A Tale of Two Women Leaders: Diversity Policies and Practices in Enterprise Universities

Jane Wilkinson
Charles Sturt University

Abstract

This paper explores the ways in which senior female academics' leadership practices are informed and negotiated in relation to a multiplicity of fields. As part of the shift in the logics of practice underpinning the Australian academic terrain, there has been a movement from the implementation of equity policies to that of diversity in relation to the employment of academic staff, characterised by neoliberal discourses of new public management which favour the production of the individualistic, entrepreneurial academic identity as opposed to notions of collectivity and the public good. However, diversity policies are not the sole texts that inform the ways in which many women leaders operate, nor the most important in guiding the practices they produce. Drawing on a larger study of representations of women's leadership in the media and academia, this paper examines how two leading female academics drew upon a range of logics of practices within the different fields of academia, feminism and Indigenous rights to inform their leadership practices. In so doing, the women contested the emergent logic of practice underpinning the contemporary Australian academic field. Such contestation can be considered one of the "subaltern" consequences of policy regimes and forms an integral part of policy fields.

Introduction

> I don't think we can ignore the fact that some presence produces . . . (particular) . . . signals in our country which are about power, authority, class, style . . . They're just there in the background all the time . . . There's nothing you can do about it – you can't educate everybody on the spot about diversity and fairness and civility . . .
> (Quote from "Simone"[1], senior Australian female academic).

At first glance, Simone appears not to be a candidate for Bourdieu's notion of "la petite misere" – the everyday social suffering which, he argues, characterises contemporary western societies (Bourdieu, Parkhurst Ferguson, Emanuel, Johnson & Waryn, 1999). On the contrary, she belongs to a small group of privileged, middle-class women holding positions of some power and authority within the global tertiary field. It is a group that has been characterised as an emerging "elite" of "knowledge experts" who make up a "new class of professional nonpartisan politicians serving on international organisations" (Luke, 2001, pp. 20-21). If this is the case, then, to use an Australian colloquialism, what do such women have to whinge about?

This paper examines how two senior women academics from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, negotiated the "dangerous territories" of the current Australian university field (Roman & Eyre, 1997). It is a field, which, in terms of its policy commitment to equity and diversity, has offered much to women academics but which in practice, has delivered a "meagre harvest" (Kaplan, 1996). In particular, the paper explores the "ambiguous empowerment" (Chase, 1995) of the women's subject location as leaders in so-called "enterprise" universities. The latter term refers to a sector whose "fundamental mission" has become the generation of "institutional prestige", over and above, academic and/or economic objectives (Marginson & Considine 2000, p. 5). This transformation of the sector has led to a felt dissonance for many women leaders. On the one hand, Australian universities have had a long-standing commitment to equity and diversity policies for women. On the other hand, the emergence of an array of concrete practices arising from enterprise discourses of efficiency and competition have subverted the intention of these former policies (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007).

However, this is not a "text of despair" (Kenway, Willis, Blackmore & Rennie, 1994). The paper examines how the women call upon collective practices drawn from the fields of Aboriginal activism and feminism amongst others, in order to challenge the policies and practices of the current university field. Although not always successful, their practices suggest a clear contestation of the prevailing managerialist logic, which characterises many Australian universities.

Researching Ethnically and Socioeconomically Diverse Senior Women Academics

In 2001, as part of a larger study examining representations of women's leadership in the media and Australian universities, in-depth interviews were conducted with six women academics from a variety of ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, who held a range of leadership positions with the Australian academic field (Wilkinson, 2005). The interviews explored their leadership experiences in terms of:

- The intersection of gender, ethnicity and class; and
- The individual women's perceptions of the dominant discourses of leadership they encountered in their work.

The women came from European, Anglo, Asian and Aboriginal origin and were of working and middle-class backgrounds. Due to the small numbers of women of non Anglo ethnic origin in leadership positions in Australian universities, their descriptions deliberately have been kept as general as possible to avoid identification and pseudonyms have been used. The women held a range of leadership positions in research and management in universities and they came from a variety of disciplines including both the arts and sciences. The decision to select women leaders from a range of ethnic and socio-economic origins was based upon the need to begin to challenge the hegemonic norm that still underpins much contemporary feminist leadership research in terms of an assumed (white, middle-class) construction of female leadership (Wilkinson, 2005).

It could be argued that the presence of such a diverse range of women within positions of leadership in academe provides some anecdotal evidence for the success of equity policies within Australian universities over the past three decades. There is some credibility to this claim. Equity, and more recently, diversity policies have been part of the logics of practice, which have shaped the discursive terrain of the Australian tertiary education field over the past three decades. A number of the women interviewed acknowledged the positive capital that their difference as female, and sometimes, non Anglo managers brought in terms of kudos and "cachet" to their university (Wilkinson, 2005). However, they also commented upon the dissonance in values they experienced between their various subject locations within the feminist and Indigenous rights fields, and the personal domain; and the contrasting values of the academic field of management, in which an uncritical adherence to new managerialism and the market was expected (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007; Wilkinson, 2005). Before looking more specifically at two of the women leaders' experiences of diversity policies and practices, it is necessary to contextualise the discussion in terms of the emergence of diversity as a policy in the Australian academic field.

Diversity Policies in Enterprise Universities

One of the consequences of the predominance of corporate managerialism in the organisation and administration of Australian academe (Deem, Hillyard & Reed, 2007) has been the emergence of diversity policies, as a substitute for equity policies. Diversity policies are drawn from the American business management field and came to prominence in Australia through a series of key reports into Australian management

commissioned by the federal government in the mid 1990s (Burton & Ryall, 1995; Karpin, 1995).

There is a number of different readings of diversity, depending upon the context. For example, the Australian-bred discourse of productive diversity emphasises "negotiated difference" and "civic pluralism" (Bacchi, 2001; Cope & Kalantzis, 1997). Alternatively, diversity may be framed within a discourse of social justice, which aims to change the culture of organisations rather than assimilating people within them (Bacchi, 2001). More commonly in Australian universities, with the reification of competition over collaboration (Deem et al., 2007) the discourse has drawn upon an "individual differences" approach which ignores recognition of structural inequities such as gender, "race" and class. Instead, management of diversity is posited as making business sense, utilising the talents and skills of the variety of individuals within one's workplace (Bacchi, 2001; Burton & Ryall, 1995; Karpin, 1995).

The language of diversity may be associated with many different agendas and appears within vastly different contexts (Bacchi, 2001). It can signal a genuine commitment to "deep cultural change" through the embedding of diversity principles within the deep, underpinning values of an organisation (Bacchi). Alternatively, given the current emphasis in the Australian university field upon corporate principles, cost-efficiency and competitive individualism; it connotes a logical fit with such an institutional habitus (Bacchi).

How compatible are equity issues with corporate managerialism, given the latter's emphasis upon efficiency and effectiveness? Moreover, what are the material effects of the practices and policies of diversity upon senior women managers, particularly given the context of contemporary Australian university management's adherence to new managerialism? The stories of the two women which follow centre upon their experiences of restructuring and illustrate the Janus face of diversity upon the group that at face value appears to have benefited most from such policies – senior women academics.

The Outsider as Positive Capital: The Janus Face of Diversity in Academia

It has been argued that traditionally in the academic field, "(t)he status of citizen is reserved for those who are male/academic" (Stanley, 1997, p. 3). Hence, to be a female "non-citizen" in a position of authority appeared to be a two-edged sword for Simone, a senior academic. To be an outsider was heralded as an important form of symbolic capital by her employing university, whilst simultaneously, leaving her vulnerable to prejudice and sexism.

Simone was of European, working-class origin and a relatively senior manager within her university. Given the culturally and socioeconomically diverse student clientele of her university and the fierce competition, which Australian tertiary institutions are facing for a rapidly dwindling education dollar, part of the quest for legitimacy may rest upon a university's reputation as an institution, which embraces diversity. Hence, the presence of high-profile leaders such as Simone "who are . . . used as the institutional 'breath of fresh air'" (Yeatman, 1995, p. 203) may provide universities such as hers with valuable symbolic capital and a competitive edge. However, Simone noted that the diversity, which her university sought when appointing her to an executive management role, was no longer so welcome when it was put into practice. Diversity as a marketing tool which enhanced perceptions of quality might be acceptable but as a set of practices, which might upset the hegemony of the largely Anglo-Australian management, it was less so. Simone summed up the dilemma of diversity:

> There has been for a number of years a certain cachet or attractiveness to being a woman and of minority background for universities…They've wanted to include people so that they can live up to the kinds of values that they espouse. So at one level…they want you for your difference and that does make an opportunity for you…
>
> On the negative side…the very things…that make you attractive are then the things that for some people irritate, grate or are attributes of an outsider…you are also quite often an outsider in emotional terms and in terms of the way that you operate and your values…you're carrying an extra burden…on top of the outsiderness that women bring…in a place – particularly in management – that's dominated by Anglo men.

One of the major material effects of diversity policies in Simone's workplace appeared to be to provide a positive subject location upon which she could call. Why did this initial advantage become something which "grate(d)"? Let us turn to an examination of her experience of restructuring to tease this point out further.

Leading Restructuring: Simone's Story

For Simone, a bold attempt at changing traditional management structures left her feeling "burnt-out" by a perceived lack of support from senior executive. She commented:

> I said there'd be no job losses when I came in and I've kept my word. But I did say there would be different roles…so in moving as I did to

> produce this change and to bring in new business processes, which were . . . about fairness, openness, access, equitability, making sure that . . . (different groupings of) . . . staff had equal status. When you set about democratising . . . and focusing on creativity rather than the kind of privileged hierarchy that was there before . . . that group that felt they were no longer in control of resources were very bitter . . .
>
> When the going gets tough what you get is the rhetoric . . . So even though you might produce excellent performance and excellent results, in the end it's the political balance that . . . ultimately prevail(s) . . . it's old-fashioned politics, hierarchy, affinity, networks, looking after your patch . . . People like myself are wasted when they try to deliver both what is required in terms of the financial as well as . . . re-engineering for survival.

Sandwiched between her staff and upper management in a university in which most of the decision-making was concentrated in the latter group's hands, Simone, like many female middle managers in academia, had to bear the brunt of the "emotional labour" (Munford & Rumball, 2001, p. 140) which has eventuated as a result of the at-times brutal restructuring of the tertiary education system in Australia. She noted that

> the troops – your staff – expect you . . . (as senior academic) . . . to be the boundary rider against the . . . (senior management) . . . And so you're the meat in the sandwich in a sense, without the power or active participation . . . it's just rhetorical participation in the . . . decision- making because you're not actually in the circle that makes the decisions because you're down there on the ground trying to keep things running . . . And I think they are very difficult . . . roles . . . because you wear the responsibility of the success or failure of the unit that you lead without having all the power to be able to determine its future.

The environment in which Simone attempted to implement changes was one that appeared to embrace diversity, but in practice, placed severe limitations upon it as a construct. The formal management structures of her university appeared to be particularly hierarchical and corporate-driven, in contrast to the more collegial models of decision-making in sandstone universities (Marginson & Considine, 2000). For example, despite the presence of one other more senior feminist manager, Simone noted that her university operated like a tightly knit (Anglo, men's) club. She observed:

> I'm forthright. I engage – I'm frank . . . and that's not how it operates. There's a code of operation around tea and coffee and . . . networking . . . I'm

> one of the few outsiders in this university. Usually…you come up through the ranks…

Simone's outsider status was exacerbated by a personal habitus, which she described as "expressive . . . passionate . . . womanly". It was thus in clear opposition to the "unspoken and unspeakable rules" (Moi, 2000, p. 318), underpinning the deeply hierarchical and insular culture of Anglo, masculinist university management (Walker, 1998). In particular, Simone noted the clash between the public and personal domains in "an organisation that regards professionalism as not involving those tags of family. Not in more than pictures on your table anyway".

Simone attempted to be management's "breath of fresh air" (Yeatman, 1995, p. 203) through her implementation of a more democratic regime, based on what she saw as key business principles of "fairness, openness, access, equitability". In so doing, she both exposed and threatened, the naturalised, taken-for-granted practices of power and the multiplicity of points from which it was exercised within her faculty and the wider university (Foucault, 1990). Simone's surprise at the lack of support for her major changes from senior executive when the backlash to her faculty's restructure emerged, suggests that Simone may have "fallen down in her 'mastery'" of academic management (Walker, 1998, p. 336) perhaps because she had not read, understood or been mentored by more knowledgeable management players into the subtle play which informed her university's implicit management practices. This is not to read Simone's attempts at restructuring as an individual failure, but to point to how it connotes a broader academic management habitus which

> obscures the subtle barriers, the "clubbiness", while leaving the technical aspects of the profession visible. Hence women's confusion when they meet the technical demands, but still fail to advance, for they have fallen down in their "mastery" (literally) of the academic occupational culture (Walker, 1998, p. 336).

Simone may not have built, or perhaps had been refused entreÏe into the alliances, networks and coalitions, which would have allowed her to build a power base from which to attempt more significant change. Her management practices may have presented the uncontainable face of diversity to upper management, for they appeared to pose a degree of threat to entrenched power relations. For example, Simone attempted to confer equal status upon both administration and higher education staff, thus challenging long-standing gendered binaries between (largely femininised) administration staff and (masculinized) academic staff (Carrington & Pratt, 2003).

Simone's doomed attempts at restructuring suggest the micropolitics of power embedded within academic management, that is, "the ways in which power is relayed in everyday practices" such as "influence, networks, coalitions, political and personal strategies to effect or resist change…(and)…alliance building" (Morley, 1999, pp. 4-5). Her university's habitus of clubbiness and refusal to adopt her as a full academic management citizen, through a range of "subtle and overt practices" left her "feeling undermined, confused and disempowered" (Morley, 1999, p. 1). Simone's despair at the symbolic violence which arises from the dissonance between management's apparent adherence to policies of diversity and the brutalising material impacts of other management practices, is exposed when she declares at one stage:

> Maybe people like us shouldn't be here…maybe they've tamed me…they have broken my spirit…I think I'm bi-cultural…I can move in and out of that. But if you're of the kith-and-kin you're looked after. If you're not…you're hung out to dry…

Simone's observations suggest the material effects upon staff that result from a new entrepreneurial discourse of masculinity in the academic field, characterized as "singularly lacking in empathy as to the human costs of…changes…in…institutions" (Collier, 2001). It suggests the symbolic violence wreaked upon individuals when policies of diversity open up discursive locations which appear to promise ways of leading, but in reality may not reach beyond the symbolic level of an organisation (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007; Newman, 1995).

Leading Restructuring: Amelia's Story

Simone's experiences of leading restructuring may suggest the limitations of diversity policies in Australian universities for senior women academics. In particular, it implies that the genuine take-up of diversity/equity policies at an individual organisational level, may depend upon the university context in which women are located and whether the organisation adheres at a deeper level or a more purely symbolic level to practices of equity. Does Simone's story suggest that women leaders must choose between being positioned as the containable face of diversity, relying on an individualised reading of the game and fit within the field; upon the skilful building of alliances; depending upon the good graces of those in senior authority; not challenging entrenched practices; and hence, running the risk of reasserting old gender hierarchies in new guises? Alternatively, do women leaders boldly attempt to enact alternative forms of workplace practices based on notions of equality and fairness, drawn from one's political location in alternative fields such as feminism, but in the long run, possibly face professional and personal burnout and disillusionment? Let us turn to an alternative model of leadership, which suggests a different subject location to these stark choices.

Amelia was the most senior of the women leaders interviewed – an Indigenous feminist from a working-class background, with grown-up children and a partner. As a former educator, leading public servant and member of the legal fraternity, she brought to her university position, the symbolic capital of the legal and political fields of power. In sum, the legitimacy she had earned in terms of the Anglo-Australian, masculinist authority of the law and public service, carried over into her senior academic role.

Although she held no formal leadership position within Aboriginal politics or feminism as fields, Amelia's public profile and willingness to speak out on a range of topics, including Aboriginal/feminist issues, meant that she was regularly used by the media as a source of information, as well as featuring as a central and often controversial figure in news articles. Her regular presence in two other dominant fields of media and politics, located Amelia within a "metafield…which acts on other fields and influences their practices" (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002, p. 87). Her leadership habitus was powerfully shaped by her location within the fields of feminism, law and academe and she called upon feminist discourses to enact change at the most senior level of her university. Moreover, she possessed the formal authority to bring about change within her university to a far greater degree than Simone, while simultaneously being subjected to the power, which arose from her location within the metafield.

In addition, Amelia was located within a university which she described as having a "pretty good record with respect to Indigenous education" and which appointed her because she was viewed as an "Indigenous female role model". However, she noted, its culture was also rooted in "long decades of a sense of privilege" both for men and "the landed gentry", with "less attention" paid to the position of women, and racist and sexist attitudes amongst upper management.

Crucially, Amelia was appointed at a time when the university was "in such a condition that it was necessary" for her to take a lead role in terms of major reforms, including the overhaul of management. Thus, she had a unique "opportunity to have a major impact on the higher education sector in this country". Amelia's university had lower stakes in the academic field and less symbolic capital to lose compared to Simone's institution. In this sense, it was "precariously free to reinvent…(it)self" by appointing to a leadership role, an Aboriginal feminist who came from outside the academic field and complemented its student profile (Marginson & Considine, 2000, p. 202).

As a "network of relationships" and a "distribution of power", each sub sector within the field of academe is "related to each other in determinate ways" and has a "specific 'weight' or authority" (Ringer, 2000, p. 67). The "weight" of the sandstones defines what counts as "intellectually established and culturally legitimate" within academia and hence, the symbolic capital attached to "Angloness", middle/upper "classness" and

masculinity, suggests the power and authority designated to white, Western forms of knowledge and leading. By appointing Amelia to a senior position, her university both indicated its lesser weight within the field, (but also "in the absence of a history" it could use which would give it legitimacy) and attempted to "reinvent . . ." itself with a bold strategy of selecting a leader from outside dominant paradigms of ruling (Marginson & Considine, 2000, p. 202).

Changing the System from Within

Amelia entered a university that required her to act as a harbinger of change, "to 'call' all the fustian, patriarchal inefficiencies of the old institutional culture" into being (Yeatman, 1995, p. 203). She seized her power with alacrity, drawing on her significant pool of knowledge about the change process as a former senior public servant. For example, in describing a major change she brought about to a major committee over which she temporarily presided and which was to select new management, she commented:

> I . . . looked around the . . . table and saw that there were only . . . (a minority of) . . . women . . . and I said that this had to change. Whereupon I got a blast from . . . (the) . . . men . . . (One of the men) . . . was . . . actually racist and sexist . . . (t)hat was pretty much the . . . culture . . . at the time . . . I suppose they could see . . . that this was actually a threat to their incumbency . . . I intended to get rid of them and . . . that's precisely what I did. It took me about . . . (X amount of time) . . . but I did it.

Amelia had the power to change the habitus of her university's formal leadership team, to reflect her commitment to equity, feminism and more democratic structures and processes, rather than being brought in as a harbinger of change and then struggling, like Simone, with a lack of fit within the hierarchy, little formal authority, and symbolic punishment for her outsider status. Amelia called up her political commitment to second wave feminist values of equity and collective ways of working, when she observed:

> I do try to treat everybody around me – and I don't care what position they hold . . . as a human being. I know . . . of men who walk past and don't even acknowledge the presence of people like typists or . . . their PA's . . . they treat them like dogs . . . I have the view that everybody . . . has a view on how the institution can run . . . So that's important to try to include everybody in the team rather than being . . . the head honcho . . . I'm actually much more interested in having the institution achieving a position within the world hierarchy . . . and . . . long after I'm dead and gone . . . the . . . institution will be remembered and I think that's what's important.

The symbolic capital of Amelia's gender and race, combined with the legitimacy of her authority within the legal field, and the senior position she held in academia, afforded her a unique opportunity

> to be able to change attitudes within – the universities . . . (which) . . . have been . . . like law . . . the strongest bastions of sexism and male privilege and there's an enormous opportunity . . . to break that down.

Her habitus as a former senior public servant and member of the legal fraternity, provided her with a very strong *"practical sense* . . . of a socially constituted 'sense of the game'" of the fields of power in law and the public service which she brought to her university role (Wacquant, 1989, p. 42). For example, in discussing how to bring about changes to the system, she argued for the need to be

> absolutely clear about why you are there, what is your agenda, what is it you think you're going to achieve and how do you think you're going to achieve it. And you've got to be absolutely clear – you've got to keep your eyes on the prize – you don't waver.
>
> There are some things that you'll go to the trenches over because they are . . . fundamental principles that you don't give up. There are other things you've got to learn to say, "I'm not prepared to go to the trenches over this" . . . But the important thing is not to get caught up or get . . . smoke in your eyes . . . when the brushfires break out . . .
>
> The big challenge is to find your way through the morass of rules and the regulations and conventional practices . . . but . . . if you've got a very clear idea of what it is you want to do and how you want to do it, you soon find your way through those things . . . And not to be sidetracked and not to waver . . . I think it's because people are impatient or that they haven't done their own work on themselves . . . So they become acted upon instead of acting upon themselves.

The dominant fields of politics, law and academia produce "certain commonalities of habitus and practice as they are translated within the differing logics of . . . (the) . . . separate fields" (Jenkins, 1992, p. 86). Thus, unlike Simone, Amelia was not confused by the inner logic of academia's habitus of "subtle barriers" and "clubbiness", for it had parallels within the "occupational culture" of the legal and public servant fields – locations whose games she had "master(ed)" (Walker, 1997, p. 336).

Importantly, however, Amelia was also strongly located within the fields of feminism and Aboriginal civil rights – fields whose habitus are imbued with a political commitment to values of social justice and equity, and collective ways of leading. They stand in stark

contrast to the individualising, hierarchical focus that Amelia noted had characterised the academic and legal fields and which Amelia constantly challenged both through her own practices, and via the appointment of feminist women at the most senior levels of her university whose presence and practices had "actually change(d) the culture in the place". However, she also noted the enduring nature of the sexism and racism that underpinned both these fields and society as a whole, commenting:

> that's not to say that there are not deep-seated pockets of racism and always attempts at male domination. And that's not to say that . . . the male paradigm doesn't operate very strongly. It does obviously. In fact it permeates society and how we change that is another thing.

Answering Back to Policies and Practices of Diversity: Where to from Here?

What do Amelia's and Simone's stories reveal about diversity policy and leadership as a set of practices within Australian universities? Although acknowledging that this paper is limited by its focus on two women leaders, nonetheless, their accounts suggest the inadequacy of traditional modernist, rational modes of policy analysis which view policies as formal texts offering technocratic solutions to the so-called problem of lack of diversity in the university field (Hardy, Wilkinson, & Rawolle, 2006). What is not considered in such approaches is the dialectical interplay between policies as texts and the material effects of policies in terms of the varying practices they engender, in particular in relation to how people with diverse amounts of capital act as policy players as they interact with, reshape, challenge and reconstruct policies in a range of institutional contexts within a field. Secondly, such approaches ignore how policy texts are differentially taken up, in an academic field whose institutional habitus and ensuing practices often remain deeply raced, classed and gendered. Finally, they fail to consider the differing habituses of the individual universities in which such policies are played out and the differential material effects thus engendered, of which the two women's narratives of restructuring provide a glimpse.

The women's stories suggest that the degree to which a specific policy is realised within a university may depend upon how deeply it becomes embedded within the habitus of an institution, and that this in turn, is dependent upon a university's values, beliefs, behaviours and practices in relation to equity and diversity. Simone's story provides a salutary tale of the symbolic violence that may flow when diversity or equity policies are embedded only at the symbolic level, leaving the organisational practices, norms of behaviour and values layers unchanged and unchallenged (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007; Newman, 1995). The implication in Simone's story appears to be that diversity is an attractive, individualised and containable commodity to be marketed to clients in order

to promote choice, rather than a policy genuinely rooted in values of inclusivity and difference (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003). This is particularly the case in Simone's university, where an apparently symbolic adherence to diversity, allied to a strong adherence to corporate models of enterprise management, appeared to produce a set of institutional logics of practice which clashed with the values of equity and democracy, that Simone had absorbed through her location within the field of feminism. Her experience suggests that "new privileged hierarchies" of power may be in danger of being asserted (Chan, 2000) when leadership discourses and policy texts of diversity and women as change agents (Yeatman, 1995) are apolitically and unreflectively interpellated into the gendered, raced and classed habitus that constitutes the academic field (Currie, Thiele, & Harris, 2002).

Amelia's story provides a glimpse into the agentic possibilities that can be opened up within a field, when an individual player with significant symbolic capital, genuine authority at a senior executive level and a commitment to equity values drawn from other fields outside the higher education terrain, is brought in to transform an organisation. Her attempts to embed equity and diversity policies at the symbolic, the organisational and the attitudinal levels of her organisation (Newman, 1995), (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003), through, for example, the appointment of female managers across all levels who had a reputation for commitment to equity, and alterations to the gender and ethnic balance of senior committees, suggest the power of a diversity policy infused with political notions of social justice. It reveals both the political nature of educational leadership and the important shifts that can occur in a field when people are "in control of their knowing as primarily policy makers rather than just policy takers" (Gunter, 2004, p. 38).

Bourdieu has argued that there has been an increase in the "potential for subversive misappropriation" with the increase in "movement and conflict between fields of action" in contemporary society (Bourdieu, 1989, cited in McNay, 1999, p. 106). Feminists are divided as to whether the gender reflexive dispositions that may arise when women experience dissonances between the fields (that is, a lack of fit between field and habitus) will, in turn, translate into dramatic transformations of gender norms or alternatively, may instead result in the reinscription of gender in "new but old ways" (Adkins cited in McLeod, 2005, p. 23). Simone and Amelia's stories suggest that their subject location in a number of fields such as Aboriginal rights, feminism, the personal domain, business, politics, law and the media, may open up spaces for "subversive misappropriation" (McNay, 2000, p. 52). Their varying experiences of restructuring and of their individual universities' responsiveness to diversity policies, suggest the agentic possibilities that may flow in terms of the transformation of gender norms. However, they also reveal how gender norms may be retraditionalized in individual institutions when policies such as that of diversity, uncritically position women as the new source of change, while leaving largely uninterrogated, the subtle

practices and processes that entrench more traditional gender relations of ruling. Simone and Amelia's narratives suggest however, that a critical difference between the two scenarios lies in the willingness of individual universities to adopt a "systemic and structural recognition of gender equity" (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007, p. 239) which is both "bottom up", as well as top down and is informed by leaders with the moral and positional authority to ensure that equity policies are executed throughout the organisation (Sinclair, 1998). The challenge for enterprise universities is to embrace this latter position.

Endnotes

[1] Pseudonyms are used in this paper for interview participants.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Bill Green for his crucial support of the "Policy as Practice" Symposium held at Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, November 2006 from which the original ideas for this paper arose. I would also like to thank colleagues, Shaun Rawolle and Ian Hardy, as well as Jill Blackmore for the stimulating discussions and feedback, which informed the writing of this paper. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the wisdom of the Indigenous elders and their commitment to social justice, for without them this research would not have been possible.

References

Bacchi, C. (2001). Managing equity: mainstreaming and "diversity" in Australian universities. In A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon (Eds.), *Gender and the Restructured University*, pp. 119-135. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2003). Managing equity work in the performative university. *Australian Feminist Studies*, *18*(41), 141-162.

Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2007). *Performing and reforming leaders: Gender, educational restructuring, and organizational change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bourdieu, P., Parkhurst Ferguson, P., Emanuel, S., Johnson, J., & Waryn, S. Trans. (1999). *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Burton, C. & Ryall, C. (1995) Enterprising Nation – Renewing Australia's Managers to Meet the Challenges of the Asia-Pacific Century: Managing for Diversity, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Carrington, K. & Pratt, A. (2003) 'How Far Have We Come? Gender Disparities in the Australian Higher Education System', Social Policy Group, Department of the Parliamentary Library, Commonwealth of Australia, Current Issues Brief No. 31 2002-3, Canberra.

Chan, D. (2000) The poetics of cultural theory: on hybridity and new hierarchies, *Journal of Australian Studies and Australian Cultural History*, vol. 22, pp. 52-57.

Chase, S. E. (1995) Ambiguous Empowerment: The Work Narratives of Women School Superintendents, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Collier, R. (2001) Gender, the academic career and work-life balance: women, men and the "private life" of the law school. Paper presented at LSA Conference, Budapest.

Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (1997) *Productive Diversity: A New, Australian Model for Work and Management*, Pluto Press Australia Limited, New South Wales.

Currie, J., Thiele, B. & Harris, P. (2002) *Gendered Universities in Globalized Economies: Power, Careers, and Sacrifices*, Lexington Books, Lanham, Maryland.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S. & Reed, M. (2007) Knowledge, Higher Education, and the New Managerialism: The Changing Management of UK Universities, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Foucault, M. (1990) The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality Volume One, Penguin Books, London.

Gunter, H. (2004) Labels and labelling in the field of educational leadership, *Discourse*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 21-42.

Hardy, I., Wilkinson, J. & Rawolle, S. (unpub.) Policy as practice. Paper prepared for 'Policy as Practice' symposium. Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, November, 2006.

Jenkins, R. (1992) *Pierre Bourdieu*, Routledge, London.

Kaplan, G. (1996) The Meagre Harvest: The Australian Women's Movement 1950s-1990s, Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd, Sydney.

Karpin, D. (1995) Enterprising Nation – Renewing Australia's Managers to Meet the Challenges of the Asia-Pacific Century: Report of the Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Kenway, J., Willis, S., Blackmore, J. & Rennie, L. (1994) Making "hope practical" rather than "despair convincing": Feminist post-structuralism, gender reform and educational change, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 187-210.

Luke, C. (2001) *Globalization and Women in Academia: North/West, South/East*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey.

McLeod, J. (2005) Feminists re-reading Bourdieu: old debates and new questions about gender habitus and gender change, *Theory and Research in Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 11-30.

McNay, L. (2000) Gender and Agency: Reconfiguring the Subject in Feminism and Social Theory, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Marginson, S. & Considine, M. (2000) *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Moi, T. (2000) Appropriating Bourdieu: feminist theory and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of culture, in D. Robbins, ed., *Pierre Bourdieu, Volume Four*, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 314-341.

Morley, L. (1999) Organising Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy, St Martin's Press, New York.

Munford, R. & Rumball, S. (2001) Managing innovatively, in A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon, eds., *Gender and the Restructured University*, The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham, pp. 136-150.

Newman, J. (1995) Gender and cultural change, in C. Itzin and J. Newman, eds., *Gender, Culture and Organizational Change: Putting Theory into Practice*, Routledge, London.

Ringer, F. (2000) The intellectual field, intellectual history, and the sociology of knowledge, in D. Robbins, ed., *Pierre Bourdieu*, vol. 3, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 66-86.

Roman, L. G. and L. Eyre, eds. (1997) Dangerous Territories: Struggles for Difference and Equality in Education, Routledge, New York.

Sinclair, A. (1998) Doing Leadership Differently: Gender, Power and Sexuality in a Changing Business Culture, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.

Stanley, L. (1997) Knowing Feminisms: On Academic Borders, Territories and Tribes, SAGE Publications, London.

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1989) Towards a reflexive sociology: a workshop with Pierre Bourdieu, *Sociological Theory*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 26-63.

Walker, M. (1997) Women in the academy: ambiguity and complexity in a South African landscape, *Gender and Education*, vol. 9, no. 3.

Walker, M. (1998) Academic identities: women on a South African landscape, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 335-354.

Webb, J., Schirato, T. and G. Danaher (2002) *Understanding Bourdieu*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Wilkinson, J. (2005) Examining representations of women's leadership in the media and Australian universities. Unpublished dissertation submitted for fulfilment of Doctor of Philosophy, Deakin University, Geelong.

Yeatman, A. (1995) The gendered management of equity-oriented change in higher education, in J. Smyth, ed., *Academic Work: The Changing Labour Process in Higher Education*, Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham, pp. 194-205.