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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’², senior Australian female academic).

At first glance, Simone appears not to be a candidate for Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of ‘la petite misère’ – the everyday social suffering which, he argues, characterises contemporary western societies (Bourdieu et al, 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). The paper explores the ‘ambiguous empowerment’ of the women’s subject location as leaders (Chase, 1995), in terms of a dissonance on the one hand, between Australian universities’ avowed commitment to equity and diversity policies, and on the other

² Pseudonyms have been used for interview participants.
hand, an array of concrete practices arising from new managerialist discourses of efficiency and competition which subvert over the long term, the intent of the former policies (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003).

However, this is not a ‘text of despair’ (Kenway et al, 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. In so doing, their practices suggest a form of answering back, which foreshadow new logics of leadership practice within the Australian higher education terrain.

**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 origin³ and were of working and middle-class backgrounds. They held a range of leadership positions in research and management in a variety of universities, including sandstones and the new universities formed as a result of the Dawkins reforms. 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).

---

³ Due to the small numbers of women from diverse ethnic origin in leadership positions in Australian universities, I have deliberately kept descriptions of them as general as possible to avoid identification.
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, on the one hand, their various subject locations within the feminist and Indigenous rights fields, and the personal domain; and on the other hand, the academic field of management in which an uncritical adherence to new managerialism and the market was expected (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003); (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 managerialist structures in Australian academe is the emergence in some universities of the policy of diversity, 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 (Karpin, 1995); (Burton & Ryall, 1995).

There are 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’ (Cope & Kalantzis, 1997), (Bacchi, 2001). 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 current emphasis upon corporate structures, the discourse has drawn upon an ‘individual differences’ approach in which management of diversity is posited as making business
sense, utilising the talents and skills of the variety of individuals within one’s workplace (Karpin, 1995); (Burton & Ryall, 1995); (Bacchi, 2001).

The language of diversity may be associated with many different agendas and appears within vastly different contexts (Bacchi, 2001). On the one hand, 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, 2001). On the other hand, given the current emphasis in the Australian university field upon corporate principles, cost-efficiency and competitive individualism; it connotes a logical fit with such a habitus (Bacchi, 2001).

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 racial stereotyping 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 extremely well:

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 outsidersness 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 ‘burn-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 self-described personal habitus, which both valued openness and frankness and was ‘expressive … passionate … womanly’ in 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, she 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 has not read, understood or been mentored by more knowledgeable management players into the subtle play which underpins 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

obsures 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 not built, or perhaps has been refused entre 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, through her attempts to confer equal status upon both administration and higher education staff, thus challenging the gendered binary between (largely femininised) administration staff and (masculinized) academic staff.

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’ leaves 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 need ways of leading, but in reality may not reach beyond the symbolic level of an organisation (Newman, 1995); (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003).

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 et al 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 who 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 them legitimacy, 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:

4 This is not to idealise the feminist or Aboriginal rights fields as their practices may not always exhibit these values but nonetheless it does suggest a particular logic of practice which underpins such fields, and which opens up particular subject locations for women such as Amelia. They complement Amelia’s own primary habitus which was fiercely imbued with such values.
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 suggest about diversity policy and leadership 
as a set of practices within Australian universities? One obvious response is that they 
expose 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 habitus and 
institutional 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 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 
(Newman, 1995); (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003). 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, appears to produce a set of institutional logics of practice which clash with the values of equity and democracy, that Simone has 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, 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 university’s responsiveness to diversity policies, suggest on the one hand, the agentic possibilities that may flow in terms of the transformation of gender norms; and on the other hand, how gender norms may be retraditionalized 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.
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