Journal of Research on Leadership Education
Volume 3, Issue 1 (May, 2008)

ULYSSES' RETURN: RESILIENT MALE LEADERS STILL AT THE HELM

Rhonda McClellan
Texas Woman's University

Dana Christman
Anthony Fairbanks
New Mexico State University

Resiliency is defined as an adaptive and coping trait that forms and hones positive character skills is often attributed to a person's ability to overcome adversity (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Janas, 2002; Richardson, 2002; Werner & Smith, 1982; Whatley, 1998). In fact, Grotberg (2003) contends that when enduring adversity, resilient people change their personalities bettering ways that help them persevere through future hardships. Furthermore, in order to develop resiliency, individuals must continue to persevere through the interaction of two factors: (a) risk factors that may be defined as adversities that intensify vulnerability, and (b) protective factors that may be personal, familial, and community safeguards and provisions of strength (Jessor, 1993; Kumpfer, 1993; Masten, Best, & Garmezy, 1990; Norman, 2000; Rutter, 1987). For resilient people, these transformations lead to reoccurring self-reflection and insight.

Much has been written about resiliency, but little of it addresses how people in higher education leadership positions describe or acknowledge their experiences with overcoming difficulties. Indeed, when talking about one's own resiliency, an individual must acknowledge the risk factors of recognized threats, as well as personal strength and constitution in overcoming threats. Additionally, much of leadership depends on the person's self-awareness and identity (Ackerman & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2002; Christman & McClellan, 2008; Komives, 2005).

Identity is, in large part, defined by our sex and the social constructions surrounding gender. Regardless of biological and social restraints, how we choose to gender ourselves may be in contrast to how we are biologically and socially sexed (Lorber, 1994; Ragins, 1997; West & Zimmerman, 1987). What we perceive as our strength and ability to overcome difficulties, twistingly enough, may project a gendered-self that is problematic for onlookers. In leadership positions, gendering one's identity beyond the social constructions may create an interesting intersection of society and self—risk and personal protection. How others perceive the leader's gender and how the leader acknowledges the constraints and freedom of his or her gender can be both a threat against and a catalyst for resiliency. The study reported in this article used *discussions about resiliency* as a tool for understanding leaders' perceptions of their own identity and how they gender their leadership.

Most of who we are is defined by our gender. Judith Butler (2004) points out that much of this identity is beyond our control, that the making up of our own gender is historical, cultural, and political. In fact, dividing gender into two norms, one positioned by power and the other positioned by subjugation, initiates an internal and social struggle (Butler, 1990, 2004; Harding, 1998; Oakley, 2000; Sloop, 2004; Steinberg, 1993). Women must work to become more like those in positions of power; men must avoid being perceived as feminine (Gilligan, 1993; Harding, 1998; Tannen, 1994). In general, this thinking initiates the "us versus them" understanding of gender differences. This dichotomous approach to gender, based on sex, simplifies into one way of being or another. Thus, society expects—problematically so—women to behave like other people in positions of power without appearing too masculine. And men are expected to behave like men.

Gender theorists tell us that when individuals cannot envision independent identity constructions and new gender identities, they are more bound by what *is* than what *could be* (Butler, 2004). Identity is controlled individually and socially and for most individuals, identity is shaped by others' power. Extending this logic then, we posited that men experience the same social constructions of gender and may be as oppressed by these

constructions as are women. We wondered if today's men leaders describe their leadership in the stereotypes of masculinity (Jung, Franz, Henderson, Jacobi, & Jaffe, 1964; Steinberg, 1993). Would our men participants convey that they perceive risk and strength in terms that emulate masculinity archetypes? Would their resiliency and gender talk resonate with having to comply with these socially constructed restraints?

Purpose of the Study

The first phase of this research presented a modified Delphi study of resilient women administrators in higher education. Participants defined components of their resiliency and narrated examples of it. We explored if feminine approaches to leadership, i.e., relationship-oriented, consensus-seeking, compassionate, collaborative, and flexible (Hall, 1996; Herber, 2002; Martin, 2000; McCall, 1999; Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1992; Oakley, 2000; Offerman & Beil, 1992; Ropers-Huilman & Shackelford, 2003; Shakeshaft, 1989) make leaders more resilient in today's complex organizations (Marion, 2002; Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001; Ritt 2004). What we discovered, however, is that our women leaders described a rather messy and complex leadership and did not define their resiliency in strictly feminine terms. We had difficulty fitting these women leaders into a neat, dichotomously-gendered, and easily analyzed packages. This realization pushed us to extend our own understanding of resilient leadership and of gendered leadership (Christman & McClellan, 2008). The thought developing from the first phase of this research is that leadership, shaped strongly by our sense of self, may not easily fit into one gender stereotype or another. Leadership and gender may be too convoluted to be defined in simplistic binary terms. Or, at least this is what we concluded when considering women in higher education administration. With the conclusions of the study's first phase, we wondered how men administrators in higher education leadership preparation programs might talk about their resiliency and how this talk might be viewed in terms of masculinity theory.

This article reports the second phase of our study which examined resilient men in higher education administration educational leadership programs to determine what they identify as components of their resiliency, how they describe events that demonstrate their resiliency, and how they prescribe ways in which educational leadership programs can best foster resiliency in students who work in today's learning organizations. We viewed their responses through masculinity theoretical lenses to determine if our participants describe their resiliency in conventional gender terms or if they, like the women participants of our prior study, practice a more multidimensional gendered leadership.

Our participants' discussion of resiliency reveals how leaders position their leadership and how that positioning substantiates or refutes gender leadership theory. This study thus provided insight into how people respond to a leader when he or she strikes positions within and beyond gender stereotypes and how these responses can threaten or strengthen resiliency.

We realized that their notions of resiliency might rely upon a synthesis of gender identities. However, we also realized that their discussions of resiliency would help us understand how they positioned their leadership and whether that positioning supported or refuted gender leadership theory.

We begin with a discussion of masculinity theory following Steinberg's use of Jung's archetypal model of masculinity as a lens to view our participants' commentary. Then, we provide our data collection procedures, define the modified Delphi technique, describe our participants, and present their online commentary. We then view the responses through our theoretical lens and present ideas about what we hear them saying. We conclude with our reactions to our participants' messages and thoughts about masculinity.

Masculinity Theory

Theories of femininity have begun to explore the interplay of masculine and feminine behaviors. Theorists identify intersections of gray in regards to the feminine gender,

particularly how women shade their gender with masculine and feminine forms (Cordova, Neely, & Shaughnessy, 1988; Mertz, Welch, & Henderson, 1987; Offerman & Beil, 1992; Shakeshaft, 1989; Short, Twale, & Walden, 1989). However, the continuum that these theorists explore is measured against the constraints of a dichotomous labeling of sex, a problematic perspective. So women encounter only a degree of freedom and face Oakley's (2000) double-bind, "a behavioral norm that creates a no-win situation no matter what she does" (p. 324). Even with these varying degrees of freedom, scholars argue that women are not as free in gendering themselves as they may deserve to be so.

Without feminine studies and feminism, we would know even less about masculinity. The study of masculinity owes what little attention it has received to the emergence of feminism and women's studies (Gardiner, 2002; Kimmel, 1987). Masculinity and feminism are binaries, but they exist because of the exploration of the other (Weber, 1998). However, the argument goes, in being the reference for the "norm," masculinity has stronger social conventional parameters of acceptable forms of masculine behavior. Whereas women can rebel against the social constraints of being feminine to be perceived as a socially acceptable form of a leader, men face criticism when appearing, to any degree, as being feminine. Furthermore, just as women are criticized for attempting to be too strong or too manly, men who are criticized as being feminine are often labeled as being weak or lesser-than (Pleck, 1992). Neither forms of criticism are palatable for those scholars studying issues of diversity and equity.

Our focus on masculine theoretical lenses presents some difficulty, but in part, it may come from researchers' reluctance to investigate those individuals in socially-empowered positions, individuals who require no advocacy because their opinions have become the referenced norm (Kimmel, 1987). As one of our participants commented when hearing of our second stage of the study, "Why study men? Everything that has been written about leadership has been from their viewpoint." As feminists, we find her argument meaningful. But we must remind ourselves that just because the man's voice has been

heard, it doesn't necessarily represent the masculine one. It may not represent how men resist social constructions of their sex (Messner, 1993) or how they gender their leadership. We must not assume that just because they are male that they lead in only male ways. As Miller (2005) reminds us, "While there is literature that examines the ways women adopt masculine characteristics while maintaining feminine values, there is little if anything in the literature that examines how men might develop a wider repertoire of behavior to include the kinds of feminine characteristics becoming so important to manage" (p. 624). Little research has been done to pinpoint the current expectations and definitions of masculinity and how it affects leadership resiliency.

Because of the constraints of gender identifiers, many scholars continue to call for a re-theorizing of gender (Arnot, 2002; Brunner, 2005; Butler, 1990; 2004; Christman & McClellan, 2008). From feminists and gender theorists alike, a call for a deconstruction of "static, binaries in gender studies" is surfacing, for a gender theory that examines "parallelisms, interdependencies, and asymmetries between men and women" (Gardiner, 2002, p. 2). Their discussions, however, have not included how masculinity and male leaders, not to be taken as synonymous, might fit into the current feminine and feminist, not to be taken as synonymous, frameworks.

Educational leadership has changed because the organizations in which we work have changed. Leaders are being encouraged to behave more in, what gender studies have defined as, feminine ways. Masculinity studies (Brod, 1987; Kimmel, 1987; Gardiner, 2002; Mosse, 1996) prompt us to question if men are learning to navigate similar intersections of gender and leadership constructions.

To determine if our men participants were sticking to a masculine form of leadership, we turned to archetypes or descriptions of what it is to be masculine. From a Jungian perspective (Jung, Franz, Henderson, Joacbi, & Jaffee, 1964), masculinity can be understood through five archetypes. Steinberg's (1993) discussion of the Jungian masculine archetypes are as follows:

- Male-Male Competition
- Man and the Mask
- “We-Males” Category
- Achievement Conflicts
- Power

First, the “male-male competition” is defined as the need to control one’s environment and to respond quickly with aggression around “issues of territoriality and hierarchical struggle” (Steinberg, 1993, p. 31). Additionally, external forces define masculinity in terms of aggression, competition, strength, and power, terms that shape what it is to be a man. Society expects men to exemplify this gender construction, who must initiate the journey to fulfill the heroic role. Masculinity is a direct effort to fit the “man and the mask” (p. 41). Donning “the mask” of masculinity requires boys to adapt their egos to fit social expectations, resulting in the boy becoming a replica of the masculine role model and losing his individual identity” (p. 63).

Next, for most boys who are adapting their persona to replicate norms of masculinity, their fathers become the “implicit authority in defining masculinity” (Steinberg, 1993, p. 67). A “we-males” category emerges as a separation from the “other,” their mothers who are not of or are opposites of what it is to be power and strength. This splitting from the feminine marks the masculine gender as an identification with the older male role model and in conflict with femininity.

To determine if their persona is successful, men evaluate their external achievement, e.g., status, pay, and trophies. To acquire these things, men must be decisive and assertive, and not to acquire them means to be considered “failures, and even worse, feminine” (Steinberg, 1993, p. 98). Even making mistakes can be perceived as being lesser-than and can lead to intolerance. In terms of achievement and conflict, when men succeed,

they are more likely to attribute their success to their skill, and their failures to luck, “an external cause” (p. 100).

According to Steinberg (1993), because men hate to appear weak, they often respond in a powerful manner. To exhibit their power, men must always come out on top. The need to be in control and the dislike of the weak extends in the male’s reluctance to change his behavior. If men become submissive, they are “devalued in their own eyes and in the eyes of the collective” (p. 140). Power is satisfying for men and they confirm this power by exercising possession of control, authority, or influence over others and events. Thus, men are perceived as being powerful and assume leadership positions.

Procedures

Generally speaking, the Delphi technique relies upon the interaction of a group of people, usually considered experts in their field, and relies on their opinions to form an aggregate of the combined knowledge and experiences of the group. Typically, Delphi studies are conducted so that participants remain anonymous throughout the process and involve a number of rounds of data collection. The notion is that the group can form consensus and make judgments during the process and do so without introducing problems often associated with group interactions (Hanafin, 2004; SEAMEO Voctech, no date). There are several reasons for using this technique. Turoff (1970) delineates four research objectives for such use: to explore or expose underlying assumptions or information leading which could lead to different conclusions; to elicit information which may generate a consensus on the part of the participants; to correlate expert judgments on topics across disciplines; and to educate the participants about the diverse and interconnected features of the topic.

Adapting the Delphi Technique for this Study

We opted to use a modified Classical Delphi technique since we wanted participants to feel free to answer questions without being concerned about others' opinions. Prior to forming the group who would respond using the Delphi technique, we met as a research team and discussed how we would reach consensus among ourselves as researchers and facilitators and how we could keep participant responses "fresh," yet still anonymous. We first decided that an online, asynchronous mode could be used to keep the study moving along at a somewhat brisk pace and devised a method for sending out queries under a "blind carbon copy" mode in email messaging, so that participants could be assured that their names were not known to other participants. Yet, we wanted participants to know how the group as a whole was forming and developing thoughts about resiliency. Thus, we decided to provide responses which could be posted in subsequent iterations in aggregate with all identifiers removed.

Electronic Delphi. This technique was used in a computer-based environment and was conducted almost exclusively online. One of the reasons for using an online environment was due to the time and distance between participants. Each participant had ready access to email, both in his office and at home. We felt it would be easier, given the demanding schedule of each of the participants, for them to be able to respond asynchronously. Turoff and Hiltz (2005) explain that "a person may choose to participate in the group communication process when they feel they want to, [and] a person may choose to contribute to that aspect of the problem to which they feel best able to contribute." Study participants could respond at any time and they could revise, delete, and add to their responses over time, if they chose, before sending out their responses to be placed with the group as a whole.

Using an electronic Delphi also allowed us to structure and organize the study in ways that made sense to both participants and us. Additionally, the online environment provided us with a way to quickly ascertain which participants had responded and not

responded and to make revisions in the ways we asked questions, requested information, or provided additional information if participants requested. Still, the online environment provided structure that we did not feel we could otherwise obtain—researchers could each take the lead in asking questions of and responding to the participants and group members could participate at their convenience—than with the more standard "paper and pencil" Delphi. One of the benefits of the online environment, we discovered, was that the iterations of the study did not need to be divided as discretely as traditional Delphi studies (Turoff & Hiltz, 2005). Participants could respond past a deadline, before we met as a research group for discussion, and still have voice in the iteration.

Next we discuss how participants were identified, their collective expertise in academe, and how each iteration unfolded.

Identifying Participants

For the purposes of this study, we identified male administrators who possessed such titles as department head or chair; assistant department head or chair; dean, associate dean or assistant dean; vice president or president; or any similar acting, interim, or former position, and who worked in any university, educational administrator preparation program. Initially, we sent a private email message to 40 male department chairs listed as having institutional affiliation with a consortium of major research universities with doctoral programs in educational leadership and policy (http://www.ucea.org). We asked these men administrators in educational leadership programs if they were interested in participating in a Delphi study about men's resiliency in the academy and to identify other participants that should be invited to the study. We received a number of replies recommending others for participation and contacted those educational leaders via a private email message as well. We explained that a commitment of approximately 30 minutes per week for 8 weeks would be necessary to participate in the study. No incentives were provided for participation.

After receiving answers back from the invited participants, we quickly noted that

many of the same male administrators were named repeatedly in respondents' replies. We then sent out private email invitations to collaborate on the study to a total of 17 men. From this group, eight men agreed to participate by the deadline we provided. Other men declined to participate due to heavy workloads and previous commitments. The eight participants were men who had also indicated their willingness to commit to 8 weeks of online communication in the study and returned by facsimile copy or electronic response consent forms for participation in the study.

The participants in the study included Hispanic and European American men. The average number of years of experience in the academy was 21.6 years, with an average of 21.25 years in administrative roles. Accomplished in their roles, these men administrators had an average publication rate of 6.5 refereed journal articles in the last five years, 2.4 book chapters, 3 books, and 12.7 national/international conference presentations over the last five years. Many of the men administrators had also had experience as both teachers and administrators in the preK-12 school and community college system.

Iterations of the Delphi

After receiving the consent forms back from the participants, we started the first iteration of the Delphi during which we asked participants to provide markers and/or components of their own resiliency. All queries that we sent gave participants approximately 6-15 days in which to respond. This timeframe was dependent on the type of response requested and the academic calendar of most universities, since all of the universities with which the men were affiliated experienced a spring break during the third iteration.

Following the first iteration and throughout the study, we met online and through a conference call as a research team to discuss the data collected. From the first responses, we studied the markers and components of resilience and looked for similar responses. When it appeared that responses were similar in content or context we collated such responses and discussed among the research team if the responses were indeed similar in

content or context. Ultimately we collapsed similar responses into 14 descriptive phrases. These markers and components of resiliency in aggregate were sent back out to participants for their review and critique.

When the markers and components were returned a second time, participants had been asked to rank their top 10 components and markers. We reviewed the rankings and comments and suggestions made by the participants, generated a collective summary of all participants' comments, and sent it out a third time. Simultaneously we asked for participants to describe an event that demonstrated their ability to overcome a conflict at work by relying on their resiliency. When the rankings were returned a third time, as a research team we rank ordered the markers and components of resiliency again and carefully read and discussed each response regarding participants' accounts of resiliency. We then sent out another email query, asking participants to address how educational administration programs might foster resiliency in men administrators.

When we received the participants' accounts regarding educational leadership programs fostering resiliency in male administrators, the research team met online and in a conference call again and read and discussed participants' response. We then took the last rankings of markers and components and returned them to the participants for a final review. We asked them to interpret on the aggregate material in terms of their own resiliency and male leadership and to respond once more. Participants also were invited to make any comments about resiliency or the study if they wished. The research team met online and in a conference call again, having read all responses, and discussed the similarities and differences of the responses. We then scheduled another conference call to reflect on and analyze the data.

Analysis and Findings

Initially participants were asked to identify components and/or markers of their own resiliency. During the iteration, one participant commented in an email that he wondered if

we wanted an impulsive or deliberate response, pointing out the differences in the responses that we would collect and the effects it would have on the study. We encouraged the participant to contribute in the manner he felt appropriate and that worked within the timeframe. After gathering all responses from the group, as a research team we identified components and markers noted by more than one participant, discussed whether the content and context of the components and markers were indeed similar, carefully blended a few of the similar, overlapping themes, and then resubmitted the list to the group for the next iteration. Participants were encouraged to review and critique the list and to add any additional markers and/or components of resiliency if they desired.

Participants once again responded, one of the participants commenting that he might not have collapsed two items as we had and another wondering whether participants should brainstorm or deliberate in their responses. However, no additional items as markers or components were added. Participants were also asked to rank order the list from most important to least important, using the numbers one for most important and ten for least important. Ultimately, we found that 12 markers or components of resiliency were identified by the participants. We collated the rankings and Table 1 represents the order in which items were ranked by the group as a whole.

We investigated whether the components of resiliency as described by the men in the study could be described as masculine or feminine based on the extant literature. For example, the literature classified components and markers such as authoritative, decisive, controlling (Hudson & Rea, 2005), transactional (Aburdene & Naisbitt, 1992), taking charge (Getskow, 1996), assertive, powerful (Brunner, 1999; Steinberg, 1993), ambitious (Steinberg, 1993); competitive (Steinberg, 1993); listening for facts (Shakeshaft, 1989), unemotional, distant, competitive (Ryan, 2005), competent and rational (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972) as masculine. Components and markers aligned with terms like empowerment, teaching, openness (Aburdene & Naisbitt, 1992), collaboration, working

through people (Brunner, 1999), listening (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972); and emotional intimacy (Gardiner, 2002), the literature classified as feminine. For those components and markers which we could not classify as either feminine or masculine per the literature or those which we felt had elements of both, we labeled as both masculine and feminine. The participants' rankings suggested that these male leaders perceive their resiliency as being maintained by what would be described in the literature as an interplay of both genders (see Table 1).

Table 1: *Delphi participants' identified key components and markers of resiliency ranked in order of importance*

		Perceived Gender
Components and Markers	Ranking	Response per Literature
Adaptability, flexibility	1	Feminine
Keeping balance	2	Feminine
Persistence	3	Masculine
Believing in others	4	Feminine
Keeping my word	5	Masculine
Commitment to vision	6	Masculine
Keeping perspective	7	Masculine/Feminine
Maturity	8	Masculine/Feminine
Positive self concept	9	Masculine
Exercise	10	Masculine
Spiritual foundation	11	Feminine
Courage to take risks	12	Masculine

Episodes of Resiliency

After the participants had reviewed and ranked the markers and components of resiliency, we asked them to provide a description of an event that demonstrated their ability to overcome a conflict at work by relying on one or more of their markers or components of resiliency. We discovered that their discussion tended to focus on how they

were adaptable and flexible in their work, how they had to lead during difficult times, and how this shaped their resiliency.

Male-Male Competition. These resilient men sometimes found themselves at odds with others in academe, yet they supported others as well as themselves. For example, when one participant was working with a group of peers on an accreditation issue, he noticed they were doing so well that they were likely to receive a large percentage of the total points available. “We were standing at 21 out of the maximum 24 points, which put us equal to other universities we wanted to be seen alongside, but now we had a chance to top them.” This participant felt that his resiliency was substantiated through his work with the team:

> Firstly, I trusted the team to come up with the best they could and they delivered. Secondly, I was tired and stressed by the experience but knew I had one more task left in me (persistence). Thirdly, we knew we were OK and sitting on “good” and this was good enough to put us equal to the competition.

One participant claimed that making it through the task meant that he “was well on the way to winning the battle.”

Another participant spoke of always “bouncing back,” his resilience being a consistent theme throughout his life. He initially related a story from high school and his ambition to graduate as one of the top ten seniors. However, a difficult course threatened his plans: “My targeted goal of achieving one of the top ten spots was disintegrating before my eyes!” The participant succeeded in ultimately making an “A” in the course, attributing his resilience to have “faith that things would go well; the belief that I would meet my targeted goal; I was persistent in my study of algebra…practice, practice, practice; I asked for help from teachers and friends.”

Thus, we found that these men saw their resiliency as relying heavily on persistence. They became committed to a vision and remained steadfast. They believed they could make

it through any challenge. Indeed, they viewed their challenges through a competitive lens. To accomplish their goals, they had to "win." We were reminded of Steinberg's (1993) explanation of Jungian archetypes, those of masculinity and achievement conflicts, where men are rewarded in their masculinity for success, as well as the man and the mask, where men's egos adapt and present themselves to the environment. Our participants referred to what Steinberg and Jung identified as the "male-male competition." We were also reminded that resiliency comes from a *personal* ability to adapt to situations or the environment. Indeed, even some of the resiliency scholars used the same discourse of one of these two participants. Whereby one participant talked of the need to beat the competition and another to win the battle, Wang, et al. (1994) additionally spoke of the ability to *conquer* [emphasis ours] personal vulnerabilities and adversities effectively. Making it through challenges is also how another participant related something about his resiliency. He commented, "I define resilience as the tenacity to continue working toward those things even when defeated or discouraged."

Man and the Mask. Working through defeat and discouragement, the same participant spoke about being put in leadership roles by others. He questioned: "Does it count as resilience if I keep finding myself in leadership positions without really choosing to do so, but keep slogging on to make the best of it anyway?"

An additional participant became knowledgeable about his resilience from a different direction. He spoke about an incident in which he felt that it would be difficult to rebound, if ever. Yet, he

> …knew from past experience that what seems to be a threat to a unit often becomes an opportunity to reexamine priorities. With the support of remaining colleagues and my family, I soon rebounded and led a 'new' organization toward having a strong program for current and future students.

Still another participant saw his resiliency in terms of being able to distance himself from challenging situations. He stated,

> I was able to view situations from a logical rather than a 'personal' point of view. I was prepared to defend our organization because we had not been involved in any wrong-doing and I knew it…I stuck with what I knew was right about our policies and practices, yet I have to admit that when I got over the fact that it was not personal.

This participant found that, for him to be resilient, he needed to be logical, to keep perspective, to distance himself from the situation, and view it as a contest—something to be won or lost. His role in this episode might be characterized as that of warrior or hero of someone who was placed in a leadership role, fulfilling leadership responsibilities and often in the role of the "hero" simply because others called upon them. Steinberg defines this Jungian archetype as the "man and the mask. Because of their sex, men are "adapting their egos [and actions] to fit social expectations" (p. 63). The literature casts this role – and that of the other participants who need to fulfill the role of a man and hero - as distinctly masculine (Jung, 1964; Steinberg, 1993; Wang, et. al., 1994). In these episodes it appears that the men, are fighting adversaries and fulfilling roles they have been placed in. Fighting against adversities or wrong, they needed to persist in their goals and to be "undefeated" and always competent to execute the truth. Validation of their resiliency was external; validation was winning the war.

Fostering Resiliency

Participants also were asked to address how educational administration programs might foster resiliency in men administrators. They seemed to be of somewhat different minds on this topic. One participant did not seem certain that educational administration programs could foster resiliency. A participant initially explained, "I can't think of a way to prepare people in a licensure program to be resilient."

"We-Males" Category. Other participants seemed to have clearer impressions of how educational administration programs could foster resiliency in administrators. For example, one participant felt that administrator candidates needed to learn to "reflect on who they are and what they value and what they think they are going to do about it." Another suggested,

> Program personnel assume that participants have an understanding of who they are as a person and administrator. Educational leadership programs need to assist and guide students in outlining their values, beliefs, biases and character strengths/weaknesses. Participating in activities that define and help solidify the self are extremely important in fostering resiliency.

Others talked about the need for students to become aware of resiliency through modeling. One participant specifically remarked,

> The best approach might be to foster awareness of its [resiliency's] importance. Provide role plays of difficult dilemmas and consider how best to resolve the issues and then move on. Share case studies or personal examples of how others or you have overcome difficulties that have and will continue to face all administrators.

Another participant wrote that an important consideration to foster resiliency would be to use "resiliency scenarios." He stated,

> Experiences/scenarios can be analyzed, discussed and in some cases role played. Students can be asked to develop scenarios containing resiliency components. They can discuss the reasons for selecting specific as well as a combination of components. Further, students can discuss how the components relate to their person.

This participant found that resiliency could be fostered in some specific ways. He suggested that students study resiliency models. He believed that students could learn from studying models that provided insight into resiliency concepts and characteristics. He felt that a student could use the models for comparison to his "defined self." If such students were also able to meet and discuss the concept with resilient individuals, then a better understanding of how to become resilient could be fostered.

Thus, we note that participants felt like students needed to know who they were and what they valued, "to know thyself." Our male participants spoke of the value of modeling to support the development of self-understanding. Steinberg's (1993) Jungian archetypes aided us again in viewing this strong need. In this masculinity study we found the archetype of identification and conflict, a sort of "we-males" category. Steinberg defined this category as 'men who are defining their identities will turn to models of "authority in masculinity" (p. 67). Furthermore our values are often founded upon our personal knowledge of ourselves and others like most us (Kogut & Zander, 1992; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Schein, 1992; Starratt, 2003). As argued by Jung (1964), Steinberg (1993), Butler (2004) and others, identity and "knowing oneself" is largely shaped and controlled by others and their perceptions of who we are based in part by our sex. These scholars point out what may occur is a further division of those unlike us. Although our participants spoke about the importance of self awareness, these scholars argued that how students identify themselves and model their resiliency may, in large part, rely upon their images of those like them—by how leaders of their own sex behave and, in turn, are expected to behave.

Achievement Conflict. Still another participant described the coursework necessary to foster resiliency. He said that courses should "concentrate on the culture of higher education" as it tends to reward individuals, rather than team efforts. He believed, "In a culture of individualism and independence, people have to be very persistent in accomplishing their work goals – resiliency would be couched in persistence and not giving up…" However, a couple of the participants were careful to note what seemed to us, and

sometimes to them, a careful and deliberate foray into a more feminine way of leading or knowing. For example, one participant stated that by acknowledging "my *weaknesses* [emphasis ours]… to some extent this has put me in touch with what might be termed the 'feminine' side of my leadership." These comments resonate with Steinberg's explanation of Jung's category of the "Achievement Conflict." Steinberg comments that to break away from others not within the "we-males category," men must acquire external achievement, markers that keep them from being considered "failures or feminine" (p. 98). We wondered if these comments were references to separation of the masculine from the "unfit" feminine (Steinberg, 1993).

Unlike the other participants, one participant who initially could not think of a way to foster resiliency eventually provided an explanation of what might foster resiliency among aspiring administrators. Using quotations of others from his memory or notes, he provided some fodder for though by likening other characteristics to resiliency. He used these quotes to demonstrate what might foster resiliency. For example, he used a "voice" of a superintendent to express where resiliency might come from:

> You know just who you are, who your mother taught you to be, and your dad, and just your ethics and values, and all those things come into play when you're a superintendent or administrator. Is that fairness? Is that equity? Is it caring about people? Is it caring about kids? That's basic gut-level stuff.

The same participant explained that he also looked at focusing on the element of time to demonstrate resiliency. In writing about James Joyce, he stated,

> Only someone driven at an early age to conceive time in large uninterrupted chunks – as weeks, months, terms, academic years, and holidays, as seasons in the Church calendar – could have assembled the necessary habits and the perspective for such an undertaking.

Finally, the same participant relayed his understanding of Greenfield's concept of giving aspiring administrators "short-term experiences that would be life changing." The idea would be to place these aspiring administrators "in total environments that are alien to what they regard as normal and natural." Examples of such foreign environments and the positions the aspiring administrators would take include as monks in secluded monasteries perched on the sides of mountains where vows of silence are taken; as bouncers or bartenders or managers of discos; or as orderlies or patients in mental institutions. This participant noted, then, that resiliency might be fostered through one's basic values, being able to "weather" time, and having experiences outside one's norms, of getting in touch with how others think and live.

In our participants' responses, we noted a clear emphasis on focusing on one's self or knowing what one believed in and stood for. At times, resiliency was compared to change and life experiences of oneself and others. Like the rankings participants had provided earlier, they spoke of resiliency in terms of being adaptable, yet they also spoke of resiliency as being something deliberate, almost tangible, something which could be discovered and followed if one was persistent. With reality as an external force, using resiliency, our male participants could "win;" they could conquer whatever adversity arose. As Ulysses, himself, our resilient male educational leaders discovered that they could face an adversary, go into battle and win the day, only to move onto another foe.

Talking about leadership from the male perspective was been a bit problematic for us. As one participant from our women's study commented, "Why men? Every book about leadership that you've read has been the masculine interpretation of leadership." Initially, we thought, good question: Why men? Don't we have enough of *their* perspective regarding leadership? But stepping back from the stereotypes and the debates continuing on about gender, we realized that men have had their identities shaped as well by social constructions. One might argue that they feel greater pressure to succumb to these stereotypes: who argues with becoming a certain way when it will guarantee power?

Discussion and Conclusion

Most participants did seem to believe, ultimately, that educational administration programs could cultivate resiliency, perhaps in ways that are not so complex. Initially, this is what we thought. But, as we went through discussion of what the data were revealing, we felt the study expanding. We kept returning to our perceptions of how the entire Delphi process had unfolded. Quick to criticize ourselves, a distinctly feminine characteristic, we believed additional perspectives could be useful. We decided to try a new tack in navigating the process. We brought in another researcher, a male junior faculty member, with an interest in resiliency and who desired to be a part of such research. We believed that an additional look at the data would give us an opportunity to see the data through another's eyes. As well, we steered a course back into the literature.

In our own iterations of the data, we critiqued the process and questioned not only what the participants had written, but *how* and when they responded. We noted that the men appeared to be somewhat slow in responding and several had commented that they had not really thought in terms of their own resilience or of that of other men. At times it had been difficult to get our participants to respond and we sent out several reminders during each iteration. We questioned their commitment to the study. We questioned their seeming need to critique the process. We were reminded of Miller's (2005) work in regards to how men *used* to lead: "There was certainly great reluctance to share, let alone discuss problems or concerns that might leave them feeling vulnerable" (p. 619). One manager in Miller's study commented, "I got to my position by winning and beating the rest, and by using my power and authority. Now I'm being asked to encourage and support and work with you. If you think it's hard for you, I've got 43 years of habit to change" (p. 621). Something resonated with us. We pondered whether their being the "object" of our study and whether our own gender in running the study had altered the typical ways of navigating for these male leaders.

So, we looked at the process further, a research team of three now, two females and a male. We noted that some of the participants had wanted to do things differently. They certainly had challenged the process more than our female participants in the first phase of the study. Perhaps, Rosenthal, Jones, and Rosenthal (2003) had aptly described what we had encountered, that "men are more interested in accomplishing the task at hand and more likely to offer opinions and talk in general" (p. 100). Maybe we were seeing what Miller had seen, that, like the men in her study, "this was a new learning and a new way of working for these men who had long ago learned that the hallmarks of success in a masculine world were action, control, individuality, achievement, and competition" (p. 622). Indeed, we had "heard" such discourse in their comments as well.

We knew that "un-layering/undoing gender [would be] difficult. Gender appears to be so deeply structured into society, individual psychology, identity, and sexuality that eradicating it will be extremely difficult" (Gardiner, 2002, p. 3). But, we felt certain that while we were hearing the men's voices as masculine, we were also hearing something more, something more simple than binary gender discourse. And what we heard was not necessarily either masculine or feminine. The discourse we heard went against the older grain of "binaries that now seem simplistic of and potentially distorting and exclusionary" (p. 12).

We were reminded once again of the ranking of resiliency components (See Table 1). Whereas when the men related their resiliency episodes and how educational leadership programs could foster resiliency, much of what they related could be characterized as distinctly masculine discourse. We saw needs to overcome, conquer, win, and a notion that reality was external to them. Such comments and discourse fit rather tidily into a nicely arranged masculine box—and into resiliency theory. However, we also noticed that the rankings themselves very nearly betray this external reality. We find that the top two components or markers (adaptability/flexibility, keeping balance) of the men's resiliency were characterized as feminine by the literature. Adaptability/ flexibility and keeping

balance seem to be personally-held components, ones internalized or ones requiring individuals to look internally, not externally, for their reality. Fourth in the rankings we noted “believing in others,” which was also characterized as feminine.

The only masculine component or markers of resiliency in the top four rankings was persistence. Yet, as we just noted, the episodes related by the participants were seemingly masculine in discourse. Could it be that these men are free in the way they think about their resiliency but are restricted in their actions as indicated by the literature? On one hand, Miller (2005) and Steinberg (1993) posit that there is less freedom for men to define themselves in feminine terms because every way they have learned to define themselves is not to be the “other,” that to be feminine is weak and submissive. Our study suggests a slight difference, however: our participants, when defining their resiliency, appeared to feel somewhat freer in using feminine terms. When demonstrating their resiliency or considering how to foster it in others, however, our participants clearly discussed doing so in masculine ways. Because our participants could describe their behavior using both genders does not mean that they wanted perceptions of their behavior to be as flexible. Whereas our participants apparently wanted to describe themselves in more multi-dimensional gendered terms, they still seemed to seek masculine labeling. To be perceived otherwise, they suggest, is not valued in the collective—and is still problematic for themselves.

Resilient male educational leaders are narrowed by social constructs. Like the women in the first phase of the Delphi study, male leaders find their range of acting as a leader restricted, bounded. Through their privilege, men have been the ones to actively design these social constraints, undoubtedly their own oppression; they epitomize the “oppressed/ oppressor” (Messner, 2000; Weber, 1998, p. 29). Their leadership, however, does not fall neatly into the attributes described in masculinity theory. At least, in this study our male educational leaders *talked* as leaders willing to define themselves in multi-dimensional gendered terms, but when they described their behavior, they boasted of being on a quest for the self, of being heroic in battle, and of taking their teams into victory. In a way that

was not apparent to them, they portrayed their resilient leadership as having one foot in contemporary times and the other firmly on the helm of Ulysses' ship.

References

Aburdene, P., & Naisbitt, J. (1992). *Megatrends*. New York: Villard Books.

Ackerman, R. H., & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2002). The wounded leader: is. How leadership emerges in times of cris*is.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Council in Educational Corporation Database. (2002, March 28). *Black Issues in Higher Education,* 29-31.

Arnot, M. (2002). *Reproducing gender?: Essays on educational theory and feminist politics.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bennis, W. (2001). *The future of leadership: Today's top leadership thinkers speak to tomorrow's leaders.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bernshausen, C., & Cunningham, C. (2000, October). *Collaborative building and maintaining of resilient teachers.* Paper presented at the Texas ASCD Fall 2000 Conference, Houston, TX.

Brod, H. (1987). *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P., & Vogel, S. R. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34*, 1-7.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*, 59-78.

Brunner, C. C. (2005). Women performing the superintendency: Problematizing the normative alignment of conceptions of power and constructions of gender. In J. Collard and C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Leadership, Gender and Culture in Education: Male and Female Perspectives,* pp. 121-136.

Brunner, C. C. (Ed.). (1999). *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

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

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

Chlinwiak, L. (1997). *Higher educational leadership: Analyzing the gender gap.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christman, D., & McClellan, R. (2008). 'Living on barbed wire': Resilient women administrators in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*, 3-29.

Cordova, F., Neely, R., & Shaughnessy, M. F. (1988). *Mentoring women and minorities in higher education*. Unpublished Viewpoint. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED325 005).

Fairbanks, A. (2005). *Walking in two worlds: making professional transitions between Native and non-Native worlds.* (p. 37). Published doctoral research project, University of Minnesota.

Gardiner, J. K. (2002). *Masculinity studies and Feminist Theory: New Directions*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Getskow, V. (1996). *Women in community college leadership roles*. ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 400025).

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, K. A., & Coscarelli, W. C. (1996). Recognizing and fostering resilience. *Performance Improvement, 35*(9), 14-17.

Grotberg, E. H. (2003). *Resilience for today: Gaining strength from adversity*. Westport: Praeger.

Gupton, S. L., & Slick, G. A. (1996). *Highly successful women administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Hall, V. (1996). *Dancing on the ceiling: A study of women managers in education*. London: Paul Chapman.

Hall, V. Gronn, P., Jenkin, M. Power, S., & Reynolds, C. (1999). Review symposium. *Educational Management & Administration 27* (1), 99-116.

Hanafin, S. (2004). *Review of literature on the Delphi technique.* Retrieved February 27, 2005, from http://www.nco.ie/upload_documents/DelphiTechniqueALiteratureReview.

Harding, J. (1998). *Sex acts: Practices of femininity and masculinity.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hasson, F., Kenney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 32*(4), 1008-1015.

Herber, C. (2002).Women in academia: A review of women's status, barriers, and leadership issues. *Women as school executives: Research and reflections on educational leadership.* Eds. Stephanie A. Korcheck & Marianne Reese. Austin, TX: Texas Council of Women School Executives.

Hudson, J., & Rea, D. (1998, Summer). *Teachers' perceptions of women in the principalship: A current perspective*. Retrieved May 22, 2005, from http://www.advancingwomencom/ awl/summer98/HUD.html

Janas, M. (2002). Twenty ways to build resiliency. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 38*(2), 117.

Jung, C. G., Franz, M. L., Henderson, J. L., Jacobi, J., & Jaffe, A. (1964). *Man and his symbols.* New York: Dell.

Kimmel, M. S. (1987). *Changing Men: New directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992, August). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization Science, 3*(3), Focused Issue: *Management of Technology*, 383-397.

Komives, S. R. (2005, November/December). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 593-611.

Kumpfer, K. (1993). Resiliency and AOD use prevention in high risk youth. Unpublished manuscript, University of Utah at Salt Lake City, Utah.

Levesque, C. (2002). The big question: What defines resilience? *Association Management, 54*(13), 29-43.

Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (2002). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications.* Retrieved February 27, 2005, from http://www.is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/ch1.html

Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Marion, R. (2002). *Leadership in education: Organizational theory for the practitioner.* Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Education.

Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12,* 389-418.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1995). *Designing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Martin, J. R. (2000). *Coming of age in academe: Rekindling women's hopes and reforming the academy.* New York: Routledge.

Massey, S., Cameron, A., Ouellette, S., & Fine, M. (Summer 1998). Qualitative approaches to the study of thriving: what can be learned? (Thriving: Broadening the paradigm beyond illness to health). In *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 337.

Masten, A. S., Best, K. M., & Garmezy, N. (1990). Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. *Development and Psychopathogy, 2*, 425-444.

McCall, A. L. (1999). Can feminist voices survive and transform the academy? In S. Steinberg (Ed.). *The edge: Critical studies in educational theory.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Mertz, N. T., Welch, O.M., & Henderson, J. (1987). *Why women aren't mentored*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Portland, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 953).

Messner, M. A. (1993). 'Changing men' and feminist politics in the United States. *Theory and Society 22*(5), 723-737.

Messner, M. A. (2000). White guy habitus in the classroom: Challenging the reproduction of privilege. *Men and masculinities 2*(4), 457-469.

Miller, S. (2005). Men working differently: Accessing their inner-feminine. *Journal of Organizational Change Management 18*(6), 612-626.

Monti, E. J., & Tingen, M. S. (1999). Multiple paradigms of nursing science. *Advances in Nursing Science,* 21(4), 64-80.

Morgan, R. (2003). *Sisterhood is Forever: The women's anthology for a new millennium*. New York: Washington Square Press.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E., & The Center for Creative Leadership. (1992). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations*. Updated Version. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Mosse, G. L (1996). *The Image of the Modern Masculinity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Norman, E. (2000). *Resiliency enhancement. Putting the strengths perspective into social work practice.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEO's. *Journal of Business Ethics 27,* 321-334.

Offerman, L. R., & Beil, C. (1992). Achievement styles of women leaders and their peers: Toward an understanding of women and leadership. *Psychology of Women Quarterly 16*, 37-56.

Pleck, J. (1992). The theory of male sex-role identity: Its rise and fall, 1936 to the present. In H. Brod's *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies,* (pp. 21-37). New York: Routledge.

Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 22,* 482-521.

Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58*(3), 307-321.

Ritt, E. (2004, Winter). Hearing the opus: The paradox for women leaders in the postmodern university. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 16.* Retrieved March 9, 2005, from http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/winter2004/Ritt.html

Ropers-Huilman, B., & Shackelford, M.(2003). Negotiating identities and making change: feminist faculty in higher education. In B. Ropers-Huilman, (Ed.), *Gendered futures in higher education: Critical perspectives for change*. (pp. 135-147). Albany, NY: State University Press of New York.

Rosenthal, C. S. Jones, J. & Rosenthal, J. A.. (2003) Gendered discourse in the political behavior of adolescents. *Political Research Quarterly 56* (1), 97-104.

Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 57*(3), 316-331.

Ryan, L. (2005, May). *Canary in the coal mine*. Retrieved from WorldWIT, May 22, 2005, http://www.worldwit.org/Columns/TimeOfTheMonth/Toxic_Air_At_Work/

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). The gender gap in research in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 25*(4), 324-337.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

SEAMEO Voctech Journal. (n.d.). *Using Delphi technique in assessing needs for VTET.* Retrieved February 27, 2005, from http://www.voctech.org.bn/virtual_lib/Programme/Regular/Emerging99/Using%20Delphi%20Technique.htm

Short, P. M., Twale, D. J., & Walden, J. C. (1989). *Women professors of educational administration: A profile and salient issues.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 - 656).

Sloop, J. M. (2004). *Disciplining gender: Rhetorics of sex identity in contemporary U. S. culture.* Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Starratt, R. J. (2003). *Centering educational administration: Cultivating meaning, community, responsibility.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Steinberg, W. (1993). *Masculinity: Identity, conflict, and transformation.* Boston: Shambhala.

Stewart, J. (2001). Is the Delphi technique a qualitative method? *Medical Education, 35,* 922-923.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: How women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done*. New York: William Morrow & Company.

Turoff, M. (1970). The design of a policy Delphi. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2,* 149-171.

Turoff, M., & Hiltz, S. R. (2005). *Computer based Delphi processes*. Retrieved February 27, 2005, from http://eies.njit.edu/~turoff/Papers/delphi3.html

Wang, M.C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1994). What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership, 51*(4), 74-79. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED461694)

Weber, L. (1998). A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality. *Psychology of Women Quarterly 22,* 13-32.

Weigman, R. (2002). Unmaking: Men and masculinity in feminism. In J. K. Gardiner (Ed.), *Masculinity studies and feminist Theory: New Directions*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982). Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth. New York: McGraw-Hill.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society, 1*(2), 125-151.

Whatley, A. (1998). Gifted women and teaching: A compatible choice? *Roeper Review*, *21*(2), 4.

Wolin, S. J., & Wolin, S. (1993). *The resilient self*. New York: Villard Books.

Rhonda McClellan serves as an Assistant Professor and program coordinator for Educational Administration at Texas Woman's University. She enjoys examining gender issues in education, community colleges, higher education leadership and teaching, and PK-12 leadership. Her work has appeared in *Educational Administration Quarterly* and *Journal of Educational Administration.*

Dana Christman, Ed.D., is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Management and Development at New Mexico State University. She is currently coordinating, working with and teaching a cohort of American Indian students in a doctoral educational leadership program. Her research interests include, broadly speaking, multiple aspects of educational administration and leadership, including social justice, American Indian, and gender issues, as well as processes of

educational change in K-12 and higher education, and border issues. Some of her work has appeared in *Educational Administration Quarterly, Advancing Women in Leadership, Journal of Women in Leadership, Education and Urban Society,* and the *Education and Law Journal*.