom: Teaching and collective consciousness.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Elgin, D. (2009). *The living universe*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler.
Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Anchor.
Flesch, R. (1953). *Why Johnny can't read: And what you can do about it*. New York: Harper.
Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
Hanson, R. with Mendius, R. (2009). *Buddha's brain: The practical neuroscience of happiness, love & wisdom*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger Publications.
James, W. (1909, October). The final impression of a psychical researcher. *The American Magazine*.
Messerli, J. (1972). *Horace Mann: A biography*. New York: Knopf.
Newfield, C. (2011**).** *United States in unmaking the public university: The forty-year assault on the middle class.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Palmer, P. (1997, November/December). The heart of a teacher: Identity and integrity in teaching. *Change, 29*(6), 14-21.
Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
Ravitch, D. (2010). *The rise and fall of American public schools: The political economy of public education in the twentieth century.* New York: Basic Books.
Sadker, D., & Sadker, M. (1972, February). Nepotism: A clause for concern. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 53*, 376-377.
Sadker, D., Sadker, M., & Zittleman, K. (2009). *Still failing at fairness: How gender bias cheats girls and boys in school and what we can do about it*. New York: Touchstone.
Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How schools cheat girls.* New York: Scribner.
Sadker, M., & Frazier, N. (1973). *Sexism in school and society*. New York: Harper and Row.
Sexton, P. C. (1969). *The feminized male: Classrooms, white collars, and the decline of manliness*. New York: Random House.

Walker, T. (2009). *The force is with us: The higher consciousness that science refuses to accept*. Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House.

David M. Sadker
Professor Emeritus
American University

CHRISTINE SKELTON

FEMINISM AND SOCIAL CLASS

There are three aspects that define my "intellectual journey" in becoming a professor of gender equality in education at a prestigious UK university: my working-class upbringing, the "discovery" of feminism, and my gender. It was only when I came to write this chapter that I fully appreciated the significance of my social class background in shaping how and what I write. Although a central tenet of second wave feminism was "the personal is the political," I find it very difficult to talk about myself. Pursuing a career in higher education has meant putting a veil over my class background (Burke & Jackson, 2007), and the thought of removing this in order to illustrate my intellectual career is disconcerting. In keeping with other working-class feminists in higher education, this chapter has proved a challenge in "coming out" after "engaging in a kind of masquerade" throughout my life in academia (Walkerdine, 1990, p. 157; see also, Reay, 1997). Whilst feminism has provided women with the confidence to speak out, the "authority" of social class is an effective silencer. What I offer here is a brief tour of the intertwining of literature and life at various stages which offer an intellectual self portrait.

BECOMING A FEMINIST

> "Christmas won't be Christmas without any presents," grumbled Jo, lying on the rug.
>
> "It's so dreadful to be poor!" sighed Meg, looking down at her old dress.

Even though I have not read the book for more than fifty years, these opening lines from *Little Women* (Alcott, 1868) are engraved on my mind. It was my favourite book as a child and I must have read it over and over again, never tiring of losing myself in the mid-nineteenth century world of the four sisters. I have often wondered what I found so appealing about the book—perhaps its effect on me was similar to that of a "girl band" on today's youngsters, where you identify with one of the characters, imagining their life to be one you could lead when you grew up. When I look back I can see that I never really wanted to be the "masculine" Jo, with her disinterest in clothes and her tomboyish attitudes, nor Meg whose concern was with finding love and marriage, or the simpering, spoilt Amy; and I most certainly did not want to follow in the footsteps of Beth, the ailing sister who dies at the end of the book! What I did admire and envy though was Jo's striving for economic independence and a career (for those not familiar with *Little Women*, Jo sold her long hair in order to raise money for the family and established a career as

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 217–226.

an author). Was the character a "feminist role model" for me? The answer is most probably "yes," although it could only have been at a subliminal level.

I "discovered" feminism through a series of happy accidents in the late 1970s when I was in my mid-20s. At this time I was a primary school teacher, married (to another teacher) and working in my husband's hometown in the Northeast of England. I had obtained a teaching certificate by studying for three years at a teacher training college, but by the late 1970s the British government announced its intention to make teaching a profession that required a degree (Department of Education and Science, 1987). Higher education institutions all over the United Kingdom set up part-time B.Ed. courses to allow practicing teachers to obtain this qualification. Barbara, a colleague from the primary school I taught at, and I went to an introductory meeting at the local college to find out more about this degree. It quickly became apparent that that this was not the course we wanted to do; it sounded too similar to the study we had already taken for our teaching certificates. Over coffee she and I talked about the kind of degree courses we would really like to pursue. Barbara's background was very different to mine: Her mother was a teacher and her father the manager of an electrical appliances factory. They owned their own house and she had stayed on at school to take "A" levels. Higher education was, for Barbara, always going to be an option, and whilst her mother wanted her to go to university, her father thought a teacher training course would be the best route for her. Although Barbara's father had himself started a university degree programme, he believed that teaching was "a good job for a girl" (Buchan, 1980). My experiences had been very different.

My father was a postman, my mother a housewife, and, together with a younger sister and grandfather, we lived on a council estate in the Midlands. I had attended a secondary modern school, leaving at the age of 16. My parents' working-class views were, as I know now, gender specific. They wanted me to start work in an office and so earn money to contribute to the family wage. Both assumed I would be married by the time I was twenty and would then give up work to look after the children as my mother herself had done. Education post-16 was regarded as a waste of time and curtailed income earning potential. I accepted my parents' views, although with typical teenage resentment. My rebellion took the form of using pocket money to buy books (regarded by my father as a waste of money) and spending time in my bedroom pretending to be listening to pop music on the radio but, in reality, doing homework. My diligence and increasing academic success did not, of course, escape the attention of my teachers. Although going on to study "A" levels at a further education college was out of the question, my class teacher, Miss Jackson (a formidable woman who intimidated all her colleagues as well as the pupils), thought otherwise. She persuaded my parents that I should go on to do a further education course rather than going straight into the workforce. The compromise was that my parents insisted on a vocational programme, so I had to take a secretarial course, although it was a specialist medical secretarial one.

Studies of young people's decisions about jobs and higher education have shown how the cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1983) of parents and peers has a significant impact on their choices (Ball et al., 2000; Reay et al., 2005). Without

the knowledge and understanding of how to access higher education and what financial support is available, many young people assume it is not something they can pursue (Walkerdine et al., 2000). Through the cultural and social capital of my teachers at school, lecturers on the medical secretarial course, and friends made at college, I found out that I did not need "A" levels to get into higher education as teacher training colleges required prospective teachers to have just five "O" levels—and I had eight. Importantly, they gave me the confidence to believe I could go on to further study. However, as I recounted in my inaugural address 24 years after the event, "I was one of the many working-class women born in the 1950s who, in the words of the feminist historian, Marjorie Theobold (1999), 'sold ourselves as teachers to the state in exchange for tertiary education and escape from our mothers' world.' As such, it was not teaching as a vocation that attracted me but the fact that it provided me with a form of higher education" (Skelton, 2006). I will skate over what my parents' reactions were to my decision to prolong my time studying.

By the time I went to teacher training college in the 1970s, feminism had yet to make its mark on British society and certainly had not entered the curriculum of teacher training programmes. As such I started my teaching career with a number of deeply ingrained gendered and classed assumptions. On a personal basis, I believed that my husband's job should take precedence, so he applied and secured a post first and then I applied later; I also upheld the idea that because he was a man, he should be earning more than me. On a professional basis, I based my interactions with pupils on presumed "natural" gender differences. This meant I held different expectations of the abilities and interests of the pupils in my class, hence would not question some boys' dominance of my time or why I expected girls to be quieter, more industrious and apparently more adept at reading (Delamont, 1980).

When Barbara and I had that first discussion over coffee about the kind of degree we were interested in pursuing, gender and feminism were not areas we even remotely considered. Even if we had possessed some notion of these, in the mid-1970s they were not featuring as subjects worthy of academic pursuit. What we decided to do was begin Open University degrees that could be undertaken part time and allowed a wide choice of modules. Then, as now, part-time study for women was never an easy option with trying to juggle studying, full-time work and domestic responsibilities. One of the modules was entitled "The Division of Labour By Gender" (Open University, 1981). This module also contained a section that dealt with gender issues in education. It was at this stage that "feminism" and what it had to say about my personal and professional life hit me forcibly. Reading the material provided on gender inequalities in schooling for the Open University by Madeleine Arnot and Gaby Weiner (1987; Weiner & Arnot, 1987) opened a new world of understanding to me. The references in these materials to broader literature on feminism led to the insights provided by Betty Friedan, Kate Millett and Anne Oakley (to name just three). As this was the mid-1970s, second wave feminism began to make its presence felt in the UK more broadly. The passing of the Equal Pay Act (1970), Sex Discrimination Act (1975) and Race Relations Act

(1976) indicate that this was a time when civil rights were being treated seriously. Certainly, there was evidence of a greater recognition of social justice in schools as could be seen by the initiative launched by the local education authority that employed me as a teacher.

Coinciding with my Open University study was the setting up of an equal opportunities group at the local teachers centre. This was a voluntary group of mainly secondary teachers with Barbara and I as the only two representatives from primary school. The group met to talk about the kinds of gendered practices, attitudes and expectations found in schools, with the aim of trying to find strategies to address them. There was little published material available to help redress gender inequities in school (see, however, *Genderwatch* [Myers, 1987]). Furthermore, tackling gender equalities in school with colleagues was one thing—having only just arrived at the point ourselves where we could see how taken-for-granted gendered assumptions pervaded classroom practices, we expected the staff would require professional development in gender inequality. However, what we were shocked and disappointed at was the apparent lack of knowledge about gender and "race" inequalities by students coming out of initial teacher education programmes. Given that research into gender in schools was still at an early stage, there was, understandably, very little known about how and where gender featured on initial teacher training programmes. The next stage then had to be investigations into this area.

It has been observed that a substantial impetus for change in schools came from practicing feminist teachers working beyond the hours of the school day (ILEA, 1986; Weiner, 1994). Both Barbara and I took unpaid leave from school in order to undertake full time M.A. degrees. My plan was to investigate a one-year Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) course as part of an M.A. in Educational Studies (Skelton, 1989) and Barbara interviewed students on B.Ed. courses for her M.A. women's studies dissertation (Thompson, 1989). By this time we were describing ourselves as "feminists," but the question was "what *kind* of feminists"? The three dominant perspectives in education in the mid- to late 1980s were radical, socialist-Marxist and liberal feminism (later joined by Black feminism). It was aspects of all three which were relevant to our understandings of girls' and women teachers' experiences rather than just one. What was important to us as teachers was that the different perspectives were used not only to argue what was the underpinning cause of gender inequalities, but to generate "solutions" to be used in the classroom. What linked these various perspectives was the idea that "girls" as a group (albeit Black girls in the case of Black feminism; or girls of different social classes within Marxist feminism) were bound together by their common experiences of marginalisation and "oppression." Where they differed was in the source of this marginalisation: patriarchy for radical feminism; capitalism for Marxist feminism; colonialism for Black feminism; and lack of individual opportunity for liberal feminism. The dominant "voice" adopted by government in its guidance to schools was that of liberal feminism, most likely because, unlike the others, it did not include any analysis of power inequalities.

Liberal feminism focused on the notion of "equal opportunities," specifically on ensuring girls and women teachers had access to the same kind of education and educational careers as boys and men. Its theoretical basis was sex role stereotyping. The basis of sex role theory is that girls and boys absorb social messages about their appropriate gender roles, so if children learned their gender identities through role modelling, then all teachers had to do was provide a non-stereotyped environment. For example, teachers could read books that provided girls and boys with a range of adult models, and they could make a male subject (such as science) more "girl friendly." These strategies were pursued in the absence of more sophisticated and complex ways of understanding gender and, unsurprisingly, had little impact on gender equity in schooling. I was aware, too, of how it was not simply stereotyping but also class positioning and expectations of gender that were culturally and historically located that, together, explained my gendered subjectivity.

The late 1980s and early 1990s were a significant time for feminists in education. As I have indicated, until then, investigations into and understandings of gender inequalities and schooling had largely been based on notions of gender as located in the body and a consequence of stereotypical socialisation practices. The notion of "difference" which Black feminists in particular drew (Blair and Maylor, 1993) raised the possibility of there being multiple femininities (and masculinities). A key contributor to this challenging of sex role socialisation theories of gender was Raewyn Connell (see also this volume), who provided a strong analysis of gender and power, and famously drew on Gramsci's notion of hegemony to theorise how different constructions of gender (masculinity) are imbued with varying levels of social status (Connell, 1987). Connell's work was highly influential when I turned attention to exploring masculinities in schooling, but it was reading Bronwyn Davies's (1989) *Frogs and Snails and Feminist Tales* that introduced me to poststructuralist thinking and the recognition that even very young children were active agents in constructing gendered subjectivities.

In *Frogs and Snails and Feminist Tales,* Davies read various feminist fairy tales to young children. If sex role socialisation theory was correct in assuming that simply providing children with a non-stereotyped environment was sufficient to prevent children taking up stereotypical attitudes and behaviours, then reading feminist fairy tales would see girls relating to and embracing these alternative (positive) female role models. However, this was not what happened. Instead both girls and boys outwardly rejected non-stereotypical "heroes." Davies showed how 4- and 5-year-olds employed "category-maintenance work" to ensure they, and others, acted out the "correct" gender. They demonstrated such "category maintenance" by labelling those characters who were acting out non-stereotypical behaviours as "deviant." So the assertive princess and the boy who attended a dance school were seen as deserving of punishment by others. She also showed how these practices of gender category maintenance were perpetuated between children in the classroom and playground, and she explored the resulting impact on children's (gendered) power positions.

By the time these social constructionist theories of gender were emerging, I had been working in higher education for several years. After completing the M.A. at the University of York, I took up a post as an early years lecturer at Sunderland Polytechnic and two years later moved to the University of Newcastle working on the one-year PGCE. It was shortly after joining the University of Newcastle that I began researching male teachers in primary schools.

RESEARCHING GENDER, MASCULINITIES AND PRIMARY SCHOOLING

Making the decision to research masculinities was for me, as a feminist, initially quite difficult. Despite the prevailing idea that feminists were solely focused on girls and women, there were some examples where the construction of "boyness" was explored (Arnot, 1984; Askew & Ross, 1988). Yet, the generally shared feminist view in the late 1980s was that the predominance of the "male as norm" had for generations both silenced and obscured the perspectives and experiences of women. It was the responsibility of feminists to redress this imbalance. My reasons for even considering making a step towards deconstructing masculinities were three-fold. The first reason was related to my job as a teacher trainer of early years students. Following a local criminal case where a male student nursery nurse had been found guilty of abusing over 60 children in his placement nursery, local schools began refusing to take male student teachers on teaching practice. The schools we had relied on to take our students would, as soon as they realised we intended sending a male student, come up with various reasons as to why they could not take him. It was never said to any university staff member that the headteacher or teachers in the school were concerned that amongst the male student teachers may be potential paedophiles; rather, a range of excuses were produced: for example, the school did not have a men's toilet or single/divorced mothers would be worried their children would be frightened by a male teacher. Ultimately we did secure sufficient placements for all the male students on the early years course, but it was their understandings of how gender shaped their career experiences which formed the basis of the first research study I undertook into masculinity and schooling (Skelton, 1991).

A second reason for wanting to explore masculinities in primary schools was the growth in "men's studies" literature, predominantly from North America, which began to appear in bookshops in the 1980s. Much of this seemed to be premised on a backlash to feminism, although there were some writers who were clearly engaging with feminist arguments in attempting to theorise constructions of masculinity (e.g. Connell, 1987; Hearn & Morgan, 1990). A third reason for considering carrying out research into masculinities was because feminist studies had provided a richness of understanding of "girls"—a recognition of the interrelationality of social class, ethnicity and sexuality had produced an array of studies of "girlness" in schooling (e.g. Mirza, 1992; Hey, 1997)—yet "boys" remained a homogenous group in the literature.

In a "viewpoint" article in *Gender and Education* (Skelton, 1998), I outlined the arguments for why we should—and should not—interrogate masculinities more

closely. One argument was that, by 1990, we had had over twenty years of feminist insights into schooling, yet little seemed to have changed. Boys were still monopolising the space and the teachers' attention; girls were continuing to be seen as "hard workers" whilst all boys were regarded as "having potential" despite their lower exam scores; and there continued to be a greater likelihood of finding yourself in senior management positions as a male than a female teacher. I wondered why "masculinity" was so impervious to wider cultural changes in women's position, and greater insights into masculinities and schooling might provide this. A further justification was that it is difficult to really understand how masculinity wields such power without an understanding of how boys themselves produce, negotiate and are positioned by masculinity within the context of school. Related to this was *who* was doing this research on masculinity and education. At the time of writing the article, the focus on "boys' underachievement" had only recently started, and it was immediately clear that many of those involved in identifying the "problems" and subsequent solutions were males writing from an essentialist, often antifeminist stance. It was then important to me to engage with the work of male writers on gender in order to maintain a feminist voice.

Although my initial interest in researching masculinities and primary schooling was focused particularly on men teachers, the emergence of the boys' underachievement debate broadened my area of research. One of the explanations for boys' apparent failure to achieve as well as girls at school was the absence of male primary teachers to act as "role models." This assumption was located in the sex role model of gender theory that had been robustly critiqued and set aside for the more sophisticated gender theorising evidenced in the work of Connell (1987) and Butler (1990). From the outset of the "boys' underachievement" debate there have been two distinct perspectives in the literature on men and primary teaching. One dominant voice is that of educationalists who assume men teachers are a homogenous group who share experiences, "teaching styles" and relate in "male ways" to boys. It is this essentialist perspective that has underpinned the drive in many Western countries to recruit more men into primary teaching. The second perspective is that of (pro)feminist and social justice researchers who place emphasis on masculinity as a social construction—in particular, regarding "gender" as disembodied, in a constant state of flux and where men teachers are constantly negotiating "being and becoming" a male teacher. For feminists, having to retread theoretical ground that was so recently ploughed is, to say the least, disappointing. The question is why do policymakers, headteachers and educationalists seem so struck by theories that position men—and women—teachers in homogenous categories? A compelling reason has to be that simplistic arguments suggest easy solutions. In which case, if boys are not doing well at school because there are too many women teachers who do not understand the particular needs of boys, then the easy answer is to increase the numbers of men primary teachers.

At the time of writing, these discussions over the need for more male primary teachers continue, with the government and media seeming to be deaf to the arguments of feminists and pro-feminists who have researched the area for years

and who have expertise in gender. To aid our arguments is the ongoing development of gender theory. Most notably influential for my own writing is the work of Becky Francis (2006, 2010; see also this volume), whose recent publications have successfully enabled consideration of the significance of embodiment in gender theory.

CONCLUSION

What have I learned? That it is the interplay of gender with other aspects of identity, and not gender alone, that shapes our experiences, opportunities and understandings of self. I have learned, too, that the social and cultural capital of middle-class teachers, friends, and colleagues who mentored me in the early years of entering higher education have facilitated my own knowledge and life chances. Career interests have varied across the years and whereas at one time it was researching masculinities and primary schooling that was the greatest driver, more recently it has been teaching undergraduate and postgraduate students, providing them with knowledge and understanding of gender theories that enables them to understand their own lives and those of the pupils they will teach in the future.

TEN PUBLICATIONS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED ME

Arnot, M., & Weiner, G. (Eds.). (1987). *Gender and the politics of schooling.* London: Unwin Hyman with the Open University.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Byrne, E. (1978). *Women and education*. London: Tavistock.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Davies, B. (1989). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Deem, R. (1978). *Women and schooling*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Deem, R. (Ed.). (1980). *Schooling for women's work.* London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Francis, B. (2010). Re/theorising gender: Female masculinity and male femininity in the classroom? *Gender and Education, 22*(6), 477-490.

Gipps, C., & Murphy, P. (1994). *A fair test? Assessment, achievement and equity.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

PERSONAL FAVOURITES OF MY OWN WORK

Skelton, C. (2012). Men teachers and the 'feminised' primary school: A review of the literature. *Educational Review, 64*(1), 1-19.

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2011). Successful boys and literacy: Are 'literate boys' challenging or repackaging hegemonic masculinity? *Curriculum Inquiry, 41*(4), 456-479.

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2009). *Feminism and "the schooling scandal."* London: Routledge.

Skelton, C., Francis, B., & Smulyan, L. (Eds.). (2006). *International handbook of gender and education*. London: Sage.

Francis, B., & Skelton, C. (2005). *Reassessing gender and achievement.* London: Routledge/Falmer.

Skelton, C. (2001). *Schooling the boys: Masculinities and primary education.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Francis, B., & Skelton, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Investigating gender: Contemporary perspectives in education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

REFERENCES

Alcott, L. M. (1868). *Little women*. Boston, MA: Roberts Bros.

Arnot, M. (1984). How shall we educate our sons? In R. Deem (Ed.), *Co-education reconsidered* (pp. 37-56). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press

Arnot, M., & Weiner, G. (Eds.). (1987). *Gender and the politics of schooling.* London: Unwin Hyman with the Open University.

Askew, S., & Ross, C. (1988). *Boys don't cry: Boys and sexism in education.* Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Ball, S., Maguire, M., & Macrae, S. (2000). *Choice, pathways and transitions post-16.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Blair, M., & Maylor, U. (1993). Issues and concerns for Black women teachers in training. In I. Siraj Blatchford (Ed.), *"Race," gender and the education of teachers* (pp. 55-73). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1983). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Buchan, L. (1980). It's a good job for a girl (but an awful career for a woman!). In D. Spender & E. Sarah (Eds.), *Learning to lose* (pp. 81-89). London: The Woman's Press.

Burke, P. J., & Jackson, S. (2007). *Reconceptualising lifelong learning.* London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Davies, B. (1989). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Delamont, S. (1980). *Sex roles and the school.* London: Methuen.

Department of Education and Science. (1987). *Quality in schools: The initial training of teachers.* London: HMSO.

Francis, B. (2006). Heroes or zeroes? The construction of the boys' achievement debate within neo-liberal policy discourse. *Journal of Education Policy*, *21*(2), 187-199.

Francis, B. (2010). Re/theorising gender: Female masculinity and male femininity in the classroom? *Gender and Education, 22*(6), 477-490.

Hearn, J., & Morgan, D. (Eds.). (1990). *Men, masculinities and social theory.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Hey, V. (1997). *The company she keeps: An ethnography of girls' friendships*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Inner London Education Authority. (1986). *Primary matters*. London: ILEA.

Mirza, H. (1992). *Young, female and black*. London: Routledge.

Myers, K. (1987). *Genderwatch!* London: Schools Curriculum Development Committee.

Open University Press. (1981). *E 200: Contemporary issues in education: The division of labour by gender.* (Prepared by A. Oakley). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Reay, D. (1997). The double-bind of the "working-class" feminist academic: The success of failure or the failure of success? In P. Mahony & C. Zmroczek (Eds.), *Class matters: "Working-class" women's perspectives on social class* (pp. 18-29). London: Taylor and Francis.

Reay, D., David, M., & Ball, S. (2005). *Degrees of choice: Social class, race and gender in higher education*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham.

Skelton, C. (1989). And so the wheel turns … Gender and initial teacher education. In C. Skelton (Ed.), *Whatever happens to little women?: Gender and schooling* (pp. 53-67). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Skelton, C. (1991). A study of the career perspectives of male teachers of young children. *Gender and Education, 3*(3), 279-289.

Skelton, C. (1998). Feminism and research into masculinities and schooling. *Gender and Education, 10*(2), 217-227.

Skelton, C. (2006). The man in the Wendy House. Inaugural address, Roehampton University, 13th November 2006.

Spender, D. (1982). *Invisible women: The schooling scandal.* London: Writer and Readers Publishing.

Theobald, M. (1999). Teachers, memory and oral history. In K. Weiler & S. Middleton (Eds.), *Telling women's lives* (pp. 9-24). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Thompson, B. (1989). Teacher attitudes: Complacency and conflict. In C. Skelton (Ed.), *Whatever happens to little women?: Gender and schooling* (pp. 68-78). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Walkerdine, V. (1990). *Schoolgirl fictions.* London: Verso.

Walkerdine, V., Lucey, H., & Melody, H. (2001). *Growing up girl: Psychosocial explorations of gender and class.* London: Palgrave.

Weiner, G. (1994). *Feminisms in education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Weiner, G., & Arnot, M. (Eds.). (1987). *Gender under scrutiny.* London: Unwin Hymen with the Open University.

Christine Skelton
Professor of Gender Equality in Education
University of Birmingham

LYN YATES

A CONVERSATION WITH THE FIELD

In 1981, working as a university lecturer in education and after earlier Masters degrees in sixteenth century history and in sociology of education, I embarked on a PhD on *Curriculum Theory and Non-Sexist Education.* When the supervisor of one of my earlier theses heard this, he commented "Why are all the bright young women now working on gender?" With apologies for the self-serving element in retelling this, it was a good question, both in the general and in the particular. I had not gone into the field of education with a compelling interest in gender, and my personal experiences of inequalities and discrimination to that point were much more directly related to social class, as was much of the reading I had done when studying "new sociology of education" in the UK in the mid 1970s. But when as a relatively experienced candidate I came to make a decision about what I would take up as a PhD topic, a focus on gender and feminist agendas did make sense. In academia feminist perspectives seemed to be offering exciting new ways to look at the world, to uncover and create new directions. In the public sphere, a women's movement was active: organizing conferences and international declarations, challenging politicians in election campaigns. In Australia and in many comparable countries, new policies and expectations concerned with equal opportunity for girls and women were on the agenda. Teachers' unions and school textbooks were beginning to take up these new concerns, and teachers were beginning to try out new approaches. There was no dearth of objects, theories or ideas for potential study!

BIOGRAPHY, CONTEXT, INTELLECTUAL FRAMEWORKS

My initial foray into gender as a central focus of my work seemed at the time driven more by its possibilities for intellectual excitement and for embarking on an area where progress could be made than out of a sense of personal grievances or a mission. But what makes something exciting? In retrospect many aspects of my own biography reflected both why gender questions were becoming important in education and why my own particular interests in gender and in education would take the form they did.

I grew up in a working-class family, but with the advantage of being an avid reader and having a father who valued education and supported three children to complete school and continue to university when the norm among those we knew was to leave earlier and try to find good local jobs. Thanks to the demographics of this time in Australia, the need for more teachers had led the government to offer

M. B. Weaver-Hightower & C. Skelton (eds.), Leaders in Gender and Education, 227–239.

relatively generous scholarships to encourage people to train as teachers. These paid fees and a living stipend to undertake a university degree on the condition of being bonded to work as a teacher in the public system for three years on completion. A generation of working-class young men and women became the first in their family to go to university. Previously they would not have gone to university; subsequently, they would not have been offered such financial incentive to become teachers rather than to take up other studies or professions. And my own experience of this phase was strongly formative.

For one thing, this time deeply entrenched in me the sense of education as a source of power and possibility but also as a field in which unfairness and inequalities were endemic. On the positive side, I had a solid personal appreciation of the positional opportunities extended education brings. It was not long before I was earning more than my father and having opportunities not available to my parents. (And an ongoing awareness of the privilege and good fortune of this life stays with me.) But my belief in the value of education was also about the thing itself, not just the side-benefits. I wanted and believed in the value of an opportunity to work with ideas and research and to appreciate the means to do so offered by universities. Later, although I was to become in large part a sociologist of education, I was critical of its inability in many cases to deal adequately with this matter, "the thing itself," and that is a renewed debate today in the field and the projects I now work on.

My early awareness of the negative face of formal education, its role in producing and reproducing inequalities, was also something I could see and feel experientially. Only about one-third of those with whom I started high school remained to the final year, and only about one-third of that group were female. At my elite university, only two out of my final honours class of 32 had not been educated in private schools, even though at that time around 80% of secondary students were educated, like me, in government schools. I was one of the successes, but I experienced first hand the embarrassment of lacking "cultural capital" and the easy ways of being and speaking in university contexts that I would later find analysed by writers I admired (Bernstein, 1975; Bourdieu, 1986; Walkerdine, 1989)—being confronted with tacit rather than explicit rules of the game and my own embodied awkwardness.

A third formative influence on my subsequent work was disciplinary training and identity. As a new student at university, I initially went on to study the subjects I was familiar with from school, English and history, but in that first year I discovered and loved philosophy. But the terms of the teaching scholarship required that students must select their later years of study only from subjects that were taught in schools. Philosophy was not permitted unless one relinquished the scholarship (and this was paying for my living expenses away from home as well as fees). I did what I thought of as the next best thing, and went on to study history, and in particular, history of ideas. (My university at this point, modelling itself on Oxford and Cambridge, did not even offer that newfangled discipline of sociology, although newer universities in Melbourne were building large sociology departments.)

This initial foundation in history rather than in philosophy or sociology has had a lasting influence. It has given me an ongoing interest in the historical, social and material situatedness and drivers of "common sense" and of political effectiveness, and it has given me an interest in the value of trying to see and understand the sense or logic driving different actors in a given context, not just jumping to criticize or align with one camp. This was a useful perspective to bring to the disciplinary split between sociological and philosophical perspectives on curriculum that were so prominent in the 1970s. It meant that from the beginning I was looking to understand gender by working with the differences and gaps between different ways of thinking and researching it, rather than from working tightly within one. It also meant that the form my writing would often take was essay-like: a discussion with a particular segment of the field rather than a search for (or belief in) an enduring model or grand theory in the sociological mode.

ENTERING THE FIELD OF GENDER AND EDUCATION

When I embarked on my PhD in 1981, there were still relatively few academic papers being written about gender and education, though the impetus of the United Nations International Women's Year in 1975 together with national feminist movements was producing many Australian inquiries into the "disadvantage" of girls and women. Both in the academic world and in the press, gender issues were contentious, debated, and cartooned. Was sexist language an important indicator and producer of gender differentiation and subordination or just a silly issue that should be ridiculed? Were gender theories and women's studies serious new fields of inquiry or merely "political" ideological demands? Are gender issues essentially a subgenre of larger academic or political interests or sui generis? It is hard to recapture now that at the beginning of my own working lifetime, it was still legal to have different pay rates and pension entitlements for women teachers compared with men, and there was a serious debate in my own city about whether women had the capacity to be tram drivers.

In the broader context, three big streams of activity were evident, and in some respects I set out to work with all three. One was a broad sense that there was a gender problem: that women globally were losing out economically and politically, and education had something to do with this, that women needed to be more visible and treated more seriously in the processes and content of education. A second was political thinking about power, inequalities and change and whether taking gender issues on board could be done within existing theories, especially variants of Marxist thinking, or had a distinctive form. A third, and related issue was how big change in education comes about—for example, what scope is there for policy-led reform compared with action research or grounded practice or direct political action?

In my own entry to this field and attempt to contribute to my chosen thesis topic of *Curriculum Theory and Non-Sexist Education*, I was aligned with critical sociology of education in understanding that education institutions and the content of curriculum were socially constructed and serving the interests of those in power.

From this perspective the task would be to uncover how textbooks and pedagogy, conceptions of ability, and career advising had an ideological form: They worked to make outcomes seem to be the result of individual choices and efforts rather than produced by what schooling did. In relation to gender, the "naturalizing" of different abilities of girls and boys (especially in mathematics), the according of different status to their attributes, and the acceptance of a gendered division of labour as their future lot, were all examples that fitted well with this critical curriculum perspective.

I was also galvanized by new strands of feminist theorizing that aimed to produce more radical rethinking about gender and "the woman question" and "the problem that has no name" as an issue. The sense of excitement and on-the-ground activities and conflict is important to capture here. In the department where I worked, I had fierce debates with my radical male colleagues about whether the feminist work was an addition or challenge to the Marxist traditions. I took part in a reading group (and later would form others) outside the university that met monthly to read and debate "Feminism in Social Theory." FIST (!) began in 1979 and drew young women academics from all the universities in Melbourne—at one time it had 80 on its distribution list. New networks were an important part of working in this area, and we saw each other at many conferences and activist events. The issue of confronting a male academic establishment was much discussed, too, as a practical problem in terms of referees and the composition of appointment and promotion committees. For my PhD I interviewed teachers active in gender initiatives and found the majority of them had been active in the teachers' unions, and had been energized by the gender belittling they found to be endemic there.

In my initial research, I was looking for work about gender that spoke to the issue of curriculum. I sought work that spoke about the underlying conceptions of the educated person institutions were aiming to produce, about what forms of knowledge or formation are important, or that spoke to how curriculum harmed and produced inequalities.

In education, outside my own foundations in sociology, two articles in the *Harvard Education Review* disrupted their respective fields and seemed to speak to these questions. Carol Gilligan, a psychologist, in an article and later in a book, both entitled *In a Different Voice* (1977, 1982), revisited the influential hierarchy of moral reasoning developed by Lawrence Kohlberg—this time taking both males and females in the sample, not just males. She argued that we should recognize two distinct discourses, or ways of reasoning, not just one (in which women normally were judged as not reaching the highest peaks). One was an ethic (and *form of reasoning*) of rights and justice, and the other an ethic (and *form of reasoning*) of responsibility and care. Gilligan, it seemed to me, touched on two things important to education as a specific activity: that it is oriented to producing and assessing a certain kind of *intellectual* development over time, and that the traditional education hierarchy gives status to "objective" kinds of intellectual work (mathematics and science, for example) over that which is more interpretive and situational.

Gilligan would later be criticized in relation to this way of constructing morality, and for her initial inattention to race and difference, and I would share some of that. But for me the later rush to criticize skated over important things Gilligan's project was opening up about education as a problematic, and how we deal with that. A similar disruption, this time in relation to philosophy of education, took place with Jane Roland Martin's (1982) important article, "Excluding Women from the Educational Realm." Here Martin's challenge was to the way philosophers of education had conceptualized the distinctive role of education, with an emphasis on giving reasons—drawn, she argued, from an image of adults such as Socrates and his students in the marketplace—adult males detached from cares of everyday life, and not having to consider the mix of care and development necessary to model the educational actions necessary in the home or in early childhood. Nel Noddings (1984) was taking up some related directions, and the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, especially Madeleine Grumet's work, was an important vehicle of new perspectives on curriculum, though to my taste, insufficiently taking account of selection and material elements of schooling (see Grumet, 1981; Yates, 1985a).

I think one of the reasons Gilligan's and Martin's work both had an impact on me was because I found their articles personally confronting. I had very much identified with the kind of formal logical thinking that Gilligan was identifying as male; and, in contrast to Martin and Noddings, I did not want to take the home or mothering as the model for what formal education should be doing. I thought (and still think) that education's proper role was to do something different from that—to build kinds of broader and more powerful knowledge and reasoning that went beyond socialization, caring and tacit influences. Nevertheless I was trying to do some overarching thinking about curriculum from the perspective of gender, and the force of the challenge made by these and other writers about some fundamental male assumptions in the underpinning of the theories and images with which we worked struck a chord.

MY CONVERSATIONS WITH THE FIELD(S)

My "program" of work, from the beginning, has been synoptic rather than tightly focused and linear. Curriculum, I argue, requires attention to policy, practice, social change, social movements, as well as to theories about knowledge, power, learning, discourse, social forms and the like. I think questions about "where are we at this point in time?" "what is possible now?" and "who am I talking to and what are their agendas?" all matter. Through this work I think there have been some consistencies in what I have been trying to bring to it, or rather bring together in the way I take up and think about gender. In particular I work with a broad critical materialist sociological perspective on the social (and state) origins of schools and the purposes they serve (selection and transmission), but also want to keep in play a perspective on subjectivity (both students and teachers) as complex, not mechanical. I am interested in broader social theories and arguments and the light they throw on models of schooling, knowledge and curriculum, but I also am

sceptical of general answers, and I believe in the need for situated judgements and strategies.

Looking back I think my work on gender has had roughly four phases, not tightly distinct from each other.

1980s: The Case about Gender as an Issue for Curriculum

In the first phase of my encounters with the field, I was attempting to see the shape of the issues, and to speak to different constituencies about this. It included some initial mapping of the *specific form* of the problem for education, and some discussion of why gender deserves to be taken as a serious issue for education and as a serious issue by the theories, not just the empirical "findings," that frame education (e.g., Yates, 1983, 1985a, 1985b, 1986a, 1986b, 1990, 1993a, 1993b).

When I began working on my PhD, governments in Australia were already developing policies and setting up inquiries concerned with gender and schooling; teachers' unions were sponsoring conferences and lobby groups (in Australia, the Women's Electoral Lobby) were highly visible (Yates, 1999). My own contributions to mapping the problem were twofold. First, I wanted to show that the government's own facts and figures indicated that this was a new kind of disadvantaging at work, one that needed thinking about in its own terms:

> School retention is traditionally used as an indicator of inequality in large part because it is seen as directly linked to opportunity for further education and, directly and indirectly, to opportunity for better jobs. Yet, in the case of girls, a greater participation rate in the final years of school has been associated with a higher youth unemployment rate than boys, a lower transition rate to further and higher education, as well as a continued large differential in average weekly earnings. (Yates, 1993b, p. 30)

That is, in relation to gender patterns and outcomes (for both girls and boys), the content of schooling—what they learned about themselves and their place in the world—not just their examination results, was important to their future lives. Around that time, Mary O'Brien (1984) coined the term "commatization" to describe the way inequalities in schooling were too often put together as a meaningless conflation ("class, gender, race, disability …") rather than one which identified their specificities, and it is a message that seems to require much periodic reiteration. I raised these points on theorizing inequality with attention to specificities from my first articles (Yates, 1983, 1985b, 1986b), but the misrecognition of this point was also highly relevant to the later taking up of the "boy question" more than a decade later (Yates, 1997, 2000), and even more so in current times when strategies are so often driven by the black box statistics of OECD, and where the demographic statistics are presented as if they speak for themselves, detached from understandings about different ways schooling produces outcomes.

Another theme of my work at this time was directed to gender reformers, what I saw as some over-simple understanding of subjectivity and pedagogy and "an over-

simple idea of how attitudes are formed and how they might be changed" (Yates, 1983, p. 38). In other words, just showing a different version of the world did not necessarily entice girls in school to identify with those aspirations (as Bronwyn Davies [1989] was soon to illustrate so well in her book on non-sexist fairy tales; similarly Kenway & Willis, 1990). There was initially a naive faith that just producing a few videos or new textbooks would persuade working class girls that working on a building site or as a plumber was a great idea compared with their existing ideals of being a hairdresser or working on a cosmetics counter in a department store.

Another strand of this initial discussion of the problem was the need to pursue arguments in relation to the fields of sociology, philosophy, curriculum theory, and my male colleagues who wanted to see gender as a marginal issue. For example, in an article "Is Women's Studies a Legitimate School Subject?" (Yates, 1985), I argued that either the feminist critique of the disciplines had fundamentally undermined the previous criteria for establishing legitimacy (via forms of knowledge, or "the educated man," etc.) or, alternatively, that women' studies would meet those criteria as well as the subjects already being counted in.

I was also writing for teachers and trying to acknowledge their real dilemmas (Yates, 1990). My message here was essentially that schools and students are inevitably products of their society to some extent, and while teachers can and do make a difference, they cannot instantly and simultaneously transform this embeddedness in the society and its culture. In relation to gender, for example, there was some evident choice being made in practice between taking strategies designed to produce greater success in areas currently defined as important (mathematics for example) and those aimed to produce a different perspective on "women's work"; there was a similar choice being made between perspectives which see the problem as largely located *in* schools compared with what is produced longer-term *by* school (my article "Is Girl-Friendly Schooling What Girls Really Need?" took up this latter theme [Yates, 1985b]).

1980s-Present: Assessing Trajectories of Reform and of Academic Work on Gender (Yates, 1993b, 1994, 1997a, b, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2007, 2008, 2009)

Over the 1980s and 1990s there was a huge upsurge of academic interest in gender and education, and, in Australia at least, it continued to be an area of interest for policy and school reform, though with significant changes of direction and interest in both of those arenas. In the academic world, Foucault rather than Marx or Bourdieu became the guru of choice, and difference (especially of ethnicity and race) a dominant interest in work on gender. In the world of school reform, the public debate became focused on a perception that reforms for girls had solved their issues, and it was now time to focus on boys. Lively academic work on gender seemed to be particularly strong in Australia, and we engaged in conferences and discussions about this work (outside as well as in Australia) on a fairly regular basis. A lot of work on gender took the form of local research and initiatives by teachers, activists and associations, but in Australia, like Sweden and

the UK, and in contrast to the USA, social movements tend to look also to public policy as an important means of taking action (I understand the term "femocrats" was coined in Australia; see Eisenstein, 1996). From the beginning of my work I was interested in the forms being taken by policy and other government initiatives for reform, and in the ways academic research engaged or influenced or failed to engage or influence policy and government initiatives.

One line of my writing here has been to try to identify the trajectory of academic and policy work on gender and schooling since the 1970s and to consider the impact in schooling of the different forms of theorizing and researching the problem. In a series of writings on "constructing and deconstructing 'girls' as a category or concern in education" (e.g., Yates, 1998), I discussed the move from an "equal opportunity and 'non-sexist curriculum' or 'sexually inclusive curriculum'" approach of the 1970s to concerns with "girl-friendly schooling" in the early 1980s, to "inclusive education" in the late 1980s, to the social construction of gender and the boys problem in the 1990s. My argument was that although the academic work was building more comprehensive perspectives on matters like subjectivity and difference and discursive framing over that period, the translation of these into an agenda for schools was weakening its impact. For example, an initial conception of "sexually inclusive curriculum" that tried to focus on how the curriculum failed to take women and women's work seriously drew on specific understanding of the form women's subordination had taken. When turned into the more generic injunction for schools to be broadly inclusive of all sorts of difference, it became in practice a weaker direction to be nice to everyone. And teaching young children to deconstruct "the social construction of gender" in practice seemed to achieve less than trying to teach them that they should have equal rights. (This is a heavily summarized and inadequate account of many writings—listed above—where I engaged sympathetically as well as critically with different phases of the feminist work.) My point in this line of work was not that academic work should be constrained in the complex and critical questions it takes up, but that focusing on what is effective in moving things forward in a given time and set of constraints is a distinct issue also deserving attention, rather than one that can simply be read off the big theory about how gender and schooling works.

In one sense that first line of thinking about theory and practice was about how change might be effected in the light of feminist concerns. The second line of my writing in this area has been to reflect on "feminism as an agenda of the state" (Yates, 1993c). In my earliest work I had noted that the point at which the state in Australia initiated inquiries about gender was not when gender inequities in schooling were most stark, but rather those came at the point when inequities had begun to equalize (the retention rates for girls and boys in secondary education crossed over in 1976). Why was this? Certainly the existence of a Women's Movement and UN global agendas were sources of the impetus to see gendered patterns of schooling as a problem to be addressed, where once these same patterns were simply seen as reasonable. But from a Marxist-influenced perspective, I suggested the take up of gender issues also had material foundations: The growth of the economy and need for more workers meant that

> ideologies that had seen women as only a 'reserve army' of labour rather than full participants in the capitalist economy were beginning to be out of step with the economic and material conditions of the times. (Yates, 2008, p. 475)

I also argued that the gender agenda had allowed the state (i.e., the commonwealth government in Australia) to achieve two purposes of extending its power that would have been more vigorously opposed by the teachers' unions and parent bodies had they been attempted without it. One was the extension of its central authority compared with the states (the *National Policy for the Education of Girls* was the first "national" policy for schools whose governance is formally the province of the states). The second purpose was a major extension of an accounting and audit culture for schools. In terms of gender, discrimination statistics are needed to show patterns that may not be evident at the point when decisions about promotion and appointments are made. Nevertheless the more detailed record-keeping and accounting accepted for this purpose was an important step in a process that then moved on to a more recent perspective that only counts as evidence claims in this measured form and that discounts curriculum processes that may have long-term effects on girls if they are not evident in their short-term achievements.

It is not comfortable to write about negative side effects of agendas one supports, and there was some debate about the matters I raised in this analysis. But I see it as an illustration of my initial points about the necessary situatedness of work in this area, and that taking up issues of gender in the context of schooling is an ongoing "conversation" rather than a search for a single model or skeleton key.

1993–2007: The "12 to 18 Project"

By the early 1990s, I had been working on theorizing and policies and school practices concerned with girls, women and gender for over a decade. And policies to produce change in school and public discourse about this issue had also been part of the landscape for nearly two decades. It was time to take a closer look at young people going through school—young people whose mothers themselves had been part of my own generation (one of my children was the age of the students in the study)—and at schools that had now long been required to have formal equal opportunity policies and commitments. Was gender still an issue in the way the initial reports had suggested? How did this generation see the world? To what extent was schooling producing gendered outcomes for them? With Julie McLeod (see also this volume) I embarked on a longitudinal empirical study intended to gain a new perspective on gender, inequality, and the role of schools in developing subjectivity and futures, in a world where both the theoretical and the reform debates had moved on (McLeod & Yates, 2006; Yates, 2002).

In our work from this project, we have tried to give a new perspective on how schools produce inequality, by giving more central attention to the development of subjectivity and its role in the post-school outcomes the statistics track. We showed, for example, how different gendered identities and life chances and

politics are produced in different high schools. And along the way we pursued a dialogue with the field of gender research: about sociological compared with critical psychological perspectives; about research methodologies and their effects; and about wanting to produce work that could have impact as well as a critical awareness that research and theory *construct* truths, not just discover them (McLeod & Yates, 1997; Yates & McLeod, 2000; Yates, 2002).

2007–Present: Reflections on Where We Are Today

By 2000 my own children had finished school, and I moved institutions and cities and embarked on some new projects about knowledge, vocational learning, and technology. Later again I moved back to Melbourne and my current university where I hold a senior position in the research area of the university executive, and I have an opportunity to see from senior levels how universities are functioning and to learn about academic careers and disciplinary difference. In this senior role in a research-intensive university, where there is quite an intensive engagement with government policies of various kinds, I have a renewed awareness of gender—and it seems now to be more difficult to address in a number of ways than it was in the 1970s and 1980s. In part this is because some things have been achieved: Explicit discrimination is now outlawed and women are a majority of undergraduate students. But alongside this there is less consciousness about gender as a problem that needs to be recognized (other than through the counting characteristic of the audit culture), so it is more difficult to get institutional attention to it. And in part it is because competitiveness, marketization, and reduced funding now seem to be pervasive in schools and universities, so expectations are higher, while the power of unions and belief in the ability to take account of reasonable conditions of work is reduced.

For a previous occasion (Yates, 2008), I summarized the changes I see between the conditions and agendas in both society and academia in relation to gender now as compared with when I first entered the field. I reprint it here as it illustrates the major changes (Table 1).

It is clear in this article that I have carried forward my own biography and starting points very much into the way I see gender and politics. The challenges I see now are both different and the same as the challenges I saw when I embarked on this area. What is different are the kinds of new conditions and interests I have summarized in Table 1: a public and policy discourse that sees education primarily through numbers; the problem of how to theorize and work with varying kinds of differences; the changing forms of schools, universities, technology, and global relationships. The continuities are that I continue to see education as deeply important in relation to the formation of self and society. And I still believe in the need in research and action to confront the conditions of a specific time and place, to recognize "theory/practice dilemmas" rather than simply read off either from the other, and to work with critical sociological perspectives as well as new ways of seeing what is important and what might be possible.

Table 1. Feminism and education in Australia: A snapshot of some changes (from Yates, 2008, p. 473)

1970s/ Early 1980s	*Current Decade*
Feminism a visible social movement (even *the* visible social movement), with feminist associations; public debates.	Feminism less present as a form of association; often residual as a strand within other political concerns
In education, feminist academics usually junior, isolated in own setting, vulnerable, establishing networks. Very few women in senior university positions.	In education, a number of 70s feminists now in senior and relatively powerful positions; their main work associations often no longer primarily feminist. Lively younger generation of feminists with ambivalent relationship to older feminists (and vice versa).
Beginning of appointment of "femocrats" and setting up of "Equal Opportunity Units," and women's advisers. Few women in senior political or bureaucratic roles outside these special situations.	Reduced and residual existence of equal opportunity units. Many more women in senior roles, but less specifically as advocates of feminist agendas.
"Equal opportunity" for women and "illegit-imacy of sexism" not yet a given in public policy	"Equal opportunity" for women and unacceptability of "sexism" in policy and political rhetoric now claimed by politicians to be a core principle of Australian culture and a key plank of a citizenship test for intending immigrants
Politically an optimistic time in terms of expansion of employment; broader concern with "social justice."	Politically, heightened fears of global competition and cultural differences; concern about league tables; political philosophy that improvement comes through private competition and individual choice, not state programs.
Debates within feminist research: Marxist versus radical versus liberal perspectives on sources of gendered inequality and strategies for change.	Debates within feminist research: poststructural versus humanist (voice) accounts of identity; substantively about race and difference.
Education: Feminists raise challenges around who gets what; what counts as acceptable knowledge; what is appropriate pedagogy.	Education: Feminists faced with confronting the perception that the "girls" problems have been solved and the central issue is about boys; heightened concerns about sexual harassment.
Themes: ideology; social construction of knowledge and identity; who does the talking; power, gender and class.	Themes: the body, fashioning the subject, identity, difference, desire, race and ethnicity; "new times" and generational change.
In media: feminism seen as radical, sometime outlandish (challenges about language); but acceptance of idea that girls' education and career outcomes should be improved.	In media: women's equality (stories of achieving women) of interest but disconnected from feminism; feminism seen as a dated carrier of the false hope that "women can have it all" and as responsible for burn-out and turning away from feminism by younger women; and feminism as humourless.
Research agendas: Bringing women's voice into research; uncovering causes of women's inequality.	Research agendas: Identity, new times; ethnicity, religion, immigration, citizenship in relation to equality and rights; How to confront dominance of empiricist "scientifically based research" criteria and "evidence."

PERSONAL FAVOURITES

Yates, L. (1985). "Curriculum becomes our way of contradicting biology and culture": An outline of some dilemmas for non-sexist education. *Australian Journal of Education, 29*(1), 3-16.

Yates, L. (1986). Is women's studies a legitimate school subject? An outline of an agenda for discussion. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 13*(1), 17-30.

Yates, L. (1986). Theorizing inequality today. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 7*(2) 119-134.

Yates, L. (1990). *Theory/practice dilemmas: Gender, knowledge and education*. Waurn Ponds, Australia: Deakin University.

Yates, L. (1993). *The education of girls: Policy, research and the question of gender*. Hawthorn, Australia: Australian Council for Education Research.

Yates, L. (1993). What happens when feminism is an agenda of the state? Feminist theory and the case of education policy in Australia. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 14*(1), 17-29.

Yates, L. (1997). Gender equity and the boys debate: What sort of challenge is it? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18*(3), 337-347.

Yates, L. (1998). Constructing and deconstructing "girls" as a category of concern. In A. Mackinnon, I. Elgqvist-Saltzman & A. Prentice (Eds.), *Education into the 21st century: Dangerous terrain for women?* (pp. 155-167). London: Falmer Press.

McLeod, J., & Yates, L. (2006). *Making modern lives: Subjectivity, schooling and social change.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Yates, L. (2009). From curriculum to pedagogy and back again. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 17*(1), 17-28.

REFERENCES

Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, codes and control. Vol 3*. London: Cassell and Collier MacMillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). *Distinction* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Pau

Davies, B. (1989). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales: Pre-school children and gender.* Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Eisenstein, H. (1996). *Inside agitators: Australian femocrats and the state.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conception of the self and morality. *Harvard Education Review, 47*(4), 481-517.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grumet, M. (1981). Conception, contradiction and curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1*(1), 165-184.

Kenway, J., & Willis, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Hearts and minds: Self-esteem and the schooling of girls.* London: Falmer Press.

Martin, J. R. (1982). Excluding women from the educational realm. *Harvard Education Review, 34*(4), 341-353.

McLeod, J., & Yates, L. (1997). Can we find out about girls and boys today, or must we just settle for talking about ourselves? Dilemmas of a feminist, qualitative longitudinal research project. *Australian Education Researcher, 24*(3), 23-42.

McLeod, J., & Yates, L. (2006). *Making modern lives: Subjectivity, schooling and social change.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

O'Brien, M. (1984). The commatization of women: Patriarchal fetishism in the sociology of education. *Interchange, 15*(2), 43-60.

Spender, D. (Ed.). (1980). *Men's studies modified*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
Walkerdine, V., & Lucey, H. (1989). *Democracy in the kitchen? Regulating mothers and socialising daughters*. London: Virago.
Yates, L. (1983). The theory and practice of counter-sexist education in schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 3*(2), 33-44.
Yates, L. (1985a). "Curriculum becomes our way of contradicting biology and culture": An outline of some dilemmas for non-sexist education. *Australian Journal of Education, 29*(1), 3-16.
Yates, L. (1985b). Is girl-friendly schooling really what girls need? In J. Whyte, R. Deem, L. Kant, & M. Cruikshank (Eds.), *Girl Friendly Schooling* (pp. 210-230). London: Methuen.
Yates, L. (1986a). Is women's studies a legitimate school subject? An outline of an agenda for discussion. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 13*(1), 17-30.
Yates, L. (1986b). Theorizing inequality today. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 7*(2), 119-134.
Yates, L. (1990). *Theory/practice dilemmas: Gender, knowledge and education*. Waurn Ponds, Australia: Deakin University.
Yates, L. (Ed.). (1993a). *Feminism and education.* Bundoora, Australia: La Trobe University Press.
Yates, L. (1993b). *The education of girls: Policy, research and the question of gender*. Hawthorn, Australia: Australian Council for Education Research .
Yates, L. (1993c). What happens when feminism is an agenda of the state? Feminist theory and the case of education policy in Australia. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 14*(1), 17-29.
Yates, L. (1994). Feminist pedagogy meets critical pedagogy meets poststructuralism (review essay). *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *15*(3), 429-437.
Yates, L. (1997a). Gender equity and the boys debate: What sort of challenge is it? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18*(3), 337-347.
Yates, L. (1997b). Gender, ethnicity and the inclusive curriculum: An episode in the policy framing of Australian education. In C. Marshall (Ed.), *Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from primary and secondary schooling* (pp. 41-50). London: Falmer Press.
Yates, L. (1998). Constructing and deconstructing "girls" as a category of concern. In A. Mackinnon, I. Elgqvist-Saltzman, & A. Prentice (Eds.), *Education into the 21st century: Dangerous terrain for women?* (pp. 155-167). London: Falmer Press.
Yates, L. (1999). Feminism's fandango with the state revisited. *Women's Studies International Forum, 22*(5), 555-562.
Yates, L. (2000). The "facts of the case": Gender equity for boys as a public policy issue. In N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at school* (pp. 305-322). New York: Sage.
Yates, L. (2002). Effectiveness, difference and sociological research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 23*(3), 329-338.
Yates, L. (2007). Embodying education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 39*(7), 772-777.
Yates, L. (2008). Revisiting feminism and education: Who speaks? What questions? What context? What impact? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 29*(4), 471-481.
Yates, L. (2009). From curriculum to pedagogy and back again. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 17*(1), 17-28.
Yates, L., & McLeod, J. (2000). Social justice and the middle. *Australian Education Researcher*, *27*(3), 59-78.

Lyn Yates
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Foundation Professor of Curriculum
The University of Melbourne