The University of
Nottingham

UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

Fuller, Kay (2014) Gendered educational leadership: beneath the monoglossic façade. Gender and Education, 26 (4). pp. 321-337. ISSN 1360-0516

Access from the University of Nottingham repository:
http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/31938/1/Gendered%20educational%20leadership%20-%20beneath%20the%20monoglossic%20facade%20for%20copy%20editor%20Feb%202014.pdf

Title page

Gendered educational leadership: beneath the monoglossic façade

Kay Fuller

University of Birmingham

k.e.fuller@bham.ac.uk

0121 414 4857

Abstract

Recent gender retheorisation has drawn on Mikhail Bakhtin's literary and linguistic theories of monoglossia and heteroglossia to reconcile seemingly contradictory gender discourses. Thus girls/women and boys/men as they are biologically sexed might be discussed within a poststructural gender theory discourse that disconnects gender from the body. The concepts of gender monoglossia, gender heteroglossia and polyglossia have been applied here to empirical research into the construction of gendered leadership as it was seen to be done by one woman headteacher. The accounts of members of staff expose heteroglossia in the articulation of their understandings of gendered leadership beneath the construction of a monoglossic façade. They also reveal an understanding of polyglossic simultaneity as the headteacher is observed to 'switch' seamlessly between modes of doing gendered leadership depending on context and circumstances. There is also evidence of polyglossic simultaneity in the reports that might lead to the rejection and/or redefinition of gender theory discourses.

Gendered educational leadership: beneath the monoglossic façade

Introduction

School headship, like gender, is often constructed as performance. Imported from organisational theory, role theory entered the analysis of educational administration from the 1960s (see Hoyle, 1965; Burnham, 1969). The performance of roles, functions and behaviours are combined into positions marked by titles (as principal/headteacher, deputy head or teacher) with identifiers as dress, physical work setting (office or classroom), personal and professional attributes and characteristics, and relationships with others (Burnham, 1969). More recently, Peck et al (2009) attempted a similar distinction between 'leadership *is* performance' and 'leadership *as* performance'. The former is marked in a dramaturgical sense whereas the latter draws on performance studies to consider 'the explicit and implicit exhibitions of power (gender, sexuality, race) which are highlighted through the dramatic presentation of routine interactions' (Peck et al, 2009). Butler's (1993) notion of performativity is used to distinguish between the repetitive enactment of behavioural norms and the conscious selection of performance (Peck et al, 2009). With regard to schools, Strain (2009) usefully explores the multiple different uses and understandings of 'performance' and 'performativity' in educational leadership where 'performance' is managed and 'performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic)' (Ball, 2003, 216). Such lexical distinctions are necessary when considering role performance and gender performativity in schools.

The woman headteacher referred to here, literally put on gendered educational leadership in a dramaturgical sense with costume, coiffure and make up (Fuller, 2010). Her colleagues identified her embodied 'femininity'. However, beneath what is termed a monoglossic disguise (Francis, 2010) lies a complex enactment of gender that she and her colleagues constructed differently depending on their own historical and socio-cultural gender narratives (Paechter, 2003a, 2003b, 2006a; Fuller, 2010). Here I extend the notions of gender monoglossia and heteroglossia (Francis, 2010; 2012) and polyglossia (Haywood and Mac an Ghaill, 2012) to consider Jennifer's gendered headship as constructed by her and her colleagues. Beneath the construction of a monoglossic façade of a woman doing gendered leadership in traditionally ascribed 'feminine' behaviours and appearance (Acker, 2012), accounts that engage with multiple gender discourses refer to transgressions of traditional notions of 'femininity'. These can be interpreted as gender heteroglossia. By offering the notion of a heteroglossic exposé as the uncovering of nuanced and seemingly conflicting constructions of gendered leadership, I hope to contribute to the debate about gender monoglossia and heteroglossia. By focussing on staff articulations of the gendered leadership of a woman headteacher I aim to open up new lines of analysis in research and thus make a contribution in the field of gendered educational leadership.

Gender heteroglossia makes sense of the struggle between historically powerful and seemingly incompatible gender theories (Francis, 2012). I posit that polyglossia offers a way to conceptualise the multilingualism of gender theorisation and constructions that draw simultaneously on multiple discourses, rejecting or redefining them. Having provided a definition of the terms, this article

considers the literature relating to gender monoglossia and heteroglossia (Francis, 2010; 2012) and polyglossia (Hayward and Mac an Ghaill, 2012). This is followed by an outline of the case study. The main discussion focuses on the application of these concepts to multiple accounts of one woman headteacher's gendered leadership (including hers). Their usefulness as a theoretical frame for conceptualising the articulation of gendered educational leadership is considered. The article concludes there are implications for senior leaders, particularly during their preparation and development, to ensure greater understanding of the complexities of gender constructions amongst senior leadership teams, the staff and pupil bodies they lead and teach.

Monoglossia, heteroglossia and polyglossia

The concepts of monoglossia, heteroglossia and polyglossia were developed by Bakhtin (1981) to theorise about language and literature. Monoglossia is defined as 'a stable, unified language' (Morris, 1994, p248). Bakhtin described it as deaf, dense, sealed-off, closed-off, confident, uncontested, impermeable and peaceful (Bakhtin, 1981). It works within a narrow framework and muffles alternatives serving to centralize language and discourse. We 'cannot fail to be oriented towards the "already uttered", the "already known", the "common opinion" (Bakhtin, 1981, Loc 3937). Thus the monoglossic discourse is also hegemonic. It draws us to it with centripetal force. By contrast, heteroglossia is associated with decentralizing language and centrifugal force. It is marked by shift and renewal. Heteroglossia is described as rivulets and droplets of water, an ocean, swirling, washing over a culture's self-awareness and as brute (Bakhtin, 1981). It is associated with conflict and struggle, 'as close a conceptualization as possible of that locus where centripetal and centrifugal forces collide' (Bakhtin, 1981, Loc 5899). All languages may,

> 'be juxtaposed to one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically.
> As such they encounter one another and co-exist in the consciousness of real people'
> (Bakhtin, 1981, Loc 4108).

Languages are stratified socio-ideologically in belonging to social groups as castes and classes, rulers, professionals, schools, circles, generations and interest groups (Bakhtin, 1981). These languages do not exclude but intersect and interact with one another through dialogue. Polyglossia is defined as the simultaneous presence of two or more languages in the same society or cultural system (Bakhtin, 1981; Morris, 1994). In the polyglot world languages 'interilluminat[e]' (Bakhtin, 1981, p12). Polyglossia is the necessary condition for transforming language 'from the absolute dogma it had been within the narrow framework of a sealed off and impermeable monoglossia into a working hypothesis of comprehending and expressing reality… … Only polyglossia fully frees consciousness from the tyranny of its own language and its own myth of language' and the attainment of 'completely new ideological heights' (Bakhtin, 1981, p61). The speech diversity within a language,

> 'achieves its full creative consciousness only under conditions of an active polyglossia.
> Two myths perish simultaneously: the myth of a language that presumes to be the only
> language, and the myth of a language that presumes to be completely unified'
> (Bakhtin, 1981, p68).

Thus polyglossia is a space for creativity as well as rejection and redefinition of meanings and understandings.

Francis (2010; 2012) uses the terms gender monoglossia and gender heteroglossia in her retheorisation of gender and exploration of 'female masculinity' (2010) (see also Halberstam, 1998; Paechter, 2006b; Noble, 2004). She enables engagement with multiple conflicting discourses in 'doing' and 'reading' gender and gender theory. Feminist theorists have long described the difficulties in choosing between incompatible essentialist second wave gender theories of equality and difference and a poststructuralist approach that disconnects the body as it is biologically sexed from a performative construction of gender (see Scott, 1988; Francis, 1999; Raphael Reed, 2001; Fuller, 2013). Francis (2012) sees the binarised model of gender as monoglossic in its 'enduring hegemony over other accounts' (p5). By contrast, poststructural accounts that reject essentialist binaries resonate with heteroglossia; the 'recognition of both structure and deconstruction, constraint and resistance, offers a bridge between deterministic structuralism and relativism in gender theory' (p12). A struggle is found elsewhere in the theorisation of men and masculinities (Beasley, 2012; Haywood and Mac an Ghaill, 2012). Beasley (2012) sees 'creative potential' (p761) in 'eclectic interchanges or syncretic possibilities' (p749) of what Weinstein (2010) refers to as 'theory sex', between modernism and postmodernism. However, she cautions against 'simply [sticking them] together without explanation' (p749). Gender monoglossia is enacted in an individual's selection of aesthetic presentation and performed behaviours traditionally ascribed as 'feminine' as they are done by a woman/girl as she is biologically sexed. Gender heteroglossia comprises the aesthetic presentation and performed behaviours traditionally ascribed as 'masculine' also done by a biologically sexed woman/girl. A girl's '*female*ness', or biological sex, describes what has been interpreted as a performance of 'masculinity'. The 'heteroglot reality' (Francis, 2012, p6) consists of the 'mercurial multiplicities of gender productions' (Francis, 2012, p3). Such productions comprise 'plasticity, contradiction and resistance' (Francis, 2012, p4) at the micro level that are 'masked by the monoglossic façade' at the macro level (Francis, 2012, p6). Gender monoglossia and heteroglossia have been used to explore 'gender sensitive' education (Forde, 2013); young people in English school governance (Carlile, 2012); South African schoolgirl femininities (Bhana and Pillay, 2011); probation practitioners' construction of female offenders in England (Perry, 2013); Antiguan secondary schoolgirls' gender production (Cobbett, 2013); and United States kindergarten boys' classroom play (Wohlwend, 2012).

In the gendered educational leadership literature, Acker (2012) uses gender monoglossia and heteroglossia to analyse her own leadership in the academy. Other women invested in suits, shoes and accessories whilst she had the feeling of 'not being good enough at 'dress'' (p420). A woman leader manages her 'otherness' as a woman succeeding in male-dominated educational leadership by retaining 'a distinct feminine identity so as not to be ridiculed for appearing overly masculine' (Devine et al, 2011, p634). The balance is fine,

> 'Too masculine and she is threatening. Too feminine and she is wimpish. The feminine "touch" is just a little make-up. Too much and one is the sexual working-class woman. None at all and one is of suspect sexuality' (Hughes, 2004, 538 cited in Acker, 2012, p420).

The monoglossic façade consists of the appearance and enactment of 'traditional femininity' produced by a woman; it is a façade when more complex behaviours are found beneath the surface that draw on a combination of 'masculine' and 'feminine' behaviours. Acker (2012) locates the socialisation processes of learning leadership in a binarised 'women's ways' discourse labelled as 'sharing and caring' (Blackmore and Sachs, 2007). 'Women's ways' of leading has currency in the identification of approaches, not necessarily exclusive to women, but that have been found to 'characterize women's educational leadership' (Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011, p2) as leadership for learning, leadership for social justice, relational leadership, spiritual leadership and balanced leadership. It could be claimed that a woman leader is seen to be 'doing' gender monoglossia when she focuses on the quality of teaching and learning, an inclusive leadership discourse designed to enable all learners, a dialogic approach to shared and collaborative leadership, and the kind of self-aware reflexive practice that enables her own professional development. However, gender heteroglossia might also comprise women's transgressive performances of wielding power at all while 'contradictorily projecting traditional femininity' (Acker, 2012, p420). Gender monoglossia and heteroglossia have been used to explore learning gendered leadership in a senior leadership team (Fuller, 2011;); and engagement in multiple leadership discourses (Gunter, 2013). It has been used to think about intersectionality in gendered leadership discourses (Arar and Oplatka 2013).

Extending the discussion, Hayward and Mac an Ghaill (2012) propose polyglossia as a space where gender might be 'considered and understood outside of existing conceptual frames' (p 585). In other words, it is a space where new languages and discourses might develop. They give as an example Youdell's (2010) exploration of teacher and learner identities. In that study, the teacher's practices 'do not seem to cite any of the discourses that constitute adults in this school, they do not suggest a particular point of identification or recognition' (p 322). The 'haziness' of the teacher's identity and the ambivalence of her pedagogy enable the boys to 'becom[e]-otherwise' themselves (p322),

> 'There is no either/or here – the binary machines of subjectivation seem not to operate. Boys are not either student and learner *or* SEDB [social, emotional and behavioural difficulties] boys *or* cool boys. Rather there is a simultaneity and fluidity to these positions' (Youdell, 2010, p320).

Butler (1997) does not refer to Bakhtin's concepts, but she emphasises the importance of language in the acquisition of mastery, the 'speaking properly' (p 115). It is through language that the 'paradoxical simultaneity' (Butler, 1997, p116) of mastery and submission is reproduced,

> 'The reproduction of the subject takes place through the reproduction of linguistic skills, constituting, as it were, the rules and attitudes observed "by every agent in the division of labour." In this sense the rules of proper speech are also the rules by which respect is proferred or withheld. Workers are taught to *speak properly* and managers to learn to speak to workers "in the right way".

Mastering a set of skills is not simply accepting them,

> 'but to reproduce them in and as one's own activity. This is not simply to act according to a set of rules, but to embody rules in the course of action and to reproduce those rules in embodied rituals of action' (Butler, 1997, p119).

Learning and using the language(s) of a gendered professional identity through speech, embodiment and behaviour is integral to 'doing'/'becoming'/'being' and being seen to 'do'/'become'/'be' that identity. How others construct and articulate that identity is equally important in a dialogic conceptualization. There being no single, static gender or gendered leadership discourse, it makes sense to look to research in multilingualism for elucidation. The concept of 'translanguaging' has increasingly been used to explain children's and teachers' practice of 'naturally' switching between languages in learning and teaching (Lewis et al, 2012). Creese and Blackledge (2010) advocate it as a pedagogical approach in the bilingual classroom that promotes language learning and 'for identity performance' (p112) among learners and teachers. It is 'an avenue for the reproduction of social, community, and pedagogic values and goals' (Creese and Blackledge, 2010, p112). Here I use it to think about engagement in heteroglossia and polyglossia regarding the construction of gendered educational leadership. In the sections that follow I draw on gender monoglossia, heteroglossia and polyglossia to theorise about how members of staff constructed the gendered leadership of one woman headteacher.

The case study

Case study methodology has been widely used in educational research (see Merriam, 1988; Bassey, 1999; Yin, 2012). There are precedents for its use in educational leadership research located in both the humanistic (concerned with experiences and biographies) and critical (concerned with social injustice and established power structures) domains of the field (Ribbins and Gunter, 2002). Strachan (1999, p311) used a case study approach to research feminist educational leadership 'To avoid essentialising, … so that the differences as well as the similarities in [women's feminist] leadership could be teased out, and made apparent'. A case study is advantageous in an investigation into 'how' and 'why' research questions when 'the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon in a real-life context' (Yin, 2009, p2). This case study was developed in response to a perceived need for research on gender and educational leadership in the United Kingdom that draws on poststructural feminist gender theories rather than on an assumption of universal womanhood (Reay and Ball, 2000). Here a case study approach enabled the teasing out of differences between, and within, constructions and articulations of gendered leadership by individual members of staff in response to the research question 'How do members of staff construct gendered school leadership?' In its drawing on multiple voices about the leadership of one woman, it is a particularly suitable way to discuss the multidiscursivity of gender theory.

Fifteen semi-structured interviews were conducted over the course of one academic year with one headteacher (Jennifer) and fourteen members of staff and governors working with her. Interviewees were working at an English comprehensive secondary school located in a largely rural county in England. The headteacher facilitated access to interviewees confident to talk openly about her gendered leadership. Approval was gained from the University of Birmingham's ethics review committee. Interviewees gave informed written consent on the understanding their comments would remain confidential and quotations would be made anonymous. Pseudonyms have been used throughout. Interviewees' words have been quoted verbatim in italics. Equal numbers of women and men participated as mainscale teachers and non-teaching support staff; middle and senior leaders; and governors including parents ($N = 14$) (see Table 1). In keeping with national statistics on

the composition of school teaching and management structures in England (DfE, 2012) all the participants were White. Interviews lasted for approximately one hour. They were recorded and transcribed to facilitate analysis.

INSERT TABLE 1

Interviews were in two parts. First, interviewees categorised personal and leadership qualities (Gray, 1993; Dimmock, 2003) in four ways as 'feminine'; 'masculine'; 'both feminine *and* masculine'; and 'neither feminine nor masculine' with the aim of avoiding a dualist approach. A card sort enabled participants to move the qualities around the four categories mapped as a diamond. Categorisations were recorded on paper. Second, participants charted Jennifer's gendered leadership in a range of circumstances and contexts as interactions with children and adults as individuals and in groups, in public and private spaces. They described her appearance and embodiment of gendered leadership. A continuum ranging from 'extremely feminine' to 'extremely masculine' was offered as a graphic thinking tool for each item and provided a physical record. Thus participants were asked to consider a woman's gendered leadership in terms of their own constructions of femininities and masculinities.

As dialogue is central to Bakhtin's theory (Holquist, 1981; Morris, 1994) the exploration of staff members' utterances and their accounts of dialogic interactions between Jennifer and others are crucial to the analysis of their accounts of gendered leadership discourse. Their talk about gender was analysed as it related to Jennifer being seen to conform to or transgress dominant or traditional modes of doing gender/gendered leadership. It was analysed to determine whether gender/gendered leadership was constructed using dominant gender/gendered leadership discourse (gender monoglossia); alternative conflicting gender theory discourses (gender heteroglossia); or by using a multilingual approach to discuss gendered leadership and/or by rejecting or redefining gender theory discourses (polyglossia). The talk was coded as 1) gender monoglossia: a woman headteacher's gender is described as 'feminine'; an essentialist discourse conflates 'feminine/femininity' with females/women/girls and 'masculine/masculinity' with males/men/boys; 2) gender heteroglossia: a woman headteacher's gender is described as 'masculine'; and there is deconstruction of gender to disconnect it from the biologically sexed body; and 3) polyglossia: there is acceptance of multiple gender/gendered leadership discourses, resistance to or rejection of them and the proposal of an alternative.

Gender monoglossia

A woman headteacher's gendered leadership is described as 'feminine'

As a woman doing 'femininity' Jennifer was seen as conforming to the dominant essentialist gender discourse. Staff members talked about her appearance, body language, interactions with children and adults as individuals and groups in public and private arena in positive ways as her 'having' a 'feminine' appearance, personal qualities and skills conducive to educational leadership.

Jennifer and all fourteen staff members constructed Jennifer's physical appearance as 'feminine'. Her fashionable clothing, high heeled shoes, hair style, makeup, nails and jewellery were also approved by pupils (Adele and Wyn). Jennifer's formal, professional, business-like appearance gave

an air of respect, power and leadership and was not '*how you would dress on the high street*' (Justin). Her thoughtfulness about the impact of a '*polished*' appearance was constructed as 'feminine' (Charles). Jennifer's interactions with children were constructed as 'feminine' by six staff members. Her tactile approach was something men were wary of using (Jake). Her '*softer*' side was valued by pupils (Wyn) and her relational skills ensured pupils '*feel valued as an individual that is part of the collective*' (Marcia). An approach balanced between giving praise and disciplining pupils was connected with motherhood (Jake and Justin). Jennifer established friendly relations with children as their teacher (Connie). Jennifer's relationships with adults were constructed as 'feminine' by eight members of staff. Her '*softer*' 'feminine' side also applied to adults (Wyn). Jennifer's mutually respectful dialogues with staff were 'feminine' (Marcia). They were marked by a duty of care, approachability, benevolence, intuition, creativity and awareness of individual differences; all constructed as 'feminine' (Marcia). Interpersonal skills were enhanced by a sense of humour, facial expressions and open body language to result in a genuine interest in others and the value of staff. Jennifer's evaluative approach was also constructed as 'feminine' (Marcia). Others constructed as 'feminine' Jennifer's support and understanding (Amelia); decisiveness and confidence (Adele); approachability, friendliness and a collaborative style (Justin), fair mindedness and a measured approach (Alan).

Jennifer's femininity was constructed as 'lacking' by two staff members. Connie questioned the friendly relations with children in relation to a perceived need for authority. Jennifer was described as flirtatious with male colleagues, '*I do think she is a little bit more flirty*' (Connie). Jennifer used 'feminine' qualities to manipulate men (Wyn). Making eye contact with men during meetings undermined others (presumably women) (Wyn). Jennifer's approach was seen to be underpinned by vulnerability, lack of ruggedness and dynamism, and what Wyn perceived as children's need for '*strong male role models*'. These constructions demonstrate a discourse of women's leadership as lacking remains (see Shakeshaft, 1987; Blackmore, 1989; Coleman, 2003); that some women undermine women in positions of power (Cubillo and Brown, 2003; Fuller, 2013).

An essentialist discourse conflating gender with biological sex

Jennifer and twelve staff members conflated gender with biological sex at some point in their accounts. Jake switched from 'feminine' to 'female' to describe Jennifer's clothing. He thought men behaved differently from women regarding physical contact with children. Justin linked femininity with maternity. Jennifer's 'feminine' collaborative way of working was contrasted with a description of male headteachers who might be more directive. Alan distinguished between women's and men's responses, '*The trouble with males is we have a tendency to [clicks fingers] speak first and it is a measured response for women*'. Staff members commonly referred to women and men as professional or personal acquaintances to think and talk about gender/gendered leadership. Connie and Wyn distinguished between Jennifer's relationships with women and men. Gill's gender neutral categorisation of Jennifer's relationships with adults was based on her relating equally well with women and men. Thus some interviewees drew on an essentialist gender discourse to perpetuate stereotypes about women's and men's leadership, albeit self deprecatingly by some men (Pounder and Coleman, 2002).

Gender heteroglossia

A woman headteacher's gendered leadership is described as 'masculine'

As a woman doing 'masculinity' Jennifer might be seen to transgress a dominant essentialist gender discourse. Jennifer and four staff members (Adele, Amelia, Wyn and Julian) used 'masculine/masculinity' to chart Jennifer's gendered leadership. Her confident body language and presence were constructed as 'masculine' (Adele and Julian); as were public speaking skills and tough-mindedness (Adele); decisiveness, self-assurance, directness and focus,

> '*she has to be perceived as just getting on with her job and be fully focused. There is no airy fairiness sort of thing and I think you need that as a leader ….I would say that fewer women are like that than men actually which is why I consider it more masculine features*' (Amelia).

There were contexts and circumstances where Jennifer was '*more male overall*' (Amelia). Jennifer was constructed as '*a bit harder*' with children though Julian acknowledged he based this on little evidence. Wyn had seen,

> '*more evidence of the male side with children when speaking with them, it depends on the situation. I think she uses the female appearance but in her speech and the relationship I think the male side comes out and the objectivity and the decisiveness,… … I would have to say there are two sides depending on who she is interacting with*' (Wyn).

According to Wyn, Jennifer used 'masculine' qualities to manipulate women. Despite Wyn's construction of Jennifer as manipulative and her adoption of a 'femininity as lacking' discourse, Jennifer provided her with a role model,

> '*I think I am going to learn a lot from Jennifer in terms of the masculine qualities that she has got because that's an area that I need to promote more myself. … I think Jennifer does the highly regulated, the highly decisive bit really well*' (Wyn).

These staff members used 'masculine/masculinity' to describe Jennifer's gendered leadership in an unproblematic way. Jennifer charted the contexts and circumstances in which she drew on 'masculine' qualities most strongly as her decisiveness and reprimand of staff.

No one constructed Jennifer's 'masculine' qualities as 'lacking'. That aspect of her gendered leadership was seen as necessary in her headteacher role. However, references to a former headteacher as '*an extremely hard looking lady*' (Julian) revealed another attitude to gendered leadership. Jennifer's predecessor 'used' dark-rimmed glasses as a barrier that denoted lack of interpersonal skills with staff and children (Wyn). Jake constructed the gap between children's expectations and the actuality of a female teacher's gender production as the teacher's lack. These women's professional identities were deemed lacking because their 'femininities' were lacking (Martino, 2008; Paechter, 2003b).

A poststructuralist discourse disconnecting gender from biological sex

In their use of 'masculine/masculinity' to describe Jennifer's headship, each of the five interviewees cited above engaged in what might be a poststructural gender discourse that disconnects gender

from biological sex. Another group of interviewees engaged with that discourse but in a different way.

Charles, Jake, Justin and Douglas engaged in a discourse that used 'masculine/masculinity' to describe Jennifer's behaviours and qualities within an overall construct of femininity. Charles described a sliding scale on which some traits were not, '*specifically masculine traits but they are not as explicitly feminine*' (Charles). Occasionally Jennifer was,

> '*very abrupt, almost aggressive in a professional way, so her tone can become very flat, her mannerisms will change, she can use her body language to intimidate where it is appropriate and necessary which is….I suppose I traditionally think of those as being masculine traits*' (Charles).

Her courage in facing confrontation and drive for what she wanted (improved learning and teaching for all children) was 'masculine'. However, Charles ultimately described this in terms of femininity,

> '*I don't think you could look at Jennifer and say that there is anything particularly masculine about her. She is a very feminine woman but she also….She is quite comfortable having the responsibility and authority that comes with headship, she is very comfortable making high level decisions and doesn't shy away from those and doesn't shy away from the conflict that it sometimes generates so in terms of dealing with conflict she has a sort of masculine approach*' (Charles).

Jennifer's formality in meetings with parents was described as '*staid*' and constructed as 'masculine' (Jake). Jake also reverted to biological sex to categorise her relationships with adults '*being female I would still put her here* [feminine]' (Jake). Jennifer's direct approach was,

> '*a kind of fairly masculine trait. She took the bull by the horns and she knew what she wanted to do and what she wants to achieve*' (Justin).

But Justin qualified this perception by emphasising Jennifer's collaborative approach to implementing change as a '*feminine way of working*' (Justin). Similarly, Jennifer's '*business mode*' (Douglas) in formal meetings was more 'masculine' than the personal, empathic and relaxed approach after meetings that was 'feminine'. Douglas watched her '*switch*' from one mode to another just as multilinguals code switch or translanguage (Lewis et al, 2012; Creese and Blackledge, 2010).

Polyglossia

A woman headteacher's gendered leadership is described as both 'feminine' and 'masculine'

Jennifer's '*down the middle*' gendered leadership featured consistently throughout Maria's account. Her appearance was '*nicely feminine*' not '*sickly*' but her body language was assertive, '*you see this person nicely dressed, petite but she is a strong lady*' (Maria). In terms of behaviour,

> '*she can go slightly to the side of masculine but I would never imagine her to be full on masculine features in any way. She is always very much a lady*' (Maria).

Fairness, determination, clarity in communication, clear-sightedness, sensitivity, a sense of humour, focus and a directive approach contributed to Jennifer's gendered leadership as '*middle*'. There was a balance between sensitivity and assertiveness,

> '*If a child was being discussed who had sensitive issues you can definitely see that there is an emotional tug there. And also with staff, whilst she is the strong lady, like I say focused she would always approach staff in the first instance in a very nice way. If she needed to, if push came to shove, I'm sure that she could do that without feeling…. She just has a very, very fair approached manner….It's just in conversation….I probably can't think of a for instance but you just get it. When you talk to her you know that there is this warm side as well*' (Maria, adapted from Fuller, 2010, p371).

There was a '*no nonsense*' approach to pupil discipline but also a '*hearty chuckle*' (Maria). Maria's account was wholly balanced. Jennifer could do 'feminine' and 'masculine' simultaneously with no apparent conflict or sense of transgression in being a woman doing masculinity.

Altogether, seven staff members charted aspects of Jennifer's headship at the point where 'feminine' met 'masculine' on the continuum to suggest her leadership was equally 'feminine' and 'masculine'. Amelia qualified Jennifer's directness and instruction that was 'masculine' with support and understanding that was 'feminine'. So too, Jennifer's interactions with children varied depending on the circumstances, '*she can be stern; she can be caring*' (Amelia). Jennifer's ease with a range of people, adaptability and ability to communicate '*in different ways so it makes sense to different people*' (Amelia) were positive qualities ranging across the 'masculine' and 'feminine'. However, for some, it suggested uncertainty or possibly a gender neutral discourse.

A multilingual discourse that draws on essentialist <u>and</u> poststructural discourses

Jake used 'feminine', 'woman' and 'female' interchangeably to describe Jennifer's mode of dress as,

> '*a traditionally feminine way but smart business-woman type way. It's what I would associate with a female professional in any organisation*' (Jake).

'Feminine' and 'female' are adjectives; 'business-woman' is used as an adjectival noun. In his description he draws on a binarised, essentialist discourse. However, Jake had also engaged in a poststructural gender discourse by refusing to categorise any of the personal and leadership qualities except as 'neither feminine nor masculine' and 'both feminine and masculine',

> '*I'm having great trouble attributing these to any kind of gender at all … they can either be neither or both as far as I am concerned because I know people who I work with who are all these things, each person obviously individually, who are male and female who I am very proud to work with and have worked with in a deep capacity. And I don't particularly attribute any of these characteristics here to be male or female I have to say, or masculine or feminine … I don't see any point in trying to attribute these just out of a practical gender stereotyping job*' (Jake, adapted from Fuller, 2010, p375).

He acknowledged his own 'feminine' and 'masculine' qualities but ultimately rejected the terms 'feminine/femininity' and 'masculine/masculinity' in favour of 'formality' and 'informality',

'Jake: …there is a sense in which you could replace masculinity and femininity with formality and informality … There are some situations where I would perhaps act more informally which I might I suppose feel slightly more feminine than other situations where I would have to act a bit tougher…

K: Can you unpack that for me?

Jake: There are certain situations where you are talking to people on a one to one … I was trying to be more informal with J [pupil] and to try and get her to express her feelings a bit more which I feel is slightly more my feminine side than a masculine side because I think if I had been far too formal with her then she wouldn't have opened up in the way she did' (Jake, adapted from Fuller, 2010, p375).

Jake was 'translanguaging' in his simultaneous use of essentialist and poststructural discourses. Having identified the contradictions in his own dialogue, possibly for the first time, he worked through them to develop his own terms.

Discussion

The monoglossic façade

The monoglossic façade consists of the external facing mask seen to be worn by Jennifer who as a woman headteacher appears to be doing women's leadership looking like a woman. There was unanimous 'approval' of Jennifer's embodiment of 'femininity' demonstrated by fastidious attention to doing 'feminine' aesthetic presentation (Acker, 2012). Nevertheless, there was disagreement about women's suits. Both skirt and trouser suits were constructed as 'masculine' by some (Acker, 2012). It was their combination with immaculate make up, hair and nails that categorised Jennifer's appearance as 'feminine' in stark contrast with her predecessor whose dark-rimmed glasses symbolised distance, inaccessibility and poor relationships with children and staff. Clearly a pair of glasses does not achieve that by itself; other descriptions of the former headteacher's behaviour and body language reaffirmed that construction. Jennifer's leadership was constructed within a women's educational leadership discourse in its conformity with perceived women's ways of leading in a caring and collaborative approach (Blackmore and Sachs, 2007; Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011; Acker, 2012). Staff referred to her clear focus on the quality of learning and teaching for all children that might be seen as leadership for learning and social justice (Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011). But they did not voice these in terms of gender. Her awareness of self and her impact on others might be constructed as the spiritual leadership also associated with women's educational leadership (Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011). There were some unexpected constructions of 'femininity'. The decisiveness and self-confidence ascribed here as 'feminine' have been traditionally seen as 'masculine' (see Gray, 1993; Coleman, 2002). Here they were linked with Jennifer's performing arts career and her physical stage presence in addressing large audiences. Her petite physique may have impacted on the construction of self-confidence as 'feminine'; had she been a larger woman that self-confidence might have been constructed differently as might her tactile behaviour with children.

In these ways Jennifer was seen to conform to traditional expectations of a woman doing leadership. Accounts connecting Jennifer's femininity with her biological sex draw on an essentialist gender

discourse. By contrast to the monoglossic façade or mask worn by Jennifer, in the next section I propose the notion of a heteroglossic exposé as a revelation or uncovering of a fuller and more complex performance of gendered educational leadership.

The heteroglossic exposé

The heteroglossic exposé consists of the multiple traits, qualities and behaviours that Jennifer and others constructed as 'masculine', of her doing masculinist leadership, under the 'feminine' monoglossic façade. The unmasking or unfolding of heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981) reveals the extent of colleagues' articulation of Jennifer's apparent engagement with multiple gender/gendered leadership discourses. Heteroglossia is marked by transgression, conflict and struggle. Jennifer's 'female masculinity' (Francis, 2010) was demonstrated in the accounts of those (including Jennifer), who used 'masculine/masculinity' to describe her leadership. Jennifer's selection of behaviours at will based on the person/people, the context and the circumstances was seen as an exercise of power. Rather than exercising power to work with people to empower them, it appeared to some that Jennifer exercised power to control (Blackmore, 1989). This was not a feminist construction of educational leadership. There were multiple references to colleagues doing what they were told to do and therefore a very direct and instructive leadership approach. There was evidence of resistance to change in the reference to Jennifer's unflinching courage when faced with confrontation, for example. Few constructed such an approach as lacking, rather most constructed it as a strength. There appeared to be no difficulty for some in constructing a fluid and flexible notion of gendered leadership performance that was disconnected to the body as it was sexed (Butler, 1990; Reay and Ball, 2000).

However, the discursive struggle is best demonstrated in the accounts of those who held on to a binarised and essentialist gender discourse. Unable to disconnect Jennifer's femaleness from their construction of her gendered leadership, they engaged in another kind of 'female masculinity' discourse (Francis, 2010). It appears her 'feminine' aesthetic presentation and physical embodiment as a woman overrode all their understandings of gender production that they ascribed as 'masculine'. For them, the essentialist discourse determined Jennifer's gendered leadership despite their articulation of it within a poststructural discourse. They referred to degrees of femininity that others ascribed as masculinity. In a sense, these men are also bilingual. For them, the clash they constructed between Jennifer's 'femininity' and use of traits ascribed as 'masculine' alongside the clash between the languages/discourses of gender theory marks them out as heteroglossic. Their internal discursive struggle remains. There is also evidence of a sophisticated articulation of gender/gendered leadership (Fuller, 2010) that I go on to describe as polyglossic simultaneity.

Polyglossic simultaneity

Polyglossic simultaneity consists of the acceptance and use of multiple gender discourses in the articulation of gender/gendered leadership. It is found in the seemingly unproblematic use of both 'feminine' and 'masculine' in the description of the variety of traits, qualities and behaviours attributed to Jennifer. The articulation of her selection of both 'feminine' *and* 'masculine' qualities

and behaviours depending on context and circumstances equates with an acceptance of the possibilities of gender heteroglossia or female masculinity (Francis, 2010). That acceptance leads to conflict resolution and these discourses become examples of polyglossic simultaneity. The translanguaging found in these accounts demonstrates bi/multilingualism in the articulation of gendered leadership.

Douglas noted Jennifer's own translanguaging as a '*switch*' from one mode to another. In her own categorisation of qualities and attributes, Jennifer forced open a space in the middle, centred between 'feminine/masculine' and 'neither/both feminine/masculine' in which to discuss gender (Fuller, 2010). In Maria's account there is seemingly perfect balance between Jennifer's 'feminine' and 'masculine' behaviours. In each situation, she charted Jennifer's gendered leadership '*in the middle'*. Her elucidation and clarification of understandings revealed a nuanced reading of gender that demonstrates the 'simultaneity and fluidity' (Youdell, 2010) in her construction of Jennifer's professional identity. '*The middle*' was not a marker of uncertainty, or an unthinking attempt at gender construction, or of gender neutrality. It was another language with which to describe gender without veering between traditional binaries. Although he did not frame it as such, this polyglossic simultaneity appeared to enable Jake's rejection of 'femininity' and 'masculinity' in favour of 'formality' and 'informality'. His account of the simultaneity and fluidity required by educational leaders and teachers of both sexes resembles the 'haziness' of teacher identity conducive to young people's development of their own multiple identities (Youdell, 2010). Jake described his use of such an approach and identified its lack in others as problematic in building relationships with children. Perhaps the polyglossic simultaneity of engaging with multiple gender discourses enabled Jennifer to communicate clearly with a wide range of people as teaching and non-teaching staff, children, parents and governors.

Conclusion

This article has shown how these concepts of a monoglossic façade, heteroglossic exposé and polyglossic simultaneity enable a more nuanced discussion of gendered leadership. The articulation by Jennifer and all interviewees of her apparent conformity as a woman doing 'femininity' and women's leadership form a monoglossic façade. The articulation by some interviewees of a sliding scale of apparently 'more masculine' behaviours within an overall construction of 'femininity' constitutes a heteroglossic exposé. It is marked by their discursive struggle. The articulation by Jennifer and some interviewees of apparent transgressions in doing 'masculinity' and masculinist leadership demonstrate the multidiscursiveness of gendered leadership. The ease with which they articulated this marks the discourse as polyglossic simultaneity. Such nuances need recognition..

There remains a need for further work in breaking down stereotypes. Both Jennifer and her predecessor were women achieving headship 'against the odds' (Coleman, 2001); they were equal to men. Nevertheless, women remain underrepresented in secondary school headship (Fuller, 2013). The 'double path in politics' (Butler, 2004, p37) that asserts entitlement but simultaneously scrutinises social categories is still needed if equal representation is to be achieved. Jennifer's predecessor did not seem to conform to the monoglossic façade in her embodiment of expected 'femininity' with regard to appearance and body language and she was criticised as a result (Devine et al, 2011; Acker, 2012). Had she been a man no one would have mentioned her glasses, nor her

unfriendliness and lack of interpersonal skills. There was criticism of a woman teacher who lacked 'feminine' qualities that children expected to find in a woman (Fuller, 2010). There was a perceived need for women and men to draw simultaneously on a wide range of approaches in their relationships with children and adults. Further research is needed to build nuanced pictures of men's gendered leadership to ascertain what lies behind their monoglossic façades and how far their 'elastic selves' (Devine et al, 2011) might also be stretched. So too, research is needed into how women and men headteachers from potentially marginalised groups and their colleagues construct gendered leadership.

This conceptualisation of gender/gendered leadership discourses recognises the powerful gender monoglossic façade, the discursive struggles of a heteroglossic exposé and eventual polyglossic simultaneity. It marks a shift from the language of androgynous educational leadership (Fuller, 2010). Instead of finding *a* language to think and talk about gendered educational leadership, there is a need for multidiscursiveness in thinking about the underrepresentation of women (and some men) in secondary school headship as well as engagement with (pro)feminist and masculinist leadership discourses by women *and* men (Fuller, 2013). Translanguaging between the discourses of second wave feminism and post structural gender discourses is helpful. The interviewees in this case study did that in their articulation of gendered leadership. Translanguaging as a pedagogical approach is needed in the discussion of gender matters in teacher and headteacher preparation courses (Creese and Blackledge, 2010). Thus existing gender narratives of aspiring teachers and leaders would be valued as they begin to engage with contemporary gender theories. The possibilities of translanguaging between gender discourses need to be explored further by educational leaders. It is hoped this paper offers a continuation of the discussions around gendered leadership roles that will enable those explorations. Indeed translanguaging between gender discourses might also enable teachers to teach children to deconstruct gender stereotypes in the classroom, in text and in wider society. They might finally learn to accept the fe/male teacher/headteacher whose monoglossic façade barely exists.

References

Acker, S. (2012) Chairing and caring: gendered dimensions of leadership in academe, **Gender and Education**, 24:4, 411-428.

Arar, K. & Izhar Oplatka, I. (2013) Gender debate and teachers' constructions of masculinity vs. femininity of school principals: the case of Muslim teachers in Israel, **School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation**, 33:1, 97-112.

Bakhtin, (1981) **The Dialogic Imagination** (Ed) M. Holquist, Trans C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Texas: the University of Texas Press.

Ball, S. (2003) The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity, **Journal of Education Policy** 18(2): 215–28.

Bassey, M. (1999) **Case study research in educational settings**. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Beasley, C. (2012) Problematizing contemporary Men/Masculinities theorizing: the contribution of Raewyn Connell and conceptual-terminological tensions today, **The British Journal of Sociology**, 63 (4), 747-765.

Bhana, D. and Pillay, N. (2011) Beyond passivity: constructions of femininities in a single-sex South African school, **Educational Review**, 63:1, 65-78.

Blackmore, J. (1989) Educational Leadership: A Feminist Critique and Reconstruction. In Smyth, J. (ed.) **Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership**, pp. 93-129. London: Falmer.

Blackmore, J. (1989), 'Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction', in J. Smyth (ed.), **Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership**. London: Falmer, pp. 93–129.

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

Burnham, P. (1969) Role Theory and Educational Administration, G. Baron and W. Taylor (Eds.) **Educational Administration and the Social Sciences**, London: The Athlone Press.

Butler, J. (1990) **Gender Trouble**. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993) **Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits Of 'Sex'**. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1997) **The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection**, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

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

Carlile, A. (2012) 'Critical bureaucracy' in action: embedding student voice into school governance, **Pedagogy, Culture & Society**, 20:3, 393-412.

Cobbett, M. C. (2013) 'Beauties', 'geeks' and 'men-john': the possibilities and costs of girls' performances of gender in Antiguan schools, **Gender and Education**, 25:3, 251-266.

Coleman, M. (2001) Achievement against the odds: the female secondary headteachers in England and Wales, **School Leadership and Management**, 21, 1, 75-100.

Coleman, M. (2002) **Women as headteachers: striking the balance**. Oakhill, Trentham Books Ltd.

Coleman, M. (2003), 'Gender and the orthodoxies of leadership', **School Leadership and Management**, 23(3), 325–39.

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2010) Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? **The Modern Language Journal,** 94 (i): 103-115.

Cubillo, L. and Brown, M. (2003), 'Women into educational leadership and management: International differences?', **Journal of Educational Administration***, 41(3), 278–91.

Department for Education, (2012) **School Workforce in England: November 2011***, available online at: www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s001062/index.shtml [accessed 27 April 2012).

Devine, D., Grummell, B. and Lynch, K. (2011) Crafting the elastic self? Gender and identities in senior appointments in Irish education, **Gender, Work and Organization**, 18, 6, 631-649.

Dimmock, C. (2003) Leadership in Learning Centred Schools: cultural context, functions and qualities, in Brundrett, M., Burton, N. and Smith, R. (Eds.) **Leadership in Education**, London: Sage.

Forde, C. (2013) Is 'gender-sensitive education' a useful concept for educational policy? **Cultural Studies in Science Education**, 8 available at http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/64273/ [accessed 19th July 2013].

Francis, B. (1999) Modernist Reductionism or Poststructuralist Relativism: Can we move on? An Evaluation of the Arguments in Relation to Feminist Educational Research. **Gender and Education**, 11, 4, 381-393.

Francis, B. (2010) Re/theorising gender: female masculinity and male femininity in the classroom? **Gender and Education**, 22, 5, 477-490.

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

Fuller, K. (2010) Talking about gendered headship: how do women and men working in schools conceive and articulate notions of gender? **Journal of Educational Administration and History** 42, no. 4: 363–382.

Fuller. K. (2011) Learning gendered leadership: a discursive struggle. Paper presented at the 3rd **Women Leading Education Conference**, September 27, in Volos, Greece.

Fuller, (2013) **Gender, Identity and Educational Leadership**, London: Bloomsbury.

Gray, H. (1993) Gender considerations in school management: masculine and feminine leadership styles. In Riches, C. and Morgan, C. (Eds.) **Human Resource Management in education** pp 38-45. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Grogan, M. and Shakeshaft, C. (2011) **Women and educational leadership**. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.

Gunter, H. (2013) Why we 'knead' theory, **Management in Education**, 27(1) 4–6.

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

Haywood, C. and Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012) 'What's next for masculinity?' Reflexive directions for theory and research on masculinity and education, **Gender and Education**, 24:6, 577-592.

Holquist, M. (1981) Glossary, **The Dialogic Imagination** (Ed) M. Holquist Trans C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Texas: the University of Texas Press.

Hoyle, E. (1965) Organizational Analysis in the Field of Education, **Educational Research**, 7:2, 97-114.

Hughes, C. (2004) Class and other identifications in managerial careers: The case of the lemon dress. **Gender, Work and Organization** 11: 526–43.

Lewis, G., Jones, B. and Baker, C. (2012) Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond, **Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice**, 18:7, 641-654.

Martino, W. (2008), Male teachers as role models: Addressing issues of masculinity, pedagogy and the re-masculinization of schooling, **Curriculum Inquiry,** 38(2), 189–223.

Merriam, S. (1988) **Case study research in education: A qualitative approach**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morris, P. (Ed.) (1994) **The Bakhtin Reader**. London: Arnold.

Noble, J. B. (2004) **Masculinities without men? Female masculinity in twentieth-century fictions**. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Paechter, C. (2003a), Learning masculinities and femininities: power/knowledge and legitimate peripheral participation, **Women's Studies International Forum**, 26: 6, 541 – 552.

Paechter, C. (2003b), Masculinities and femininities as communities of practice, **Women's Studies International Forum**, 26: 1, 69 – 77.

Paechter, C. (2006a) Power, knowledge and embodiment in communities of sex/gender practice **Women's Studies International Forum** 29:1, 13–26.

Paechter, C. (2006b) Masculine femininities/feminine masculinities: power, identities and gender, **Gender and Education**, 18:3, 253-263.

Peck, E., Freeman, T., Six, P. and Dickinson, H. (2009) Performing Leadership: Towards a New Research Agenda in Leadership Studies, **Leadership**, 5:1, 25-40.

Perry, E. (2013) 'She's alpha male': transgressive gender performances in the probation 'classroom', **Gender and Education**, 25:4, 396-412.

Pounder, J. and Coleman, M. (2002) Women--better leaders than men? In general and educational management it still all depends, **Leadership & Organization Development Journal**, 23(3/4), 122-133.

Raphael Reed, L. (2001), "Re-searching, re-finding, re-making": Exploring the unconscious as a pedagogic and research practice, in B. Francis and C. Skelton (Eds.), **Investigating Gender: Contemporary Perspectives in Education**, Buckingham: Open University Press, pp. 77–90.

Reay, D. and Ball, S. (2000) Essentials of Female Management, **Educational Management Administration and Leadership**, 28, 2 145-159.

Ribbins, P. and Gunter, H. (2002) Mapping leadership studies in education: Towards a typology of knowledge domains, **Educational Management Administration and Leadership**, 30: 4, 359-385.

Scott, J. (1988), 'Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism', **Feminist Studies**, 14(1), 32–50.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987), **Women in Education Administration**. New York: Sage.

Strachan, J. (1999) Feminist Educational Leadership: Locating the concepts in practice, **Gender and Education**, 11:3, 309-322.

Strain, M. (2009) Some ethical and cultural implications of the leadership "turn" in education: On the distinction between performance and performativity, **Educational Management Administration and Leadership**, 37(1), 67–84.

Weinstein, J. (2010) A Requiem to Sexual Difference: A Response to Luciana Parizi's "Event and Evolution", **The Southern Journal of Philosophy**, Spindel Supplement 48: 165–87.

Wohlwend, K. (2012) The boys who would be princesses: playing with gender identity intertexts in Disney Princess transmedia, **Gender and Education**, 24:6, 593-610.

Yin, R. (2009) **Case study research design and methods**. London: Sage.

Yin, R. (2012) **Applications of case study research**. London: Sage.

Youdell, D. (2010) Pedagogies of becoming in an end-of-the-line 'special' school, **Critical Studies in Education**, 51:3, 313-324.