LEADING AT THE BORDER: GENDER, SEX AND

SEXUALITY IN HYPERGENDERED ORGANIZATIONS

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Leicester

by

Michèle Bowring

School of Management

University of Leicester

2009

Abstract

The leadership literature, although very well established, has paid limited attention to the differences between people, even when it has examined the different ways in which women and men may lead. In particular, any attention to those differences has been as if sex and gender are the same, while sexuality has been ignored.

The conceptual framework for my thesis comes from Butler's (1990) work on the performativity of gender and her discussion of the heterosexual framework. Therefore, in this thesis I attempt to address the deficiencies above by answering the following questions:

How do/can people construct identities that transcend the heterosexual matrix?
As people construct their identities as leaders, do they seek to reconcile all their other identities into a coherent whole with their identity as a leader?
To what extent are leadership, sex, gender and sexual identities 'fixed' or 'static'?
How do queer or borderline identities intersect with leadership?

I explore these questions by interviewing 34 leaders of varying sexes, genders and sexual orientations. These respondents were active and retired members of the military and nursing in the UK, Canada or the US.

Perhaps the most significant finding was that for these respondents, their body trumped the other two aspects of identity, i.e., their gender and their sexuality, when developing and enacting their leadership within these hypergendered organizations.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to a number of people who were invaluable in the completion of this PhD thesis and so I would like to thank the following:

My first supervisor, Jo Brewis, who has been the best supervisor any research student could ask for. You were inspiring and supportive at the same time that you held me to a high standard in both research and writing. I learned so much from doing this project and writing this thesis and from your leadership as my supervisor in this process. I cannot express enough gratitude for your enthusiasm and willingness to take on a not-your-run-of-the-mill student and project. Thank-you for always being there for me.

My second supervisor, Gavin Jack, who has been a source of strength and support throughout this process. You always came up with a "well done, you" when I needed it the most and your belief in me and this project got me through many a moment when I thought it was going on forever.

My friends Janet and Cam Morrill, without whose very real, material, support my PhD studies would not have been possible. Your belief in me and your willingness to offer help, no questions asked, exemplify the best qualities of friendship. Thank-you for <u>all</u> your help.

The participants in this study, who were willing to talk about such personal issues and revisit experiences that were sometimes painful for them.   I hope I have done justice to your stories.

The members of academic staff at the School of Management at the University of Leicester, who provided an exciting intellectual space in which to do this work. Your example of collegiality and research that pushes the envelope continues to inspire me on a regular basis.

Last, but most certainly not least, my wife Kay.   You always offered whatever support I needed, whether it was encouragement to go on when I was tired or a willingness to listen to countless ideas and versions of each piece of this thesis.   The knowledge of feminist theory that you brought to our many discussions and your expertise in research techniques were invaluable in helping me to work out key aspects of this project. Thank-you also for all the typing you did because I have never gone beyond the two-finger method. I really will take that keyboarding course now that I have the time!

Dedication

For Kay

Semper fidelis

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1.0 Introduction

On May 17, 2006, Captain Nichola Goddard, an artillery officer in the First Royal Canadian Horse Artillery, was killed while riding in the top of an armoured vehicle on patrol in Kandahar District, Afghanistan. As I looked at her picture in the accompanying news article (CBC, 2006), I was struck by the pensive look that gazed out beyond the photographer, her freckled face and broad smile an interesting contrast to the rest of her appearance: a young woman wearing desert combat fatigues and cradling a rifle. A lot was written in the Canadian press about Captain Goddard – her abilities, the respect she had from her colleagues and her superiors, her volunteer work, the fun she shared with her husband, the love and pride of her parents. It seemed inconceivable to many that a woman had been killed in combat, had purposefully put her life on the line in a profession that has been so strongly identified with men and masculinity. The press coverage seemed to be an attempt to make sense of why a seemingly 'normal' young woman would choose to expose herself to such risks. Her abilities were never questioned, but there was a lingering sense that, somehow, this was wrong.

At the time, I was about halfway into the interview set for this thesis and I was saddened by the loss of such an obviously capable and caring individual. I wondered what it must have been like for Captain Goddard to be one of such a small group of women working in one of the last extremely male bastions of the military, artillery. I wondered at first what made her want to ride with her head sticking out of the top of a tank, vulnerable in such an open way to mortar fire and rifle rounds – although, to be honest, that was something that I wondered about anyone who chose to be an artillery officer. After a while I realized that I did understand the desire to make a contribution, to make a

difference in whatever way an individual felt their talents and abilities permitted. What I did not understand, however, were the objections that any military organization (or indeed wider society) would have to women like her serving as an artillery officer in the first place, simply because she was a woman – clearly she was capable and she was motivated. Interestingly, Captain Goddard could not even have served as an artillery officer in any other military in the western world.

Although I never had the opportunity to meet Captain Goddard, eighteen months after her death I listened to Martha, a friend and colleague of hers, talk about her own experiences as an artillery officer after the Canadian Forces had lifted the combat exclusion for women[1]. As Martha spoke of the repeated attempts to nevertheless dissuade her from joining such a dirty, 'mud-bound' profession, I was again surprised that anyone had tried to convince a woman with such a capable and strong persona that she might not want to work in a job where she would have to sleep outside, where hot showers were few and far between and there were no toilets except for the ones dug in the bush. Surely they could have seen that this was a woman who did not care about such things.

I also heard Martha talk about the difficulties of getting the job done while being such a visible member of her unit by virtue of being one of a handful of women in the combat arms and the problems that came from well-meaning but sometimes misguided attempts to "integrate" women into the Canadian military. These two women's stories therefore confirmed my belief in how important it is to open up our ideas of sex, gender and leadership and get away from the stereotyping and binary thinking that still prevents many women from breaking barriers that persist for them, based solely on the fact that

---

[1] As I will outline in chapter 3, in response to a Canadian Human Rights Tribunal ruling in 1988, the combat exclusion for women was abolished in the Canadian Forces in 1989, except for the submarine service, which was subsequently opened in 2000.

they have female bodies or are perceived to have a feminine gender, in work organizations.

Indeed, around the same time, media articles about two other women in the forces illustrated for me the way in which women are still stereotyped and pigeonholed into what are considered 'appropriate' occupations. Sadly, these restricted views of women's place in the world come not just from the media, not just from disgruntled men, as might be supposed, nor indeed from women outside the military, but also from military women themselves. In the first instance, the media coverage (e.g. Brown and Kennedy, 2008; Taylor, 2008; Sun Staff Reporters, 2008) surrounding the death on 18 June 2008 of Sarah Bryant, an Intelligence officer on a secret counter-terrorism mission posted in support of SAS troops in Afghanistan, was remarkably different from that of Captain Goddard's death. For example, it is difficult to even discover her rank, as the initial stories about her refer to her as Ms. Bryant – something that never happens in stories about male casualties. However, what was truly almost surreal was the picture of her that appeared in many articles about her, her wedding photograph in which she is dressed in a fairy princess style white dress, hair swept up with a tiara on top. This image of the fairy princess, firmly grounded in a heterosexual view of both women's place and the importance of heterosexual marriage, is certainly appropriate as a wedding picture but, as a picture memorializing a fallen soldier it sends a clear message regarding the incongruity of this pretty girl – this wife – bleeding and dying on the battlefield. It was particularly striking in an article in the Sun (Sun Staff Reporters, 2008) that included, in a sidebar, head shots of a number of fallen male soldiers, all in uniform, some wearing the maroon cap of the Parachute Regiment, while Corporal Bryant is shown wearing a wedding dress and tiara.

Of course, I knew what perhaps many who read those articles did not – Corporal Bryant was not officially posted to a combat role, and so could not have reaped all the benefits of such a posting, even if she had not been killed. She died as a result of combat injuries yet her participation in combat was so incongruous to the military and to society at large that she could not even be afforded the respect, pay and other acknowledgements of this willingness to put herself directly in harm's way. One article suggested that, as her husband referred to her as a "truly special person who died a hero" (Jardine, 2008) he seemed to think her gender was irrelevant next to the fact that she was a capable soldier who died in the service of her country. I agreed, but I also wondered how many other people felt the same way.

The second instance came as I was writing up this chapter. As part of a series of articles celebrating the 60th anniversary of women's participation in the British Army, a BBC reporter interviewed a young female officer (BBC, 2009). When asked whether she thought that women should serve in combat positions, this young officer was appalled at the idea. After all, she suggested, if a woman was shot, her male colleagues would be so upset they might forget to shoot the enemy and instead worry about getting her to safety. Clearly, the protected/protector theory that I discuss in chapter 3 does not simply reside in the minds of fossilized old military men, but in the hearts and minds of young forces women who are nevertheless caught up in society's rigid ideas regarding their place in the world.

Changing policies of course has been a first step in opening up the military to anyone who had the ability and motivation to serve, in whatever capacity those abilities led them, regardless of sex, gender or sexuality. However, stereotypes are so much harder

to change. While I was reflecting on Captain Goddard and Martha, I realized that their

experiences had been similar, in some ways, to mine and so many other women leaders

that I have known, both in industry and in academia. So many times, people see our

female bodies and make a whole host of assumptions about the conditions and limits of

possibility that characterize our lives, what we *can* do, what we *should* do, what we *should*

want to do, how we should behave – it is a long list. Sadder yet, we are all lumped

together in this, as if we should all be, do, and want the same thing, as if we were all *one*

woman. Even when there is an attempt to understand the ways in which our sexed bodies

might make us unique, there is rarely an accompanying understanding that similar sexed

bodies do not necessarily yield similar social roles (gender) or similar sexualities (sexual

orientation). As women, we are most likely to be seen as feminine and heterosexual, most

interested in our relationships with others, whether in our personal lives or in our

professional lives. Our primary concerns are most often seen to revolve around

heterosexual marriage, children and the conflict between 'work' and 'family' – the latter

two terms having their own limited definitions within this world view. While these are

indeed the concerns of many women, they are not the concerns of every woman. The

desire to break open these stereotypes, to help develop a way of understanding leadership

that does not rely on them, lies at the heart of this thesis.

The military was my primary interest from the start for the reasons outlined above.

As I will explain in chapter 3, one of its enduring characteristics is that it is

hypergendered[2] – i.e., it has a strong gender prescription for its successful leaders. I felt

that this hypergendering would markedly highlight and expose the circumstances under

---

[2] I thank my fellow former PhD student at Leicester, Stevphen Shukaitis, for his suggestion of the term 'hypergendered' to describe the type of organization I was interested in examining.

which people who do not fit a gender prescription develop and enact their leadership. Further, the military is hypergendered in a strongly masculine way. However, I was not interested in looking at the effects of hyper*masculinity* alone, but rather the effects of hyper*gendering*. I therefore felt that it would be useful and interesting to examine a profession that is hypergendered in an opposite way and that is why I decided to contrast the experiences of nurses and soldiers.

My interest in examining the same issues in nursing also comes from my experience supervising a number of postgraduate nursing students writing in the area of nursing and leadership in Canada over a number of years. Most of these students were strong capable women who, paradoxically, faced many of the same issues identified by female soldiers: people kept putting them in boxes that they did not fit into, simply because they were women. Many of them had attended classes on leadership and on power and politics that I taught. During class discussion they often raised many of the same issues described above; frustration at being put into sex or gender and leadership boxes, difficult in breaking out of the patriarchal structure of their profession and health care in general and a desire to find ways to lead without the constraints placed upon them by their sex or gender.

As also implied in the preceding discussion, and in contrast to many studies of leadership, sex and/or gender, this study also examines the way in which sexuality, as in sexual orientation, intersects with sex and/or gender and leadership. Again, this is as a result of both academic and practical experiences. First, as I discuss in chapter 2, I found Butler's (1990; 1993) ideas regarding gender and identity to be a richer and more complex way of conceptualizing gender than many of the earlier theoretical work that saw gender

as a social identity and sex as a biological one. Second, I have had a number of friends and acquaintances who served in the military and who expressed frustration at the way in which their sexual orientation had to be hidden or, more recently, served as yet another way for them to be stereotyped by others. As well, I was aware of the way in which sexual orientation has been used to exclude many queer people from the military and I wanted to explore the way in which sexual orientation and leadership worked together in a context that was extremely uncomfortable with non-heterosexual identities.

I have also been acquainted with a number of male nurses, some of whom were and some who were not queer, and I wanted to understand the ways in which their sexuality has affected their work lives. One of my former students in Canada was a male nurse who is soft-spoken, gentle and reflective – qualities that I am sure impact the way he is viewed by his colleagues. I have no idea what his sexual orientation is, nor is it relevant or appropriate for me to know. However, I wondered at the time how different his experiences might be from those of my female nursing students, and whether they were all constrained into boxes because of assumptions made about them relating to sex or gender or sexuality. Finally, I had previously interviewed a number of LGBT people for a project on their experiences of Canadian workplaces (Bowring and Brewis, 2009). A number had been nurses and one was a soldier and they had all had some interesting things to say about their experiences as gay or lesbian employees. The impetus for this project then comes both from academic questions and questions related to the lived experiences of people who lead in potentially difficult circumstances. It seemed logical to choose two such similar yet different professions in which to examine the ways in which sex, gender, sexuality and leadership intersect.

1.1 Research Context and Questions

To reiterate, this project has, at its roots, several issues that are important to me: leadership; queer identity; the relative lack of relevance of so much of the leadership literature to the realities of leading and being led in the twenty-first century; and a frustration with the relative silence and tendency to stereotype of organization studies regarding people who do not fit mainstream leadership's prescribed identity i.e., not male, masculine, heterosexual, able-bodied, middle-class, white etc.. I came into academia on the heels of twelve years of industry experience, much of it as some sort of manager or leader. I had previously taken an MBA in order to understand why we make such a mess of day to day organizing so much of the time. I learned a lot about why that is, although I didn't learn very much about leadership that was relevant to me as a woman – a non-stereotypical woman to be more precise. When I discovered gendered approaches to management, I was in turn elated and disappointed. It was true that much had been done here in an attempt to address issues that the mainstream (/malestream) ignored. However, I could not leave behind the sense that here, too, there was a prescribed gender, or if you will, a prescribed *opposite* gender, female, feminine, heterosexual, at the very least. It seemed that one box of possibilities had been increased to two – but they were still boxes.

As I will discuss in the next chapter, much has indeed been left unsaid and undone in the leadership literature, its immense size notwithstanding, especially when it comes to understanding the organizational experience of those who do not fit into one of the two boxes, male-masculine-heterosexual or female-feminine-heterosexual – and there are many of us. This thesis, therefore, is my attempt to open up the boxes. It is my attempt to open up a space where we can understand leadership without imposing *a priori* categories

of sex, gender and sexuality and with an understanding that the lived experience of all these categories of difference is rich and complex.

The title of this thesis reflects the key aspects of this research. As suggested above, I chose to research these issues in organizations with a strong gender prescription for its successful leaders because I believed that looking at extreme cases of gendering would highlight the gender issues that I was interested in. I looked at gender, sex and sexuality because those are the elements of the heterosexual matrix that Butler (1990; 1993) uses to theorize the heteronormativity of mainstream Western gender prescriptions. I explain in chapter 2 how that characterization is relevant to my project. Finally, the border in my title refers to the place that Haraway (1990) describes as the locus of resistance to fixed, imposed gender identities. I chose to interview participants in three countries, the UK, Canada and the US. As I explain in chapter 5, there were a number of key differences between the military and the nursing professions of those three countries that I believed would be interesting to explore.

My first move towards this understanding came from my work on what I refer to as the "Janeway paper" (Bowring, 2004) – an attempt to explore the possibilities created by making the gender of a female television leader more fluid. In that paper, I developed an argument based on the two key concepts that underpin this thesis: Butler's (1990) heterosexual matrix and her characterization of gender as performative. I analyzed the representation of a female leader, Captain Kathryn Janeway from the television series *Star Trek: Voyager*, both in the television show itself and in a slash fan fiction series called *Just Between (JB)*. My analysis discussed how a fluid gender identity enabled the Janeway in *JB* to be happier, more effective as a leader and more effective in achieving

her objectives than the Janeway in the television series, who was imprisoned by the heterosexual matrix and forced to choose either her job or her personal life in order to fit into stereotypes that seemed to constrain her.

For this thesis, I wanted to move beyond looking at texts and work with actual people. I wanted to explore the ways in which people actually construct their sex, their gender, their sexuality and their leadership identity, and see how those might intersect. From the literature review in chapter 2, I developed and refined a series of research questions that seek to understand how sex, gender, sexuality and leadership intersect:

1. How do/can people construct identities that transcend the heterosexual matrix? What might a queer identity / one at the border entail?

2. As people construct their identities as leaders, do they seek to reconcile all their other identities into a coherent whole with their identity as a leader? Do they view their leader identities as in any way shaped, influenced or informed by their sex, gender and/ or sexual identities? Or do their leader identities instead come to affect how they see themselves as male, female, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera)?

3. To what extent are leadership, sex, gender and sexual identities 'fixed' or 'static'? Do we play out our sense of ourselves as leaders, men, women, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera) in the same way across time and place?

4. How do queer or borderline identities intersect with leadership? Can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? In particular, in a profession in which gender roles are still fairly rigidly prescribed, and in which only certain forms of gendered leadership are 'acceptable', can people escape the heterosexual matrix in

their leadership behaviours? If so, what are the effects of such subversion for the leader involved?

      4a. To what extent do the differently hypergendered contexts of the military and nursing in the three countries seem to lead to varying outcomes in this regard?

One final and important note with regards to the way in which I use the term leadership in this thesis is required. The focus of my interviews is the way that people lead — i.e., the way in which they develop and enact their leadership identity and how that might intersect with the sex, gender and sexuality of those individuals. I have not interviewed those who are led by these people – thus, I have entitled this thesis Lead*ing* at the Border, rather than Leader*ship* at the Border, in order to highlight this fact. In the next section I briefly describe the structure of this thesis.

1.2 Thesis Structure

In chapter 2, which follows this introduction, I provide the conceptual review that underlies the rest of the thesis. In the first part of the chapter I focus on the intersection of feminist theory and leadership studies, and in particular on how these intersections originate from two main philosophical approaches: the 'women-in-management' literature and its ties to liberal feminism, and the 'women's ways' literature and its ties to psychoanalytic feminism. In order to differentiate between these approaches to leadership, I frame the review by addressing the following questions: how are women seen?, how is gender seen?, how is sexuality seen? These are fundamental aspects of each approach, intimately tied to their theoretical roots.

In the second part of this chapter I discuss the ways in which theorists have sought to address some of the problematic aspects of these two approaches. In particular, I examine the way in which the essentialism and dualism inherent in both have been highlighted by Calás and Smircich (1991), for example, and the alternatives that have been proposed. In the final part of the chapter, I argue that Butler's (1985; 1988; 1990; 1993) ideas regarding the performativity of gender and the heterosexual matrix, following from some of Foucault's (1978, 1980) ideas regarding the subject and power, can be used to break leadership studies free of the essentialism and attendant stereotypes and heteronormativity that characterize it. I conclude this chapter with the overarching research questions that guided the thesis project.

In chapter 3 I review the literature on leadership and the military, focusing on the ways in which sex, gender and sexuality have been examined. The first section provides a historical background for my project by describing, in brief, the development of the military of Canada, the UK and the US as it pertains to gender, sex and sexuality. In order to examine the masculine hypergendering of the military in the three countries I then examine the aforementioned three aspects of this gendering according to Butler's framework: sexed body (sex), social role (gender), and sexuality. The purpose here is to review some of the key literature that has attempted to understand how and why particular attitudes towards gender, sex and sexuality developed in the military of Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, and how and why they continue to drive, to a greater or lesser extent, much of the way in which personnel are recruited, selected, trained, allowed to serve and promoted in those armed forces. However, one of the failings of this literature is that, like much of the leadership literature discussed in chapter

2, it focuses on two groups of people, 'men' and 'women', without any regard to individual differences or to the possibility that it is not just heterosexual feminine women who do not fit the military prescription. Lesbians, men who are not stereotypically masculine, gay men, bisexuals and transgendered people are also outside the military's preoccupation with the "straight, white, athletic, heterosexual, Christian male" (Harrington, 1999, p. 12) leader. This is one of the deficiencies that my project addresses.

In chapter 4 I do the same things as in chapter 3 but with regards to nursing in the three countries. I begin by offering a historical overview of the nursing profession in the three countries as it pertains to sexed body (sex), social role (gender) and sexuality. The first section thus provides a historical background for my project by describing, in brief, the development of the nursing profession in the UK, Canada and the US. Then, in order to examine the feminine hypergendering of nursing, I again examine three aspects of this gendering — sexed body, social role, and sexuality. One of the threads that runs through much of this discussion is the way in which male nurses, who are in a minority, have a vastly different experience from the women who are in a minority in the military. Instead of being cut off from the top, or having their progress on the career ladder impeded by an unchanging view of the place of women and men, male nurses find that they are afforded an easier and quicker path to power and prestige. In the last part of chapter 4 I look at some of the literature in nursing that attempts to understand how members of this profession, however they identify, can come to terms with this effect, and how a profession that is facing serious leadership challenges due to looming retirements tries to move beyond stereotypical expectations and volatile environments, all the while being stuck within a mostly patriarchal and heteronormative medical field.

In chapter 5 I provide an overview and discussion of the methodological approach that I used to gather my thesis data. I begin by going over the ontological and epistemological assumptions that guided my choices. I continue by laying out the qualitative research strategies that I used, and in particular the way in which I planned to address the sensitive nature of this research project[3]. I describe the choice of semi-structured interviews and the process through which the interview schedule was developed. This is followed by a discussion of the data collection process, including sampling and the interview process as well as the rest of the issues raised by Lee and Renzetti (1993): methods, technical issues, ethics, politics, legalities and the effects of doing the research on my life (1993). My purpose is to offer a justification of my philosophical and methodological choices and to explain how I tailored those choices to fit the specific issues and potential participants at hand. Finally, I describe the data analysis process.

In chapter 6, I analyse the interview data that I collected. I begin in the middle, by discussing the answers to the questions "What, for you, is a great leader?" and "Can you give me an example?". I chose to begin with this discussion because the participants' answers revealed a consistent picture of great leadership, regardless of their own sex, gender, sexuality or organizational affiliation. What was most interesting about this ideal leader was the mostly gender-neutral quality of the traits, characteristics and behaviour that were put forward. The next section examines what organizational life and leadership were like for the participants and the way in which their sex, gender and sexual orientation intersected with their lives at work. In the third section of this chapter I examine the ways in which the participants developed and negotiated their leadership given the following

---

[3] Here I refer specifically to Lee and Renzetti's (1993) definition of sensitive topics.

and their interconnections: their sex, their gender, their sexuality, their ideas regarding

good leaders and the realities of their organizational contexts.

In chapter 7 I return to the overarching research questions and discuss the answers

to those questions as they came out of the data. I finish by reflecting on this research and

reviewing what I did, what I found, and what I could do in the future. Some examples of

future research questions include: How do team members perceive their leaders' sexed

body, social role and sexuality and how do these intersect with their leadership? In the

military, how do these related issues play out in combat situations versus home base / non-

combat postings? In nursing, how does the increasing proportion of women physicians

affect the way in which nursing leaders operate? In the next chapter, 2, I begin by

providing the conceptual foundations for this thesis.

2.0 Conceptual Framework: Feminism, leadership and identity

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the conceptual foundations for the thesis. As such, it aims to provide both a context for the research project and a discussion of the way in which my theoretical approach has developed from the existing leadership literature. It will not be surprising that this chapter is primarily a review of feminist approaches to leadership studies. By definition, feminist approaches to any academic area investigate the way in which certain aspects of gender identity such as, for example, the sexed body, social roles with their attendant femininities/masculinities or sexual orientation, intersect with that particular subject area. In the first part of this chapter, as I mention in chapter 1, I focus on the intersection of feminist theory and leadership studies and provide a review of two main approaches, the liberal feminist/women in management approach and the psychoanalytic feminist/women's ways approach.

In the second part of this chapter I discuss the ways in which theorists have sought to address some of the problematic aspects of these two approaches. In particular, I discuss the way in which the essentialism and dualism inherent in both have been highlighted (e.g. see Calás and Smircich, 1991) and some ways in which others have sought to deal with these problems. In the final part of the chapter, I discuss Butler's (1985; 1988; 1990; 1993) ideas regarding the performativity of gender and the heterosexual matrix, following from some of Foucault's (1978, 1980) ideas regarding the subject and power. I explain how these ideas can be used to break leadership studies free of the essentialism and attendant stereotypes and heteronormativity that characterize it. I

conclude this chapter with the over arching research questions that guided this thesis project.

It is important to be clear from the outset about both the scope and the limitations of this chapter. This chapter is a review of the leadership literature that intersects with aspects of gender and the underlying philosophical approaches of that literature. It is not a review of the leadership literature as a whole. Not only is that far beyond the scope of this thesis, it is also not necessary to the location of my project. Moreover, I do not review all the feminist approaches that have been written about in organizational or management studies because my purpose is to review those literatures that speak to leadership.

Two additional issues likewise need to be clarified at this stage: what is leadership, for the purposes of this thesis? and is the difference between leaders and managers relevant to this thesis? With regard to the latter, and being aware of the ongoing controversy and debate in the area, I would agree with Zaleznik (1977) that there are indeed differences between leaders and managers. As suggested by Northouse (2007), the study of leadership goes back millennia while the study of management can only be traced back to the early twentieth century. So, for example, Fayol (1916) characterized managers as those who plan, organize, staff and control in bureaucratic organizations. Nonetheless, the terms 'leader' and 'manager' are often used interchangeably, both in academia and in the popular press. Zaleznik (1977), however, pointed out that they describe two fundamentally different types of people. He suggested that leaders are emotionally invested, involved individuals who open the possibilities to new solutions to problems while managers remain emotionally distant and uninvolved with their staff teams while working towards solving problems in approved and sanctioned ways. Bennis and Nanus

built on that distinction, eventually coining the phrase that is most often used to differentiate between the two, "managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right things" (1985, p. 221). Perhaps the most obvious difference is that leadership has to involve other people in some way whereas one can manage without managing people, e.g., a budget. However, these differences *per se* are not the focus of this project but simply a way of singling out the type of interpersonal interaction that I wish to examine.

In terms of a review of the literature, moreover, I have focused on work that addresses the topic of 'leadership', however the respective authors define it. But my particular interest is in the way people with responsibilities for staff groups relate to those groups. I have elected to call this 'leadership' and those people 'leaders'. This process includes two dimensions, the process of leading and the end result of that process; that is, the achievement, or not, of a goal by the leader and her/his team. Thus, I see leadership as a fundamentally interpersonal process that involves persuading others towards the achievement of a goal by whatever means are deemed appropriate. Leaders are those who persuade and they lead people whom I refer to as 'team members'.

In the leadership literature, liberal feminism has had a large influence on the study of the intersection of gender and leadership. Much of this literature attempts to discover whether there are differences between women and men leaders, in an attempt to address any inequities that might result from these differences. For comprehensive reviews of this vast literature see Terborg (1977); Powell (1988; 1993); Butterfield and Grinnell (1999); Alimo-Metcalfe (2002); Alban-Metcalfe (2002). Below I briefly review this literature, using the following questions for guidance: How are women seen? How is gender seen?

How is sexuality seen? What are the goals of liberal feminism leadership writing and theorizing?

I should also state that I use the terms 'sex', 'gender' and 'sexuality' with deliberation, never assuming that they are interchangeable despite their obvious discursive connections. In order to be even more precise, I have chosen to use the following terms. For example, although at times I use the term 'sex' to indicate the physical body (female or male) that each of us inhabits, I most often use the term 'sexed body' in this regard. I also use the words 'social role' to indicate the ways in which each of us might perform femininity, masculinity or aspects of both. In a similar way, I use the word 'gender' to indicate areas of study that include discussions of the sexed body we each inhabit, and/or the social 'consequences' of that body. Thus, when I refer to literature that discusses leadership and gender, I am speaking broadly of the literature that addresses both leadership and some aspect of the way in which a person's body and/or apparently attendant characteristics, be they physical, psychological, cultural or emotional, among others, intersect with leadership. Finally, I use the term 'sexuality' to refer to a person's sexual orientation, without ascribing any *a priori* categories in this regard. For me, as for Judith Butler, sexuality/sexual orientation is an important aspect of the heterosexual matrix that both delimits and reproduces gender in the West. However, this is rarely acknowledged in the leadership literature, as we shall see.

2.2 Liberal Feminism and Leadership: anything you can do, I can do better

2.2.1 Liberal feminism and its roots

In this section I provide a brief discussion of the development of liberal feminist philosophy in the West and then examine the stream of leadership literature that falls

under the broader 'women-in-management' umbrella and shares the goals and values of

liberal feminist philosophy (Calás and Smircich, 1996). Academics and social activists

alike have been thinking and writing about feminist concerns for a long time. Indeed, one

could say that "Feminism is one of the basic movements for human liberty" (Schneir,

1992, p. xiii). It would be difficult, then, to suggest a 'beginning' for feminist philosophy

in general. And it would be both difficult and misleading to suggest that there is *one*

feminism or *one* feminist philosophy (LeGates, 2001). It is possible, however, to state

that, in an effort to understand the underpinnings of the leadership literature that addresses

gender, one should begin by examining liberal feminist writing. This is because a

substantial stream in the leadership and gender literature shares the goals, world-view and

methods of liberal feminist philosophy (Calás and Smircich, 1996).

Liberal feminism came out of the Enlightenment (LeGates, 2001, p.5). At its core

are the principles of liberal political philosophy which liberal feminism uses to argue that

women share men's capacity for reason and must therefore be allowed to develop that

capacity without constraint because of their sex (Jaggar, 1983). At the same time, liberal

feminism is a reaction against the sexism inherent in both liberal political philosophy and

classical Enlightenment doctrine. As such it shares both the liberating potential and the

restrictive limitations of Enlightenment values and liberal political philosophy. For

example, the liberal feminist goals of "creation of a society free of gender distinctions"

(LeGates, 2001, p.6) and equal access to opportunity for women as well as men (Calás and

Smircich, 1996) resulted in many policy and social changes that enabled women in the

three countries[4] (and of course elsewhere in the West) to escape the social and economic straitjackets of their counterparts in earlier generations. On the other hand, as I will discuss below, even as it works to move beyond them, at its heart liberal feminism continues to believe in the essentialism and dualism that characterize liberal political philosophy and it thus (often inadvertently) excludes many women from full participation in its own project – women who are different on the basis of race, colour, class, ethnicity, ability or sexual orientation among others.

Jaggar (1983) describes the confrontation between feudalism, with its restrictions on individuals, and capitalism, with its requirement for mobility and individual action, as the birthplace of liberal political philosophy. According to her, this struggle reached its climax in the mid 17th century with the English Civil War. She draws a parallel between "bourgeois man's revolt against the monarch's claim to absolute authority and divine right" (1983, p. 27) with women's questioning of the authority that men held over them. I discuss this further below.

Certainly, the Enlightenment changed fundamentally the way in which people in the West strove to understand the world around them. Once people stopped relying on the authority of Church or King to tell them how and why things work and accepted the legitimacy of curiosity and inquiry, their relationship both with the natural and the political order of things also changed. The scientific method (Descartes, 1637) developed as a way of finding the 'truth' regarding the natural world, involving replicable

---

[4] As I explained in chapter 1, I examine the intersection of leadership, sex, gender and sexuality by interviewing participants from three countries, Canada, the UK and the US. Thus there are many instances in this thesis where I discuss events, characteristics and histories with particular attention to those three countries. For brevity, in those instances, I refer to them simply as 'the three countries'.

experiments that relied on empirical validation instead of authoritative truth claims. Indeed important scientific discoveries that came out of such developments were and continue to be responsible for changing the way in which people lived and the conditions of their lives – e.g. Newtonian physics and Harvey's ideas on medicine among others.

As mentioned above, Jaggar (1983) traces the roots of the Enlightenment in the liberal traditions that emerged in the 17th century in many countries of Western Europe. There are differing views on when the Enlightenment started and ended: however precise beginning and end dates are not important. Indeed it is difficult to say that the Enlightenment has ended at all because we still live by Enlightenment principles to a greater or lesser extent in many parts of the world today. However, the period of *change* that is labelled the Enlightenment is generally agreed to run from somewhere in the mid-17th century to somewhere in the mid to late 18th century.

Jaggar (1983) cites three important aspects of the Enlightenment as evidence of the shift in the way humans both perceive themselves and their place in the world. First among these is the belief that humans are rational, i.e., that humans hold an innate, mental capacity for reason. She points out the importance of understanding reason as a *potential* that is realized to different degrees by different individuals. According to Locke (1690) children are like a blank slate when they are born, receiving information about the world and processing and categorizing it through their rational mind. The purpose of education, both by parents and others such as schoolteachers, is to help the child develop their mind in order that they can develop fully as a rational being. Of course, Locke was referring to the male children of upper-class gentlemen, not all children regardless of class or sex. It is important to understand the implications of this view of rationality; the capacity to reason

that makes a person a man is not tied to a male body but rather is a mental capacity

developed as he matures into a man. This is the root of the mind-body dualism that is one

of the fundamental principles of Enlightenment thought. The second key aspect of the

liberal tradition according to Jaggar is that humans exist "ontologically prior to society"

(Jaggar, 1983, p. 28) – they exist outside of any *a priori* social network. This belief leads

to an essentialist and ahistorical understanding of human beings. Thus all men are seen to

have a set of essential qualities, regardless of time or place. The third core aspect is that all

men have the capacity to be equal – i.e., all men are born with the potential to be rational.

However, although all men are born with the capacity to be equal they will express it to

different degrees. Part of the determinant of a man's rationality would be the way in

which his education enables him to develop and express it.

Certainly, there are some important implications of the above principles. The

identification of rationality as the key characteristic of humanity and its firm location in

the mind and *not* the body led to the first of a series of dualisms at the heart of liberal

philosophy, the mind/body dualism mentioned above. The essentialist understanding of

sex and gender added to this dualism aligned men/the mind/rationality firmly against

women/the body/ emotion (non-rationality).

The liberating potential of the Enlightenment was far-reaching. Simply voicing

the idea that all men have the capacity to be equal was a revolutionary change from the

past that called into question class, race and ethnic hierarchies that had been fundamental

to Western societies. However, it is clear from the writings of philosophers and

politicians at the time that this liberation from feudal systems did not affect all equally.

Certainly it was understood that the potential for rationality was best developed and

expressed only by certain men. For example, Locke wrote in the *Second Treatise of Government* (1690, Ch.2, Sec. 4) that "creatures of the same species and rank, promiscuously born to all the same advantages of nature, and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal one amongst another without subordination or subjection" but also that "a great part of mankind are, by the natural and unalterable state of things in the world, and to the Constitution of human affairs, unavoidably given over to invincible ignorance of those proofs on which others build" (Ch. 5, Sec. 36). Thus, white men of property and education (but not 'noble birth') were allowed greater participation in social, civil and legislative affairs than before. Poor men were not – and neither were women, because they were not included in the vision of rationality and reason at the core of Enlightenment and liberal values. As LeGates suggests, "Considered emotional beings, women could not fully participate in the Enlightenment which was defined as a Age of Reason, nor could they justifiably demand the same rights granted to man on the basis of his rational nature" (2001, p. 136).

In the context of this thesis, the feminist critiques of the Enlightenment and its liberal political values are therefore important because they highlight one important group that was not invited to participate in this liberation, women. Indeed, some argue that the Enlightenment, in concert with increasing industrialization, <u>reduced</u> the status of women in Western society (e.g., Tong, 1989). Before this time, so these commentators have it, women were an important part of the economic and social fabric of society. They participated in many aspects of daily life, including but not limited to agriculture, market preparation and trading, and manufacture of a variety of goods in largely rural and agricultural settings. Increasing industrialization changed the way in which many goods

were produced, taking them away from small family owned and operated concerns to larger mechanized concerns in urban areas. As well, other dualisms that were part of Enlightenment thinking such as reason/emotion, male/female and public/private created an imbalance in the way women and men participated in everyday life. Women were relegated to the private sphere, removed from economic participation in society and tied more and more tightly to the domestic arena. They were also excluded from participation in education which was, as Locke, Bentham and others had stated, the way through which the capacity for reason was developed. Women were not (thought these philosophers) born with the capacity for rationality and thus had no need to develop and express it –
a neat consequence of the essentialist dualisms I pointed out above, despite the emphasis on the <u>division</u> of mind and body. Of course, as Mary Wollstonecraft (1792) later pointed out, relegating women to the back room, as it were, and stripping them of the ability to participate fully in social and civil affairs led to particularities of behaviour that often reinforced stereotypes of the flighty, overemotional, manipulative airhead who was obsessed with fashion, gossip and attracting and retaining the attention of men. I discuss this further below.

Importantly, then, just as liberalism and the Enlightenment were beginning to change the way that men thought about the social world and their place in it, Mary Astell wrote about the way in which women were being excluded from these emancipatory efforts. Astell wrote a number of books and pamphlets mainly focused upon religion and philosophy. Those that dealt most directly with the conditions under which women lived were *Some Reflections upon Marriage (1700*) and *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, Parts I and II. Wherein a Method is offer'd for the Improvement of their Minds* (1694, 1697). Her critique, later

characteristic of liberal feminists in general, took exception with philosophers such as

Aristotle and Locke, in particular their resolve that women <u>could</u> not be rational. In

Reflections upon Marriage she asked "If all Men *are born free*, how is it that all Women

are born slaves? As they must be if the being subjected to be *inconstant, uncertain,*

unknown, arbitrary Will of Men be the perfect Condition of Slavery?" (Astell, 1700,

Preface, emphasis in the original). She continued "If God had not intended that women

shou'd use their reason, he wou'd not have given them any, for he does nothing in vain"

(p. 5). Astell's point was that liberal ideas should be applied to women as well as men and

that not doing so left women virtual prisoners of men. In *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*

she exhorts women to break out of their imprisonment:

> "Why won't you begin to think, and no longer dream away your
>
> Time in a wretched inconstancy?... Can you be in Love with
>
> servitude and folly? Can you dote on a mean, ignorant and
>
> ignoble Life? An Ingenious Woman is no prodigy to be star'd on,
>
> for you have it in your power to inform the World, that you can
>
> every one of you be so, if you please yourselves (2002 [1697], p.
>
> 120).

Astell recognized, and indeed agreed, that women's primary role lay within

marriage and the family. However, she also believed it was important for women to

educate themselves in order to reach their full potential as rational beings. This seeming

contradiction she resolved by suggesting that women could step out of society and spend

time away in reflection and academic study, and then return to regular life and become the

wives and mothers they were supposed to be. In this way, women would simply be better wives and mothers and citizens of their society.

Astell's views were therefore revolutionary in a sense but in another sense, at least by current standards, they were quite conservative. For example, she foreshadowed the writing of utilitarian philosophers when, in The Christian Religion, she wrote "upon the principles of reason, the good of many is preferable to the good of a few or of one; a lasting good is to be preferred before a temporary, the public before the private." (cited in McDonald, 1998, p. 20). The good of society (the many) required women (the few) to be good wives and mothers. Thus Astell did not advocate a change in society's familial structure or patriarchal structure. Nor did she suggest a break away from the mind-body, public-private, male-female dualisms that highlighted the liberal political philosophy of her time. Rather, she suggested simply that women could profit from liberal ideas as well as men.

Over the ensuing decades ideas proposed during the Enlightenment brought about radical changes in the political structure and civil relations of countries such as England and the United States[5]. And, while much of the 18th century also saw many reforms and changes in areas such as science and medicine, it was not witness to large advances in feminist writing and theorizing. Thus Astell's writing on women and their place in this new political, social and intellectual landscape was not immediately answered by other women writers, although her ideas added to the changing social climate. But it was not until almost a century had passed that the call for change in the situation of women was once again taken up with greater force.

---

[5] Canada did not become a country until 1867.

Mary Wollstonecraft was the first of a number of writers and philosophers of this later period to engage with the idea that women had been left out of the Enlightenment project. According to Tong (1989), her writing was a response to the way in which women were increasingly excluded from the social and economic sphere in Western Europe, primarily because of increasing industrialization as discussed above. Certainly, Wollstonecraft seems to be concerned with this issue. However, I would suggest that she is not so much focused on the fact of women's exclusion but on the place to which they were banished. Wollstonecraft, in *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792), likens bourgeois women to prisoners in a gilded cage, unproductive, vain, unhealthy and frivolous. The consequences for women are twofold: 1) unhealthy bodies because they get no exercise and are confined indoors most of the time and 2) lack of virtue because their capacity for reason is underdeveloped – indeed they are not encouraged to develop it. She agrees with Rousseau that women are superficial, but explains that this is because they are typically only praised for their appearance.

In her dedication in *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792, p.b3) Wollstonecraft writes:

> "Consider, as a legislator, whether, when men contend for their
>
> freedom and to be allowed to judge for themselves respecting their
>
> own happiness it be not inconsistent and unjust to subjugate
>
> women even though you firmly believe that you are acting in the
>
> manner best calculated to promote their happiness? Who made
>
> man the exclusive judge, if woman partake with him the gift of
>
> reason?

In this style argue tyrants of every denomination, from the weak

king to the weak father of a family; they are all eager to crush

reason, yet always assert that they usurp its throne only to be

useful. Do you not act a similar part, when you force all women by

denying them civil and political rights, to remain immured in their

families, groping in the dark."

Wollstonecraft's argument is that women and men are born with the same capacity

for reason, and that they can only achieve virtue by the exercise of that reason. She

suggests that the way men learn to do this is through education: however, women are

denied both the education and the resultant ability to exercise reason. "In fact, it is a farce

to call any being virtuous whose virtues do not result from the exercise of its own reason"

(Wollstonecraft, 1792, p.37). Rousseau made this argument about men, she says, and she

is extending it to women. Wollstonecraft addresses the sometimes problematic behaviour

of women in her society by explaining that people will seek to achieve power in whatever

ways they can and that women, who are denied men's avenues to power in that society,

find other ways. She describes this "illegitimate power which they [women] obtain, by

degrading themselves," (1792, p. 38) as a "curse" and suggests that it may be impossible

to convince women that "they must return to nature and equality" (*ibid.*) until times and

society change. Wollstonecraft addresses work by other contemporary poets and

philosophers such as Milton and Pope as she makes the following argument: men are

physically stronger and have throughout history used that strength to refigure and

configure the world such that women are said to have been created for men and should

serve them. However, because we are human, we are all capable of reason and virtue and

thus education is the key to bringing women into an equal position to men in society. If women were educated the same as men, they could be better able to contribute to society as "observant daughters" … "affectionate sisters", "faithful wives" and "reasonable mothers" (1792, p.19). Thus, Wollstonecraft echoes Astell's ideas regarding the ways in which women are oppressed by men, the effects of the limits placed upon them and the advantages of educating them in the same way that men are educated. This is not radical by today's standards but, in the context of their times, these were radical ideas indeed.

Through much of the nineteenth century, men continued to debate the relative merits of liberal political philosophy versus conservatism, while, according to LeGates (2001), women had been banished to the private realm and thus were excluded from these debates. However, within emancipatory movements such as the anti-slavery movement in the United States, women began to form all-female groups that networked with others both in the United States and the UK. Male abolitionists were often unhappy with women organizing and speaking out in public. Thus these women began to fight for their own rights at the same time as they fought to abolish slavery in the United States, since, as campaigner Abby Kelley stated, "in striving to strike irons off, we found most surely that we were manacled ourselves" (quoted in LeGates, 2001, p.184). In fact LeGates makes a clear link between the abolitionist movement in the United States and the growing women's movement, and the *Declaration of Rights and Sentiments* at the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 stated "we hold these truths to be self evident that all men and women are created equal". The similarity of the language between the US Bill of Rights and this declaration illustrates how these women saw their own emerging political rights in the context of their country – as an extension of the existing liberties already granted to white

men and an extension of the liberties they wanted to see granted to African-American men, who were mainly slaves at this time. LeGates also points out how Elizabeth Cady Stanton's writing drew parallels between a women taking a husband's name and a slave taking a master's name. These motifs link these two movements, the movement to free slaves and liberal feminism, and illustrate how they arose from similar roots, in the US at least.

Feminism, during the first half of the nineteenth century, was characterized by small groups, loosely linked and often operating independently in all three countries, as well as many countries in Europe. By the mid 1850's, however, LeGates suggests that "reformers in Europe and North America were forming more sophisticated organizations" (2001, p. 197) that have come to be referred to as the first wave of feminism.

These women's groups differed from their predecessors in that they were less interested in broader social reform (e.g. abolitionism) than they were in reforms that directly affected women, access to education, health care, marriage rights and employment. Like Astell and Wollstonecraft, by today's standards, these women can be seen as conservative because they did not challenge traditional family arrangements, for example. Nor did they challenge the private/public dualism that left women firmly ensconced in the home: they simply wanted women to have the same opportunities for self-fulfillment as men. They also failed to challenge issues of race or class, speaking for all women as though they were all white and middle-class. However, that does not mean that the first wave of feminism did not challenge systematic sexism and as a result bring about many positive changes in the lives of many women, both rich and poor.

One of the texts considered key to this emerging women's movement is John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women* (1869)*,* heavily influenced by his wife and intellectual collaborator, Harriet Taylor Mill. Mill, like Wollstonecraft more than a half century earlier, was concerned with achieving full equality in education for women. True to his liberal political philosophy, he believed that it was the only way women could achieve virtue and become full participants in political and social life. Mill begins *The Subjection of Women* by emphatically stating:

> "That the principle which regulates the existing social relations
>
> between the two sexes -- the legal subordination of one sex to the
>
> other -- is wrong itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to
>
> human improvement; and that it ought to be replaced by a
>
> principle of *perfect equality*, admitting no *power or privilege* on the one
>
> side, nor disability on the other." (1869, p.1.1, emphasis in the
>
> original).

Then he draws the parallel between the abolition of slavery and the emancipation of women. White men chose to enslave other men and over time convinced themselves this was the 'natural' order of things. The same happened with their subjugation of women, a rule of force that Mill states "has survived through generations of institutions grounded on equal justice, an almost solitary exception to the general character of their laws and customs" (p. 1.7). Mill especially critiques the way in which women were treated in marriage:

> "The law of servitude in marriage is a monstrous contradiction to
>
> all the principles of the modern world, and to all the experience

through which those principles have been slowly and painfully

worked out. It is the sole case, now that negro slavery has been

abolished, in which a human being in the plenitude of every

faculty is delivered up to the tender mercies of another human

being, in the hope forsooth that this other will use the power solely

for the good of the person subjected to it. Marriage is the only

actual bondage known to our law. There remain no legal slaves,

except the mistress of every house... " (p. 4.1).

Like Astell and Wollstonecraft, Mill addresses the roots for the behaviour that is viewed

with scorn in women at the time:

"Hence also women's passion for personal beauty, and dress and

display; and all the evils that flow from it, in the way of

mischievous luxury and social immorality. The love of power and

the love of liberty are in eternal antagonism. Where there is least

liberty, the passion for power is the most ardent and unscrupulous.

The desire of power over others can only cease to be a depraving

agency among mankind, when each of them individually is able to

do without it: which can only be where respect for liberty in the

personal concerns of each is an established principle."(p. 4.20i)

Also like Astell and Wollstonecraft, Mill does not advocate changing the structural

arrangements of society. He challenges men's need to dominate women, suggesting it

comes from a fear that women will not choose to be wives and mothers if they are given

other choices. However, he states, ultimately, women will choose to be wives and

mothers because it is in their nature: they will simply be free and thus better, happier wives and mothers if they are allowed to develop their capacity for rationality and their individual freedom.

Texts like this underpin a social movement, the aforementioned first wave of feminism that began to effect change that both reflected and affected broader social issues. For example, in 1869 Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton formed the National Women's Suffrage Association in the United States. Their goal was voting rights for women, one which was introduced to the US Congress in 1878 as the Federal Women's Suffrage Amendment, but was not passed until 1919. Stanton had been active in the women's movement in the US for a long time, having founded the Seneca Fall Convention in 1848 with Lucretia Mott. The convention produced the aforementioned *Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions*, considered "the single most important document of the nineteenth-century American women's movement (Schneier, 1994, p. 76). The declaration, as noted above, contends "that all men and women are created equal", but that "The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of men toward women, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her." Women's suffrage was achieved much later in both the UK and Canada. Women over thirty were granted the vote in 1918 in the UK, while all women were finally allowed to vote in 1928. In Canada, a number of provinces granted women the vote in 1916 (Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan) and all the rest but Quebec followed by Federal decree in 1918. Quebec did not grant women suffrage until 1940.

But the achievement of suffrage was only one in a series of changes brought about by the first wave of liberal feminism: information and access to birth control, safety in

employment and rights within marriage changed and were expanded over the ensuing decades, giving women increasing control over their bodies, their place in society and the way in which they chose to live their lives. Increasing access to education, especially the ability to earn the same qualifications as men, also enabled women to choose to live outside the private realm they had been heretofore relegated to.

Thus, during the decades following the achievement of women's suffrage at the beginning of the twentieth century, their roles outside the home expanded during the 1920s and 1930s to encompass the public world. However, the limitations of the early feminist movement, which did not examine or critique the traditional family or look at the particular problems of women marginalized by social class or colour, for example, meant that these changes were not as sweeping as they might have been. Moreover, in the public sphere, most women's jobs paid less and were less prestigious than those of their male counterparts. It would take the second wave of feminism to address any of these issues.

World War II saw many women in the three countries and elsewhere take on work outside the home as part of the war effort. They also joined the war effort as members of the military, even though in most cases they did not receive the same recognition or pay as their male counterparts[6]. At the end of the war, women were thanked for their contribution and sent back home to take on their rightful places as wives, mothers and daughters. This return to the 'traditional' family trapped many women in prescribed family roles and positions of subordination to men. In many ways, descriptions of the time have much in common with the constraints that women experienced in Wollstonecraft's time or even Astell's.

---

[6] I discuss this further in Chapter 3

In the 1960s the second wave of feminism began to revolutionize the way in which people thought about women's place in society. Many attribute the launch of this second wave to Friedan's (1963) *The Feminine Mystique*, in which she voiced her concern the persisting lack of opportunities for women to fully exploit their potential. Like Astell and Wollstonecraft before her, Friedan continued an approach that was grounded in the liberal/rational tradition. She did not suggest structural changes to society, but rather that women could have it all, husband, children, home life and career. Friedan's book was addressed to white, upper-middle class, married, heterosexual women who had been forced, upon the return of men from World War II, to return to the home and leave behind their career aspirations. Friedan challenged women to reconsider their role as helpers of their husbands and to ask themselves why they were willing to give up the freedoms they had earned during the previous three decades. She urged women to free themselves by obtaining education and using it to pursue career opportunities outside the home, asking for equal pay for equal work, to be paid the same as men when they did an equivalent job. This approach became the model for much mainstream academic research and resultant public policy and organizational attempts to rectify lack of access and opportunity in the past and/or ensure equal access and opportunity in the future.

For example, in the US, a number of bills were passed such as the Equal Pay Act (EPA) of 1963 that prescribed 'equal pay for work of equal value' and the 1964 Civil Rights Act (CRA), in particular Title VII, which prohibited discrimination on the basis of race or sex in employment. In the UK, the Equal Pay Act (EPA) (1970) and the Sex Discrimination Act (SDA) (1975) attempted to redress past discrimination and ensure

equal access to opportunity, while the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of Canada (1982)

later pursued the same goals in that country.

Thus, it is clear that, from its beginnings in the eighteenth century until the current

day, liberal feminism has worked to highlight issues of importance to women and

problematize some of the ways in which society treats women. Further, this version of

feminism uses a liberal framework to call upon its understanding of humans as rational

beings to propose and fight for equal access to opportunity so that all women may develop

their rationality. This has resulted in important legislative changes such as the SDA and

EPA in the UK, the CRA in the US and various provincial and federal acts governing

voting rights equality in employment and legislation requiring equal pay for work of equal

value in Canada.

There are, however, problems with liberal feminism that are tied to its essentialist

view of humanity. It assumes that all women are the same and that all men are the same.

It also allows us to conceive of women and men only as one or the other of the male-

female, masculine-feminine dualisms. These dualisms are part of a collection of dualisms

underlying this feminism that is closely tied to Enlightenment values. Further, liberal

feminism is heterosexist in assuming that all women will choose men for life partners, and

choose men as partners in raising children. It also assumes that all women naturally

behave in a "feminine" way while all men are more naturally "masculine". Finally, it also

assumes that rationality is something that all women could and should want to develop.

2.2.2 Liberal feminism and leadership: the women-in-management literature

Before I begin this section, I would like to address two points: What is leadership,

for the purposes of this thesis? and, Is the difference between leaders and managers

relevant to this thesis? With regards to the latter, I am aware of the debates

surrounding the nature of the difference between managers and leaders but have not

engaged with it in this thesis because it is not germane to the issues at hand. I would

agree with Zaleznik (1977) that there is, indeed, a difference between leaders and

managers. The exact nature of that difference, however, is not the focus of this project. In

terms of a review of the literature, I have focused on work that addresses the topic of

'leadership', however the respective authors define it. Perhaps the most obvious difference

between leaders and managers is that leadership has to involve other people in some way

whereas one can manage without managing people, e.g., a budget. With regard to the

concept of leadership, a working definition of leadership is useful. For the purpose of

this thesis, I used the following working definition of leadership: I am interested in

the way people with responsibilities for staff groups relate to them and I have elected

to call this 'leadership'. This process includes two dimensions, the process of leading

and the end result of that process, that is, the achievement, or not, of a goal by the

leader and her/his team.

In the leadership literature, liberal feminism has had a large influence on the study

of the intersection of gender and leadership. Much of this literature attempts to discover

whether there are differences between women and men leaders, in an attempt to address

any inequities that might result from these differences. For comprehensive reviews of this

vast literature see Terborg (1977); Powell (1988; 1993); Butterfield and Grinnell (1999);

Alimo-Metcalfe (2002); Alban-Metcalfe (2002). Below I briefly review this literature,

using the following questions for guidance: How are women seen? How is gender seen?

How is sexuality seen? What are the goals of liberal feminism leadership writing and theorizing?

The liberal feminist women-in-management literature in general focuses attention on issues that are problematic for women who are trying to 'get ahead' in organizations. In particular, this literature highlights the unequal ways in which women and men are often treated in organizations (e.g. Acker, 1990). Through its close ties to liberal feminist theory, the women-in-management literature has helped increase understanding of differential recruitment and selection of women and men (e.g. Heilman and Martell, 1986; Powell, 1987; Drentea, 1998; Chapman and Rowe, 2001; Freeman, 2003), as well the differences in benefits, salary (e.g. Cooper and Barrett, 1984; Martin and Peterson, 1987) and performance appraisal (Nieva and Gutek, 1969; Grams and Schuab, 1985; Ibarra and Shayo, 1997; Varma and Stroh, 2001). Other issues such as sexual harassment (e.g. Gutek and Morasch, 1982) discrimination (e.g. Konrad and Gutek, 1986; Paetzold and O'Leary-Kelly, 1994) and work-family balance (Norton, 1994; Duxbury, Jones and Causer, 1995) have also been addressed. In the area of leadership, this literature suggests that much of how we see successful leadership is tied to societal ideas about gender-appropriate behaviour and leadership-appropriate behaviour. It highlights the perceived link between stereotypically masculine behaviour and success in the public sphere of work, suggesting that even an increase in the proportion of women organizational leaders does not affect the perception that men make better leaders.

As Calás and Smircich assert, liberal feminist organizational research thus comprises of "Thirty [plus] years of researching that women are people too" (1996, p. 223). Certainly, the goals of this literature are to highlight that women can, if given the

same opportunities, perform as well as men inside organizations. Sex is viewed as one of two possibilities, female or male, while gender is seen as the cultural expression of sex. Both are considered in a static, to some extent immutable, way: men and women learn sex and gender appropriate behaviour through socialization, and therefore there is such a thing as typically masculine or typically feminine behaviour. There is virtually no mention of sexuality, as in sexual orientation, in this stream of research.

Principal questions that drive the women in leadership literature include: (1) Do people believe that women can lead like men? (2) Are women leaders like men leaders? and (3) Do people feel the same way about women leaders as they do about men leaders? In keeping with its ties to a liberal, rational way of approaching inquiry, much of this research comes from a positivist perspective and uses quantitative methods to incorporate sex and/or gender as a variable (Calás and Smircich, 1996).

Liberal feminist leadership research has found that, generally, people believe that successful middle managers hold "characteristics, attitudes and temperaments more commonly ascribed to men in general than to women in general" (Schein, 1973, p. 99). Schein thus infers that "all else being equal, the perceived similarity between the characteristics of successful middle managers and men in general increases the likelihood of a male rather than a female being selected for or promoted to a managerial position" (ibid.). The sample for Schein's first study consisted of 300 male middle line managers who were asked to describe the attributes of successful leaders by choosing terms from a 92-item list of descriptors. Schein (1975) replicated her study with a sample of 167 female managers two years later. Again, she found that successful leaders were seen to have stereotypically masculine characteristics such as emotional stability, steadiness, and

analytical ability for example. The implication was that women were just as likely as men to choose men to manage in organizations because they felt that men would be more successful. Schein advised as a result that "acceptance of stereotypical characteristics may be a necessity for the woman seeking to achieve in the current organizational climate" (1975, p. 343). This projected the idea that women needed to imitate men's behaviour and characteristics in order to be successful in their careers. Certainly, this coincides with a time, for example, when women were encouraged to wear a feminized version of the bow tie as part of their 'power suit' at work.

This study, and many others that followed, effectively encouraged women to behave more like men in order to have access to better organizational opportunities with the underpinning assumption that they both could and should do this. For example, Powell and Butterfield (1979) used the Bem Sex Role Inventory to examine how business students perceived good managers. Their results confirmed Schein's findings that a good manager was perceived as having stereotypically masculine characteristics. Their initial hypothesis had been that students would perceive androgynous managers as good managers, due in part to the increasing proportion of women in managerial roles. However, Powell and Butterfield found little change in the expectations of good managers in their sample. Similarly, a study by Schneier and Bartol (1980) found that, although there was no difference in performance of groups led by female or male emergent leaders, perceptions regarding the correlation between masculine traits and successful leadership persisted. In a follow-up study ten years later, in which Powell and Butterfield again asked business students to describe successful leaders, masculine traits continued to be viewed as associated with good leaders (Powell and Butterfield, 1989).

Indeed, more recent work in the women-in-management stream continues to ask the same questions and use the same methods to seemingly achieve very little new insight. For example, Heilman and Martell (1989) replicated Schein's studies and found that men were still perceived to be more successful as leaders. In another study Powell, et al. (2002) again asked undergraduate and graduate students about the characteristics required to be a good manager. They compared their answers to previous studies and concluded that, while both male and female students still associated masculine characteristics with successful managers, this was less the case than for previous groups.

Similarly, Scott and Brown (2006) examined gender bias in the perception of leadership by asking 192 undergraduate students to encode behaviour of leaders. They found that students had difficulty encoding behaviour as agentic when a female leader exhibited it. Equally, they found that leadership behaviour was more easily encoded as agentic when exhibited by a male leader. Overall, these studies continue to repeat methods and concepts to ask the same questions as those from thirty years earlier.

Interestingly, there is another set of studies that concludes that there is in reality no difference between the way that women lead and the way that men lead. For example, Bartol (1978) found no differences in the leadership style of women and men, whether their style was self-described or as it was perceived by their followers. Butterfield and Powell (1981) found that "it is now commonly believed that actual differences in the behaviour of real leaders [due to sex] are virtually non-existent" (p. 130). Bayes (1987), in a study of female and male managers in public administration, found that women do not manage in a different style from men, and that, indeed, there is much variability in the

way that both women and men manage others. Later studies, for example Powell (1988) and Kovalainen (1990) came to the same conclusion.

The problems with this stream of the leadership literature are threefold. First, as described in many of the studies discussed above, it does not take into account individual differences between women and between men. Second, it measures women against a male standard, either by using instruments that were developed by males using male subjects, or by comparing women to men instead of simply studying them on their own. Third, studies often use stereotypes of feminine and masculine behaviour as a way of understanding differences between women and men, without addressing the fact that only a percentage of women and men conform to such stereotypes. Thus, there is no way to assess the leadership of people who do not fit into stereotypes, nor is there a way to differentiate between respondents' stereotypical beliefs. In the next section I examine the other major stream of literature on leadership and gender, the 'women's ways' literature and its ties to psychoanalytic feminism[7].

2.3 Psychoanalytic Feminism and Leadership: there is nothing like a dame

The women's ways literature is diametrically opposed to the women in management literature in one key way: rather than trying to show that women can be just as good as men if they have equal access to opportunity, it emphasizes women's differences from men and attempts to demonstrate the valuable contribution that such a

---

[7] This section, while discussing the roots of psychoanalytic feminism and its ties to psychoanalysis, does not go into as much detail or historical background as its counterpart in section 2.2.1 which discusses liberal feminism and its roots. This is due both to its briefer and more direct development from Freud and to the much more primary role that liberal feminism played and continues to play in the public imagination and in leadership studies more specifically.

difference can make, especially to organizational success. This approach is linked to cultural feminism[8] in general, and psychoanalytic feminism in particular. In this section, I briefly discuss the psychoanalytic theoretical roots of psychoanalytic feminism and then link it to the women's ways leadership literature.

2.3.1 Psychoanalytic feminism and its roots

Psychoanalytic feminism has its roots in the psychoanalytic theory developed by Freud (1930; 1935).[9] Freud postulated that girls and boys go through four discrete stages of psychosexual development as they mature. Each stage is driven by a need for a particular type of sexual gratification. Most people successfully pass through each stage and become 'normal', appropriate women and men. If, however, development is arrested at one of these stages, the person will exhibit 'abnormal' behaviour in adulthood. Arrested development is usually caused by either too much or too little gratification at a particular stage.

The most critical passage is the resolution of the phallic stage during which the child faces the Oedipal/Electra conflict. It is in this stage that adolescent children resolve their feelings towards their mothers and fathers. Boys face the Oedipal conflict in which they become jealous of their father, especially the attention that their father garners from their mother. They are afraid that their father will discover these feelings and castrate

---

[8] Cultural feminism in this case refers to a number of strands of feminism such as ecofeminism, radical feminism and psychoanalytic feminism. For Alcoff (1988), these are all linked by "their tendency toward invoking universalizing conceptions of woman and mother in an essentialist way" (p. 413).

[9] Of course, psychoanalytic theory has a number of streams within it. However, Tong (1989) notes that most psychoanalytic feminist theory plays off Freud's work in this area, either as a basis for critique or a basis for feminist refigurations. Thus, I exclude discussions of other psychoanalytic theorists such as Lacan and Klein simply to keep the focus on the most direct roots of the women's ways leadership literature.

them. Successful resolution of this stage results in boys identifying with their fathers. For girls, the Electra conflict comes from penis envy and anger at their mother for not giving them a penis. Successful resolution also results in identification with the same sex parent.

Biological determinism underlies Freud's work in this area such that a child's biological sex will, in 'normal' circumstances, inevitably lead to a particular gender and sexuality. All boys will identify with their fathers, all girls with their mothers. Moreover, poor resolution of this conflict will result in 'deviant' sexual behaviour such as homosexuality, according to Freud. This is clearly an essentialist understanding of sex, gender and sexuality that takes the male as the standard – women are missing something that men have and that they want, a penis.

Psychoanalytic feminists thus reconfigure Freud. The focus is still on psychosexual development. However, instead of comparing women to the male standard and effectively deeming them to 'deviate' from it, the emphasis is on highlighting the unique ways in which women develop and behave. For example, an early and classic argument in this view is offered by Dinnerstein (1975), who suggests that children's first relationship with the outside world is with their mother, who becomes a symbol of both the pleasure and the pain of this uncontrollable environment. A child develops ambivalent feelings about their mother, never sure whether she will fulfill their needs. Boys will seek to control this force on which they refuse to become dependent, while girls, fearing this power within themselves, seek a male to control them. Dinnerstein also ties this scenario to men's sexual possessiveness and women's link to emotional commitments. For Dinnerstein, the gender arrangements that typically characterize parenting lead to the perception of women as the cause of pain and trouble for children. She proposes dual

parenting as a way of changing this developmental connection between the mother as the source of pain and pleasure and the rejection of the female by men.

Chodorow (1978), in another classic psychoanalytic feminist work, provides a critique of Freud that focuses on the pre-Oedipal stage, in which boys realize that they are different from their mother while girls identify with her. As they move into the Oedipal stage, boys begin to identify with their fathers, turning away from their mothers. Girls' connection to their mother is weakened because they begin to desire what their fathers have, i.e., autonomy and the ability to sexually satisfy a woman, but they are never able to completely sever their connection from their mothers because of the intense reciprocal bond between them. These differing resolutions of the Oedipal stage have different outcomes for boys, whose inability to relate deeply to others makes them ideally suited for the public domain, and girls, whose connectedness to their mother enables them to form stronger connections and relationships with others in the private sphere. On the other hand, women will find it difficult to negotiate the public world of work because they identify more as part of a set of connections than as individuals. Thus, the primary difference between the psychoanalytic feminists and Freud is that the latter saw biology as determining psychic outcome whereas the psychoanalytic feminists see it as rooted in one's psyche, psychological and sexual development and in the societal/familial arrangements within which that development takes place. Psychoanalytic feminists believe that a change in these arrangements would make it possible to have less unequal gender development (Calás and Smircich, 1996).

Gilligan's (1977; 1982) critique of Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development is another early exemplar of the feminist psychoanalytic approach. Much of the

leadership work that is based on psychoanalytic approaches mirrors her work, in the sense that it focuses on valorizing the feminine as different <u>and</u> worthy on its own merit rather than in relation to the masculine. Troubled by the contention that women rarely achieved the same level of moral development on Kohlberg's scale as men, Gilligan had set out to understand women's morality from their own point of view. She studied 29 women who were referred by abortion and pregnancy counselling services in order to "identify in the feminine experience and construction of social reality a distinctive voice, recognizable in the different perspective it brings to bear on the resolution of moral problems" (1977, p. 482). She found that women had developed their own

> "Moral imperative … an injunction to care, a responsibility to
>
> discern and alleviate the 'real and recognizable trouble' of this
>
> world. For the men Kohlberg studied, the moral imperative
>
> appeared rather as an injunction to respect the rights of others and
>
> thus to protect from the interference the right to life and self-
>
> fulfillment" (1977, p. 512).

Gilligan argued that women are not less morally developed than men, merely <u>different</u> from them. Further, she argued that women's strong attachments to others cause them to be more interested in the welfare of those around them than in their own. Interestingly, Gilligan and Antonucci (1988) assert that neither the ethics of 'care' nor Kohlberg's 'justice' is superior to the other: they are complementary. The goal of feminist psychoanalytic theorists such as Gilligan is not only to highlight the differences between women and men like Dinnerstein and Chodorow but also the differential values that are placed on masculine and feminine behaviours, attitudes and so on, and the

implications of this differential valuation, especially for women. Much of this research

also emphasizes that women's ways of doing things are not just different, not just as good

as men's, they are better.

Similar to the liberal feminist approach, psychoanalytic approaches make claims

about women and men based on an essentialist understanding of gender. The only place

for women (and men) who do not fit this essentialist mould is in the category of "deviant".

The effect of this essentialism is evidenced in studies like Gilligan's, which do not

examine the differences between the women subjects. Gilligan's ethics of care is built

upon research that continues to stereotype women, and men, forcing them, once more, into

male/masculine-female/feminine dualisms.

2.3.2 Psychoanalytic feminism and leadership: the women's ways literature

Psychoanalytic feminist research in leadership builds on Gilligan's work by

embracing women's differences and exhorting them to use those differences to the benefit

of their careers and their organizations. Some, especially earlier, incarnations of this work

looks for evidence of unusual psychosexual development in women leaders who have

achieved managerial success. These are considered 'classic' readings in this approach and

adhere closely to their psychoanalytic roots. For example, Hennig and Jardim (1977)

studied twenty-five women executives, focusing on their developmental experiences.

They found that these successful women had resolved the Oedipal Stage differently.

While "normal" women are weak and passive, these women identified more with their

fathers than their mothers, and therefore were better suited to operate in the business

arena. This identification was more in line with male psychosexual development.

Helgesen's (1990) study of five prominent women executives revealed the same father-identification.   Helgesen followed, observed and interviewed these successful female executives in an attempt to understand the way they developed and enacted their leadership. She identified what she perceived to be 'the female advantage', a phrase that has become an important signifier of the psychoanalytic feminist approach to leadership. Helgesen found that these women operated according to a number of key "feminine principles" that include caring, intuitive decision-making and a non-hierarchical approach to organization and leadership. She coined another important term, the 'web of inclusion', when describing women's leadership: according to Helgesen women lead from the centre of a network or web or relationships while men lead from the top of a hierarchy.

Like Helgesen's, other studies focus more on the ways in which women lead differently than men, and often attempt to argue for the value of those differences. Some work in this stream includes Grant (1988), who identifies the areas in which women offer unique attributes: communication and cooperation, affiliation and attachment, power (the kind that is giving and caring and offers nurturance and strength, as opposed to male power which is assertive and aggressive) and a physicality that "grounds women in the day-to-day realities of growth and development." (p. 61). She accepts that these are not attributes that contribute to organizational success "as it is currently defined in male-dominated hierarchical organizations" (1988, p.56). Grant does, however, show the value of these attributes in making organizations happier and healthier. Nevertheless, by highlighting women's unique attributes and then suggesting that they can play only supportive roles in organizational life, Grant effectively relegates women to second-best status.

Rosener (1990), on the other hand, in her classic article "Ways Women Lead", discusses the results of interviews with female and male executives that attempted to examine similarities and differences in the situations of executives of both sexes. She found that women lead in a more 'interactive' style while men prefer a 'command and control style'. Rosener states that her women respondents preferred to share power and information, and were more likely to use transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1975) to encourage employees to align the organization's goals with their own and to enhance employees' feelings of self-worth.

According to Rosener, this leadership style came 'naturally' to her female respondents because of their socialization and career paths. Experience, she claims, teaches women that they need to be "cooperative, supportive, understanding, gentle and provide service to others" (1990, p. 124). They get their "satisfaction and sense of self-esteem" (ibid.) from helping others, she argues. Thus, in many areas of their lives including work, women have not had access to power and have had to learn other ways to get things done: "women leaders don't covet formal authority, they have learned to lead without it" (1990, p. 125). In the past, women tended to have jobs rather than careers, staff versus line positions and to focus on areas such as communication and human resources that took advantage of their 'interactive' skills. Rosener asserts that, while much of that is no longer true and women have formal authority, careers and work in many areas of organizations, they still see their earlier ways of leading as advantageous. Importantly, she suggests that this style of leading is advantageous in fast-paced changing environments, especially with a workforce that is becoming more educated and professionalized and thus seeks to play a greater role in organizational decision-making.

Indeed, Rosener cautions that interactive leadership must not be seen as exclusively

feminine, lest it be marginalized. She suggests that, while it seems women have been

socialized into this way of leading, it would also be useful for men to learn to lead this

way. Interestingly, and in a change from their 1977 paper discussed earlier, Hennig and

Jardim (1997) also illustrated that the women executives in their study saw themselves as

part of a network, rather than as lone leaders.

In her more recent work, Rosener (1997) asserts that using women's special talents

will lead to increased productivity and innovation, and therefore greater profitability, for

organizations. She sees the "underutilization of women's leadership attributes" (p.6) as an

economic rather than a human resources problem. While she admits, in an apparent

change from her earlier work, that not all women are the same nor all men, she still

believes that "women and men do indeed tend to differ from the ways they think and act"

(p.10).   In order to explain the underutilization of women in leadership positions,

especially at the top of organizations, Rosener invokes what she calls the paradox of

gender: when feminine attributes are devalued in a situation, gender is seen as relevant;

when they are valued, e.g. interactive leadership, gender is seen as irrelevant. Thus she

explains that, even though organizations now understand that interactive leadership is an

important component of success, they still do not turn to women to lead them.

The women's ways approach, as established most prominently by Rosener,

continues to generate discussion both inside and outside academia. For example, Book

(2000) interviewed 14 successful women CEO's, researching their background,

upbringing, social and professional lives in order to discover the secrets of their success.

She concluded that all 14 leaders exhibited a set of uniquely female abilities that were

responsible for their rise to the top. Her prescription for successful leadership is for others

to learn to lead with these female abilities. It is interesting to note that proponents of the

women's ways approach like Rosener, Helgesen, and Book are generally very careful to

differentiate between female and feminine characteristics, in order to prevent the

marginalization of the feminine that they perceive to exist within our post-Enlightenment

dualist world that valorizes the masculine over the feminine. I believe they are trying to

distance women from the feminine, yet the essentialist underpinnings of psychoanalytical

and cultural feminism seem to make that a very difficult thing to achieve.

Relatedly, Eagly and Carli (2003) point out that the women's ways approach has

made the jump away from feminist scholarship to the mainstream. They evaluated the

evidence both for and against the 'female advantage' theory by conducting a meta analysis

of a number of meta analyses of studies comparing female and male leaders, and

attempting to ascertain whether or not there is such a thing as the female advantage. They

point out that, in contrast to both academic (e.g. Rosener, 1990; Helgesen, 1990) and

popular (Sharpe, 2000; Heffernann, 2002) accounts, some previous academic studies had

concluded that there was no relation between gender and leader effectiveness. Eagly and

Carli suggest, however, that the situation is more complex than a simple yes or no and use

their meta analysis to confirm this. They found that women are at both an advantage and a

disadvantage when it comes to leadership. They claim that women do tend to exhibit

more transformational leadership behaviour than men. This, according to Eagly and Carli,

is a good thing for two reasons. First, akin to Rosener's conclusions, transformational

leadership is an effective style, well suited to today's workforce and environment.

Second, it is a style that is seen as gender-appropriate for women, and thus, for women to

lead in a way that comes naturally to them and is also perceived as more effective could

create an advantageous situation for them. On the other hand, Eagly and Carli point out

that women are still at a disadvantage because effective leadership is itself perceived to be

related to more masculine attributes. Eagly and Carli do note that women have changed

over time to take on more stereotypically masculine (what they call 'agentic')

characteristics, while retaining their femininity. At the same time, they suggest that

leadership roles have also changed, being perceived as less stereotypically masculine (see

Diekman and Eagly, 2000).[10] Thus the female advantage issue continues to be complex as

both gender and leadership roles shift and change. In a more recent study Eagly (2007)

has confirmed the mix of advantage and disadvantage for women leaders.

An apparent critique of the 'women's ways' approach is offered by Fletcher (1994;

1998) who suggests that this approach actually jeopardizes women's contributions to

organizational life by devaluing their unique attributes. However, Fletcher insists on the

differences between women and men, and proposes that the women's ways approach does

not go far enough towards unleashing their potential. Fletcher suggests that "a fully

empowered representation of feminine strengths will recapture what has been silenced in

the female advantage" (1994, p.80). She also discusses relational practice, which involves

using feminine strengths such as vulnerability, empathy, and emotionality relationally.

She suggests that this practice will allow the outcomes of these interactions by women to

influence instrumental organizational decisions, and permit women's voices to be heard

within the organizational culture. In her later work, Fletcher (1998) argues that scholars

have tended to exacerbate female advantage because heroic, masculine leadership is still

---

[10] In chapter 3, I discuss the literature on gender stereotypes and perceived leadership
effectiveness.

in the ascendant. She also argues that because we still tend to see 'women's ways' as natural women are not rewarded for transformational leadership – but if men deploy it the reverse is true.

In summary, the psychoanalytic feminist stream of leadership research achieved two objectives. First, it highlights the accomplishments of many women leaders, and thus gives women organizational visibility and role models. Next, it emphasizes the value of certain types of 'female' behaviours such as empathy and collaboration, and how they can be utilized in the organizational as well as the private sphere. Even though, as I pointed out earlier, many theorists have called them 'female' as opposed to 'feminine' behaviours, there nevertheless seems to be a link to the feminine that continues to risk these behaviours being discounted or, at the very least, marginalized. These psychoanalytic approaches also run the risk of further marginalizing "feminine" work by imprisoning it within a predetermined role of supportive mentor instead of action-oriented leader. Furthermore, they usually focus on the achievements of upper-middle class, heterosexual, white women and postulate that their experiences speak for all women. Just like liberal feminists, psychoanalytical feminists are essentialists who see all women (and men) as the same. The difference is that they see gender as evolving from early socialization with one 'normal' psychosexual development shared by all women and by all men while liberal feminists see it as innate. Again, they also pay virtually no attention to sexual orientation.

The two approaches examined above have served to problematize and highlight the role of gender in the theory and, to various degrees, the practice of leadership. They have rendered visible women leaders. They have affected laws and policies aimed at reducing the inequity that women face in the workforce, especially liberal feminism. They have

pushed forward discussion of issues that more often affect women's lives due to the gendered division of labour in organizations and in society in general. They have also highlighted how our own writing and thinking about organizations, leadership and gender affect each of these in turn.

However, it is a virtual truism to suggest that women still face problems in the workplace that have as their origin women's gendered identities. They cannot serve in certain professions or in certain arenas (see Chapter 2). They are still valued less than men in many ways even though there are laws in place that mandate equal treatment (e.g. SDA, Title VII). They are still expected to separate their private from their public lives, even though women tend to bear the greater part of the care-giving burden in their households. Yet they are still judged by the same standards as their male counterparts. Young women in the workforce have more role models, more mentors available to them than in the past, but they are still trying to understand how they can be good leaders as well as good people in all aspects of their lives. For all these reasons, the intersection of gender and leadership continues to be an important area of study. Yet, after several decades of studying the way that leadership and gender intersect, we are still saying the same things over and over again: women can lead like men, or women can lead better/or differently than men. Studies from the 1970s such as Schein (1973) and Loden (1975) are separated from current studies such as Eagly (2007) by time but not by any particular leap in insight or understanding. While different streams of this literature have included different critiques of particular papers and different methods or approaches, there has been little work that has addressed the basic and shared problem that the gender and leadership literature is really quite moribund and has not said anything new for years. This has been

repeatedly pointed out and discussed in a series of papers by Calás and Smircich over the last two decades (Calás and Smircich, 1988, 1991, 1992, 1992a, 1996, 2003, 2006) that addresses both organization studies in general and leadership in particular. I discuss the evolution of this critique in the next section.

2.4 Taking stock: what is wrong with this picture?

In sections 2.2 and 2.3 I discussed the evolution of the women in management literature and the women's ways literature, particularly as they have developed in leadership studies. I pointed out the achievements of as well as the problematic aspects in these literatures. While each of these literatures contains papers that purport to critique what has gone before, that critique is limited by its location within the essentialist, dualist paradigms that characterize the underlying philosophical approaches of those literatures. Very little has been written to address the broader limitations of these approaches and the implications for leadership – both the academic field and the practice. A notable exception is a series of articles by Linda Calás and Marta Smircich that repeatedly outline the deficiencies in this literature, and call for change in order to move it out of its torpor. Calás and Smircich began this call for change more than twenty years ago: "We propose rather than going forward with more horses and more men (a technical solution to more of the same), that we not go forward at all, but that we stop – to give attention to what it is that we are doing, how we are doing it, and why" (1988, p. 202). They continue to explain that:

> "the phenomenon of leadership as demonstrated by human
>
> beings in organizations cannot be understood in isolation
>
> from the discursive practices which are present and possible

at any given time in a culture, because practices of writing

and talking leadership 'make' leadership as much as those

who 'do' leadership" (p. 203).

Calás and Smircich's article is an early attempt to deploy linguistic approaches in order to understand the way in which we talk about leadership, how that is culturally bound and how this both defines and delimits what leadership is and can be.

In their 1991 article "Voicing Seduction to Silence Leadership", arguably their best known and most contentious piece of scholarship, Calás and Smircich provide a deconstructive reading of four classic managerial texts as a way of highlighting the underlying sexism of the leadership literature. It is perhaps here where they start to foreground the gender-leadership intersection most explicitly. This paper has at times been described as inspiring and revolutionary and at other times been accused of being overly complex and inaccessible. It generated a strong response from Mintzberg, who was the author of one of the texts being deconstructed, and who took exception to the characterization of leadership as a game of seduction. However, what is important to me is not necessarily the specific deconstruction that Calás and Smircich present but rather their message that we need to look at the discursive practices and hidden meanings in our theorizing of leadership and how they constrain this field. This article was followed by a number of papers that made the same argument about organization studies in general (see for example, Calás and Smircich, 1992, 1996, 1999, 2003, 2006) and some of which were more specifically related to leadership (Calás and Smircich, 1992a; Calás, 1993).

Rather than provide a description of each of these later papers, I would like to discuss the important points that they make. First, Calás and Smircich make the point that

organization studies is gendered (as male) and it is important to uncover that gendering (Calás and Smircich, 1992, 1992a). Second, they suggest that there are problems with the way that different feminisms attempt to deal with this gendering. In particular, they suggest that the women-in-management literature doesn't question the production of knowledge (1992a), and thus fails to highlight the problems associated with essentialist understandings of gender. That is, Calás and Smircich suggest that a key question that feminist must ask is "How is organizational theorizing (male) gendered, and with what consequences?" (1992a, p.230). In answer to this question, they offer a number of reflections. They point, for example, to the way in which non-traditional (feminist) epistemologies are tied to non-feminist traditional ones, either because they are revised versions thereof (as in liberal and indeed psychoanalytic feminism) or simply because of the need to defend their use. Calás and Smircich further point out that, even when feminists use non-traditional methods they are often critiqued if they question apparently fundamental concepts such as objectivity. Finally, they note that knowledge is produced within an academy and therefore they ask "Isn't 'doing knowledge' part and parcel of the reproduction of patriarchal conditions of power/knowledge" (1992a, p.239). In this way, for example, the women in management literature takes for granted categories like men, women, sex and gender without understanding where they came from and without exploring alternatives.

Calás (1993) also points out the potentially problematic issue of the women's ways literature running the risk of being devalued in the same way that the feminine is often devalued in mainstream Western culture. Additionally, Calás and Smircich (1996, 2006) describe how different feminisms have addressed different issues of gender within

management and organization studies. In general Calás and Smircich position

poststructuralist and, to a lesser extent, postmodernist feminisms against both the women

in management and the psychoanalytic approaches I have discussed above (Calás and

Smircich, 1992, 1992a). They offer poststructuralist feminism as a way of moving

leadership literature in particular out of its moribund state. Taken together, these papers

constitute an important critique. In particular, they point out the problems inherent in not

clarifying ontological and epistemological positions in this literature – and its feminist

'tracks' in particular. However, by 2006 Calás and Smircich are still talking about these

problems but they have not actually moved the gender and leadership literature forward

themselves – nor, it seems, has anyone else.

To do so, and following their suggestions, I propose a return to feminist

philosophy to see whether there are new insights or approaches that may help to address

the problems highlighted thus far in this chapter. These are the limits imposed by

essentialist understandings of sex and gender that result in rigid dualisms and binary

oppositions such as male/masculine/mind/reason versus female/feminine/body/emotion,

and that map onto leadership as male/masculine/task-oriented/transactional/agentic versus

female/feminine/relational/transformational/interactive. Other problems include the

failure of the leadership literature to address differences between women and between

men, and also a failure to address sexual orientation. Finally, these problems include a

continual repetition of the same concepts and methods without examining their

ontological and epistemological underpinnings. Equally, the feminist leadership literature

does not examine the ways in which theories from other areas and disciplines might

enable leadership studies, and thereby, in Calás and Smircich's terms, the 'doing' of

leadership, to grow beyond current constraints and become more relevant to a greater range of people. Indeed, Calás and Smircich (1988) assert that academics talk to each other about leadership without examining exactly what they are saying and what it could mean to those who live and lead outside academia. In the next section, I discuss the ways in which the work of Butler (1988, 1990, 1993), drawing on Foucault (1978, 1988) with elements of Haraway (1995), can help us to address these issues.

2.5 Queering leadership theory: Who are you?

In this section, I discuss how the ideas of Judith Butler, and in particular the heterosexual matrix and performativity of gender, can be used to address some of the problematic aspects of the gender and leadership literature discussed in the previous sections. In doing this, I am attempting to 'queer' leadership theory in two senses of the word. First, in the sense that queer has come to mean multiple or fluid gender or sexual identity, I attempt to move leadership theory beyond the bipolarities and dualisms that constrain it. Thus, I wish to open up leadership so that it may speak to and about people of varying sexed bodies, social roles and sexualities. The second sense in which I use queer in the heading of this section is one that Martin Parker (2002) discusses in his article on queering management theory. Parker was not necessarily advocating the deployment of queer <u>theory</u> in management studies in that article. Rather, he suggested that perhaps the objective should be to queer or 'mess with' management studies, i.e. to turn it inside out and shake it up, and that is one of the purposes of this thesis – as regards leadership studies in partricular.

Thus, to reiterate, the previous discussions in this chapter have highlighted a number of questions: (1) is there an essential sexed and/or gendered self? (2) if so, are all

women the same and are all men the same? (3) if not, what are women? and (4) where is sexuality in all this? Certainly, one of the debates in feminist philosophy that speak to these questions is the one centred around women's subjectivity. While many theorists have tackled these issues, their questions have been the same: (1) is there a 'sex' that comes before 'gender'? (2) if so, what does this imply? (3) in particular, can 'gender' as a cultural accommodation be separate from the idea of essential, binary, biological 'sex'? (4) but, without 'sex', how can feminist work and writing continue? (5) and, with 'sex', how can we talk about 'gender' in a meaningful way?

In their aforementioned critique, Calás and Smircich propose the possibility that a poststructuralist approach may offer a way out of the quagmire in which leadership studies finds itself. I see two potential problems with this. Poststructuralist approaches that focus on language and texts may indeed help us to understand how discursive practices shape understandings of leadership. However, they also edge us toward a position where 'woman' (or indeed, related concepts like 'heterosexuality' or 'feminine') may become unintelligible, so fragmented and contested that it speaks about and to no one. Additionally, while these approaches may be useful in *de*constructing leadership, they have yet to offer ways of *re*constructing it.

Thus, on the one hand, there is a set of debates that try to nail down quite specifically what 'woman', 'sex' and 'gender' mean and, on the other hand, debates as to whether these exist in any material or realist sense or are discursive constructions. Alcoff discusses the ways in which the concept 'woman' is a problem for feminist inquiry. She cites, on the one hand, its centrality to feminist inquiry, and on the other hand, its problematic nature because knowledge of and about woman is derived from and within a

discourse "contaminated with misogyny and sexism" (1988, p.405). Alcoff examines two responses to this problem, cultural feminism and poststructuralism, yet finds them both equally problematic. She cites the "tendency to offer an essentialist response to misogyny and sexism through adopting a homogenous, unproblematized and ahistorical concept of woman" (p. 413) as the flaw within a cultural feminist approach (which includes psychoanalytic feminism, as we have seen). On the other hand, she finds equally untenable the continuous deconstruction of the category 'woman' by poststructuralists. For Alcoff, the former position limits women by tying them to their biology while the latter fails to give women a position from which to challenge the misogynist and sexist discourse that created their identity. She proposes that the concept of positionality, combined with identity politics, might offer a way out of this impasse. She maintains that: "through a conception of subjectivity as an emergent property of a historicized experience, we can say 'feminine subjectivity is construed here and now in such and such a way' without this ever entailing a universalizable maxim about the 'feminine'" (p. 431).

Alcoff explains positionality as the "external context within which that person is situated" (p. 43), likening it to the position of a pawn on a chessboard – relatively safe or in danger not just because of its ascribed characteristics (e.g. it can only move one square forward) but because of its position relative to the other chess pieces. Thus, according to Alcoff, woman can be defined "relative to a constantly shifting context, to a situation that includes a network of elements involving others, the objective economic conditions, cultural and political institutions and ideologies and so on" (p.43). She continues to explain that this would allow the argument that women's "position within the network lacks power and mobility and requires radical change" (p.434).

Alcoff goes on to suggest that we can combine positionality with identity politics, that is introduce identity as a factor in any analysis, and thus

"retain our political ability to take gender as an important point of

departure. Thus we can say at one and the same time that gender is

not natural and biological, universal, ahistorical or essential and yet

still claim that gender is relevant because we are taking gender as a

position from which to act politically" (p. 433).

One of the key results for Alcoff is that this conceptualization of woman's identity allows her to become a subject who is part of a shifting and cultural context and who can construct meaning as opposed to being a (discoverable) object of inquiry.

Alcoff's article articulated the dualist nature of feminist inquiry at the time. She attempted to offer a way to overcome the limitations imposed by a biological essentialism on one hand and the undecidability of woman on the other. She offers the possibility of combining a woman's material body with her cultural and social experience in a specific, historically contextualized way. Thus, Alcoff allows us to ground attempts at understanding others in our and their bodies as they exist within a framework of discursive possibilities available in whatever time and place we exist.

 However, while Alcoff's proposition deals with the issues that she raises to a certain extent, it still leaves some unanswered questions. There is still a concern that there is an essential woman that underlies her point of view, even if we take into account culture and history. That is, are all women in 21st century Western countries the same? All white women? All lesbians? All working class women? Or can only women of identical positions speak to and about each other? Thus, can only women from the same socio-

historical context speak to and about each other? Or are there some essential

characteristics that allow all women to speak to and about each other? There seems to be

either too much or too little breakdown of identity. In either case, if we return to Calás

and Smirich's critique we must ask whether all feminist work, even if reconfigured

through Alcoff, continues to be marginalized because of the devaluation of the feminine?

Finally, Alcoff's solution does not address the implications of continuing to operate

within the male/masculine vs. female/feminine dualism. As Brewis et al. (1997, p. 1282)

point out, "This 'binariness' of gender presents a particular problem for women, because

dichotomies such as this inevitably create privilege." They continue, "Thus, masculine

(public/political/economic) becomes superior to/prioritized over feminine

(private/domestic)" (*ibid.*).

The problem is compound: we assume that gender binaries of male/masculine vs.

female/feminine are 'natural' and we also value each pole differently, equating

maleness/masculinity with strength and femaleness/femininity with weakness. As a result,

work by women for women and about women is often deemed less valuable and less

worthy than its 'objective or masculine counterparts'. In order to explore further how we

may overcome these issues, I use the work of Judith Butler and Donna Haraway.

These two theorists approach the issue of gender identity from seemingly opposite

directions. In *A Manifesto for Cyborgs* (1991) Haraway focuses on the body as the

metaphorical site of resistance to heteronormative binary imperatives while Butler, in

Gender Trouble (1990) focuses on the ways in which we perform gender and how that can

lead to resistance. They share, however, an understanding of gender as a discursive

construction and it is on this understanding that I will build my argument. Specifically, I

focus on seeing gender as manufactured as opposed to innate and also on the idea that the heteronormativity of mainstream western culture should and can be subverted.

Haraway is a feminist who writes a great deal about science, nature, animals, humans, technology and their interrelating. I will not discuss all of her work, but instead limit myself to two of her articles that speak directly to the issues at hand. More specifically, I discuss *A Manifesto for Cyborgs* (1991) in order to explore the cyborg metaphor and all its possibilities and Situated Knowledges (1988) to examine the partiality of knowledge at the border and binary classifications as products of Foucault's (1988) technologies of the self rather than *a priori* categories of existence. Where Haraway, in these articles, is speaking explicitly about information technology and the boundary between the organic world and the technological one, I push that a bit further to suggest that we can also look at the boundary between the organic world and the technologies of the self.

Haraway's *A Manifesto for Cyborgs* is "an argument for pleasure in the confusion of boundaries and for responsibility in their construction" (1991, p. 149). Haraway addresses some of the debates in feminism prevalent at the time, especially those that address the way that women see and are seen in the world. She touches on the feminist debate over the concept of woman by problematizing the essentialist positions of both liberal feminism and psychoanalytic feminism: "there is nothing about being 'female' that naturally binds women. There is not even such a state as 'being' female, itself a highly complex category constructed in contested sexual scientific discourses and other social practices" (1991, p. 155). Haraway further highlights the way in which "gender, race or class consciousness is an achievement forced on us by the terrible historical experience of

the contradictory social realities of patriarchy, colonialism and capitalism" (*ibid*.).

According to Haraway, the crisis in feminism (as also articulated by Alcoff three years

previously) comes from an attempt to either fracture identity endlessly or to find some

essential unity that can replace those that have come before. Haraway raises the same

objections to liberal feminism discussed earlier in this chapter. She also problematizes

psychoanalytic approaches because of their reliance on traditional family structures and

the positioning of woman as Other in order to make their arguments.

Haraway develops the concept of the cyborg as a figure at the border - the border

between organism and machine, between nature and technology. Her cyborg is "a creature

of social reality as well as a creature of fiction" (1991, p.149) where social reality is the

world of lived relations that becomes its own world-changing fiction. By this, she refers

to the way that women's social reality is constituted of fictions regarding who they are,

what the world is and what science is, all of which are caught in a circular relationship so

that the fiction that constructs the world women inhabit affects the fiction of what it is to

be a woman and so on.

Cyborg is both a physical entity and a metaphor for this fusion. It stands for the

idea that identity is neither biological nor cultural alone but rather mediated through the

technologies of the time and place in which we live. Haraway proposes that high

technology, for example, which blurs the boundary between maker and technology, is a

place where cyborg can exist. If Haraway had written this article today, she would

perhaps have asked: do we make the Internet or does it make us? That is, is our

participation in online chats, e-commerce, social networking sites, and all the other

variations of Internet interaction what shapes the Internet or are we shaped in any way by our participation in these Internet activities?

Thus, for Haraway in her use of cyborg as metaphor for identity, gender does not proceed from the organic body, but is a fusion of organic, sexed, material body and technology; that is, gender is a fusion of the body and the way in which we interact with the tools of our trade, say. I would add to this the technologies of self that operate in our social and cultural context: "in short we are cyborgs. The cyborg is our ontology; it gives us politics. The cyborg is a condensed image of both imagination and material reality, the two joined centers structuring any possibility of historical transformation" (1991, p. 150).

To clarify the concept of 'technologies of the self', Foucault (1988) discusses four technologies that we use in order to understand ourselves. He sees disciplines such as biology, psychology and medicine as "very specific 'truth games' related to specific techniques that human beings use to understand themselves" (p.16). Foucault calls these techniques 'technologies' and enumerates four major types: technologies of production, of sign systems, of power and of the self. Technologies of the self:

"…permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of

others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls,

thoughts, conduct and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order

to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection or

immortality" (p. 18).

In the context of this thesis, we can take the technologies of the self to be the ways in which the organic body connects with discursively 'approved' ways of dressing, behaving

and playing that make us 'happy' and, in the sense of gender, help us to enact our masculinity and/or femininity or any combination thereof.

In Situated Knowledges (1988) Haraway builds on her earlier discussion of borders and dualisms. She deconstructs the supposed 'objectivity' of scientific discourse, asserting that these 'universal' discourses in fact "incorporate categorical imperatives that they deny and that are based on binary classification, for example, male-female, aggressive-demure, dominant-subordinate, sex-gender, nature-culture" (p.10). Haraway asserts that these binary classifications are presented as 'natural', existing *a priori* and unchanging through time, place and culture. She points out that the result is that the product of a particular regime of knowledge is thus erroneously represented as its antecedent. She rejects the possibility of a universal perspective, whether it is the objective 'viewpoint' of masculine, positivist scientific discourse or its purported opposite as generated by the 'female' or feminine subject. Instead, Haraway offers only the possibility of partial viewpoints, accessed through an understanding of subjects who are created through a fusion of technologies of the self and the physical bodies that they occupy. Thus, for example, in order to understand women and leadership it is important to reject the idea that there is one subject, 'woman', and accept instead that there are many subjects each located at different points along the border between the organic and the social world, between the body and the technologies of the self that act upon or through it.

In order to further explore how Haraway's ideas of the border, and Foucault's technologies of the self, can help us move the leadership literature forward, I turn to the work of Judith Butler (1985, 1988, 1990, 1993, 2003). Butler uses Foucault's ideas, among others, to address the issues of binarily sexed bodies, normative gender/social role

and sexuality that I problematized in my earlier discussions of the leadership literature.

As with Haraway, then, Butler moves beyond the identity politics and positionality offered

by Alcoff and others as a way out of the essentialism and dualism that characterize much

feminist work. It is important to note that Butler has written a large opus over more than

two decades that deals with much broader ideas than those relevant to this thesis. It is not

my purpose to review all her work[11], but simply two key concepts that I believe can be

used to expand or stretch leadership literature. These are, as aforementioned, her ideas

regarding the heterosexual matrix and the performativity of gender. I will trace the

evolution of these ideas in her work and its ties to Foucault where appropriate. I will also

discuss some critiques of Butler, and her responses to those critiques. I will conclude this

chapter by suggesting how all of this can be used in leadership studies.

In a 2003 essay, Butler begins a discussion of her exploration of gender categories

by suggesting that "When the category [of woman] is understood as representing a set of

values or dispositions it becomes normative in character and, hence, exclusionary in

principle" (p.201). She points out that, as a result, either those who do not fit this category

as it has been defined (by feminists or wider society) are not women, or the category is an

indication of "the restricted location of its theoreticians" (*ibid*.). Thus, those who are

different by way of race, class, ethnicity or sexuality among others are excluded from both

mainstream society's "hegemonic cultural formations" (*ibid*.) and feminist critique. Butler

proposes two possible solutions: we can redefine the category or question the need for

such a category at all. Of course, redefining 'woman' to include a new set of attributes

means that someone will have to choose, again, who to include and who to exclude. The

---

[11] For a broader discussion of Butler's possible connections to management theory, see Parker (2002).

danger then lies in continued exclusion, on the one hand, or total inclusion on the other to

a point where it becomes difficult to make coherent sense of the term 'woman'. This, for

me, is the basis and impetus of Butler's overall exploration of sex, gender and sexuality

that I will now discuss.

Butler's discussion of sex, gender and sexuality arguably begins in her 1985 article

in which she asks "how can gender be both a matter of choice and a cultural

construction?" (p. 505). She reviews the work of De Beauvoir and Wittig who both

suggest that gender is a cultural construction wherein we appropriate a series of culturally

available norms to construct our gender. However, she points out that this is problematic

because it presumes a foundation: "gender becomes the corporeal locus of cultural

meanings both received and innovated" (*ibid*.). Thus this also presumes that there is a sex

upon which gender is inscribed that exists prior to this inscription. However, Butler cites

Foucault to argue that sex is not a biological truth, but a discursive construct in itself,

developed through power relations that regulate behaviour. She states that "Foucault no

more wants to dispute the material reality of anatomically discrete bodies than does

Wittig, but asks instead how the materiality of the body comes to signify culturally

specific ideas" (p. 514). In this Butler is using Foucault's arguments in The History of

Sexuality, Volume 1 where he rejects the idea of 'natural' sex and examines how "the

deployment of sexuality…was what established this notion of 'sex'" (1980, p.154). He

continues:

> "the notion of 'sex' made it possible to group together, in an
>
> artificial unity, anatomical elements, biological functions,
>
> conducts, sensations, and pleasures, and it enabled one to make

use of this fictitious unity as a causal principle, an omnipresent

meaning, a secret to be discovered everywhere: sex was thus able

to function as a unique signifier and as a universal signified"

(*ibid.*).

Foucault goes on to call this category of sex "the most speculative, most ideal and most internal element in the deployment of sexuality organized by power in its grip on bodies and their materiality" (1980, p. 155). A critical aspect of his construction of sex is, of course, the existence of only two sexes in binary opposition, i.e. male and female only. For Foucault, then, the category of sex, encompassing the sexed body and this 'unity' of anatomy, biology, construct, sensation and pleasure, was created so that sexuality could thus be defined and both of these regulated through the relations of power. I do not intend to suggest here that there was some 'conspiracy' that created these categories but rather that Foucault examined the way in which they emerged, developed and led to particular outcomes. Of course, one of the problematic issues that many feminists point out with Foucault's work in this area is that he engaged very little with gender as compared to sex and sexuality. As McNay (1992) suggests, however, this is more of a gap than a disabling flaw in his work.

Butler built on this argument to call for what she terms "exploding the binary assumption" (1985, p.515) as a way of challenging not simply power relations within society at large, but also as "a challenge to those feminist positions which maintain sexual difference as irreducible and which seek to give expression to the distinctively feminine side of that opposition" (ibid.). She continues to say that it is also "one of the ways of depriving male hegemony and compulsory heterosexuality of their most treasured of

primary premises" (ibid.). Butler is careful to point out that "when, on the other hand, binary sexual difference is made a function of ontology then the options for sexual identity are restricted to traditional heterosexual terms" (ibid.). Thus in this article Butler lays the foundation for her vision of gender by problematizing concepts of sex and gender, particularly when they are presented as 'natural truths' and suggests that we need to explode these binaries in order to subvert the normative prescriptions of heterosexist society.

In the next article that I will discuss Butler (1988) continues to build her conception of gender. She borrows from phenomenology, and in particular, the notion of 'acts' as a way of understanding reality. She discusses how people "constitute social reality through language, gesture and all manner of symbolic social sign" (1988, p. 519). Each individual is an agent who constitutes social reality through language, and therefore for Butler the agent is a subject of constitutive acts. However, she proposes that we could be more radical and make the agent the object as well. So Butler reinterprets de Beauvoir's "one is not born but rather becomes a woman" (de Beauvoir, [1952] 1989, p. 267) to suggest that gender "must be understood as the mundane way in which bodily gestures, movements and enactments of various kinds constitute the illusion of an abiding gendered self" (Butler, 1988, p. 519). Thus, Butler continues to suggest that, if gender is the result of repetitive acts, the possibilities for subversion are within those repetitive acts or rather within the possibilities for different repetitive acts.

Butler asks feminists to examine how a continued belief in and reliance on a category called woman "could lead to the continued oppression of women by forcing them into unexamined, supposedly natural identities, within this set of binaries called man and

woman" (p. 530). She also says some other important things in this article. Chief among

them is the notion that gender is not a 'role' that we put on at will, but rather a set of

repetitive acts taken from a finite repertoire of socially mandated possible roles. She also

asserts that there is no *a priori* subject or actor here, that is, no innately sexed (or

whatever) body before the role. She summarizes:

> "Gender is not passively scripted on the body, and neither is it
>
> determined by nature, language, the symbolic or the
>
> overwhelming history of patriarchy. Gender is what is put on,
>
> invariably, under constraint daily and incessantly, with anxiety
>
> and pleasure, but if this continuous act is mistaken for a natural or
>
> linguistic given power is relinquished to expand the cultural field
>
> bodily through subversive performances of various kinds" (p.
>
> 531).

In a sense, Butler's 'continuous acts' can be said to equate to Foucault's technologies of

the self, which, as mentioned earlier, can be said to relate to or expand the technology that

Haraway fuses with the organic in order to create cyborg[12].

In her 1990 book Gender Trouble Butler pushes and develops her argument

further. Her purpose is to "trouble the gender categories that support gender hierarchy and

---

[12] My primary purpose in this section has been to trace the development of my argument
for using Butler's ideas regarding the heterosexual matrix and the performativity of gender
in this thesis. Thus, I have brought Haraway and Foucault into this discussion solely for
that purpose and that is why I address only a very specific and limited part of each
author's work.

compulsory heterosexuality"[13] (p. xxvii). Through a Foucauldian genealogy[14] of gender

she presents an analysis of the discursive practices that have produced gender and

sexuality in the contemporary west. She highlights the "matrix of power and discursive

relations that effectively produce and regulate the intelligibility of sex, gender and desire"

(p. 42). It is this three part characterization of gender that I draw on in order to explore the

issues of gender and leadership in this project. Butler claims that this 'heterosexual

matrix' operates in the west to articulate a specific, 'natural', causal loop: a particular

sexed body 'naturally' leads to a particular gender or social role which, again 'naturally',

leads to a particular sexual orientation. Moreover, these causal relationships are deemed

to be fixed and immutable: a 'female' sexed body must naturally lead to taking on a

'feminine' social role and expressing 'heterosexual' desire. The male-masculine-

heterosexual version is its 'natural' binary opposite.

Butler questions this causality, which is based on a conception of gender as

foundational and suggests instead that gender is in effect:

> "the presumption here is that the 'being' of gender is *an effect,* an
>
> object of a genealogical investigation that maps out the political
>
> perimeters of its construction in the mode of ontology." (1990, p.
>
> 43)

---

[13] Of course, the term 'compulsory heterosexuality' was first popularized by Adrienne Rich in her essay "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence" (1980), something that is often forgotten in debates of Butler's work in this area.
[14] By genealogy I mean that she offers an account of the way in which the concepts of gender and sexuality have developed in the West as generated by a set of political, historical and cultural discourses. Of course, this includes "an analysis of how these discourses came into being and the alternatives that were suppressed along the way" (Ramazanoglu, 1993, p. 93).

Further, Butler suggests that gender is a performance:

> "Gender ought not to be construed as a stable identity or locus of
>
> agency from which various acts follow; rather gender is an identity
>
> tenuously constituted in time instituted in an exterior space through
>
> *stylized repetitive acts.*" (1990, p. 179)

She explains that this performance, this gender, is never fixed nor immutable:

> "*woman* itself is a term in process, a becoming, a constructing that
>
> cannot rightfully be said to originate or to end. As an ongoing
>
> discursive practice, it is open to interpretation and resignification"
>
> (1990, p. 43)

Thus, Butler's argument can be summarized as follows: we operate in a social world in which dualisms and bipolarities such as male/female, masculine/feminine, heterosexual/homosexual are presented as 'natural' and inevitable. They underpin the compulsory heterosexuality characteristic of mainstream Western culture. However, sex, gender and sexuality are effects of discursive practices and each person's gender is a performance, what she calls 'drag'. We each perform the gender that suits us, given our sexed bodies and the possibilities we believe are open to us as a result. If we were to subvert this matrix and break the causal relations that are presented as 'natural' then we would be free to perform whatever drag 'suits us', instead of the one we feel we 'should' perform. Further, going back to the quote above, that drag, that gender identity, is neither finite nor final, but always open to change; in other words, gender is about the journey, not the destination.

In <u>Bodies that Matter</u> (1993) Butler reiterates that "sex is an ideal construct which is forcibly materialized through time. It is not a process whereby regulatory norms materialize 'sex' and achieve this materiality through a forcible reiteration of those norms." (pp. 1-2). In other words, the sexed body is not simply a given, but rather "one of the norms by which 'one' becomes viable at all, that which qualifies a body for life within the domain of cultural intelligibility" (p.2).

The vehicle for this naming, this becoming 'viable', is the heterosexual matrix with its normative prescription of female-feminine-heterosexual or male-masculine-heterosexual. Of course, this matrix of inclusion is also one of exclusion: those who do not fit within its constructions are "abject beings, those who are not yet 'subjects' but who form the constitutive outside to the domain of the subject" (*ibid.*). Thus, the subject is created in relation to the abject, the latter being necessary to position the subject against. Further, the threat of abjection is the power of the matrix, for those who do not conform to it, e.g. LGBT people, become unwanted, abhorred – abject. This, of course, makes resistance to the matrix that much more difficult – and that much more courageous.

Butler's contribution to specific debates in feminism, articulated especially at the beginning of this section, is important. She responds to the questions of sex and gender by developing an understanding of gender as a set of constitutive acts – including sexed body and sexuality – that is performed regularly and repeatedly. She deals with the problematic essentialism and dualism that have excluded many women (and men) in both academic and social discourse from discursively mandated categories of sex, gender and sexuality. Butler explicitly highlights the problems inherent in excluding sexuality from a discussion of gender. Finally, she emphasizes the way in which "under certain conditions of

normative heterosexuality, policing gender is sometimes used as a way of securing heterosexuality" (1999, p. xii).

Butler's contribution to specific debates in feminism, articulated especially at the beginning of this section, is important. She responds to the questions of sex and gender by developing an understanding of gender as a set of constitutive acts – including sexed body and sexuality – that is performed regularly and repeatedly. She deals with the problematic essentialism and dualism that have excluded many women (and men) in both academic and social discourse from discursively mandated categories of sex, gender and sexuality. Butler explicitly highlights the problems inherent in excluding sexuality from a discussion of gender. She also emphasizes the way in which "under certain conditions of normative heterosexuality, policing gender is sometimes used as a way of securing heterosexuality" (1999, p. xii).

Of course, in using Butler's concepts of the heterosexual matrix and gender performativity I do not mean to suggest that there are not critiques of her work and of these ideas in particular. The two main (and inter-related) criticisms levelled in this regard are that 1) her conceptualization of gender is overly deterministic and 2) it leaves no subject position from which women can act. For example, Benhabib agrees with Alcoff that there is an identity crisis in feminism. She suggests that this stems from the postmodernist critique of identity categories which posits a "fractured, opaque self" (1992, p. 192), one which is incapable of being reflexive, intentional, accountable and autonomous instead of a subject capable of resistance and subversion. Benhabib (1994) asserts elsewhere that, according to Foucault and Butler in particular, the subject is constituted or rather constructed by power/ knowledge matrices and therefore does not

exist as a locus of agency. She argues that Butler's view of gender is too deterministic, that it over-emphasises society, culture and the discourses operating within them and pays too little attention to the process of individualization. For Benhabib, Butler's subject is always and only determined by the discourses that constitute it and that is where the problem lies.

Butler's (1995) response is that, by troubling gender, by destabilizing the category 'woman', we highlight just how necessary it is to the continuation of things as they are. That is, rather than seeking to develop a stable category 'woman' in some 'better' or more 'comprehensive' way, we can, and should challenge the status quo by subverting that category. So, for Butler, the subject that is <u>constituted</u> by discourse is not <u>determined </u>by it. The constituted subject can act and, further, it is through the very instability of this constituted subject that subversion and resistance are possible, both personally and politically. Indeed the iterative and transformative aspects of Butler's performative view of gender are the reasons that resistance is possible. The repetitive acts of gender that we each perform daily always provide us with the possibility to resist the status quo, if we so choose. Thus, rather than continuing the debates about how best to categorize 'woman', which would also perpetuate essentialist and dualist views of gender, Butler provides a way to break free of those restrictions and to also add sexual orientation to our conceptualization of gender. In this way, we can seek to understand the intersection between gender, in the broadest sense, and leadership without restricting either - for example, by assuming that sexed body and social role are somehow the same thing.

With this in mind, then, in the next section I discuss the ways in which Butler's understanding of gender could be used to shake up leadership research, to move it beyond the place it has become stuck.

2.5 Proposition for a queer approach to leadership research

To reiterate the discussion that has developed in this chapter so far, I will briefly review it. First, I discussed liberal feminist and psychoanalytic approaches to leadership. While these literatures brought to light many problems faced by women, they also share certain problems. They rely, for example, on essentialist and dualist understandings of sex and gender that position the female/feminine against the male/masculine. Further, liberal feminism in particular, but to a lesser extent, psychoanalytic feminism, uses a male standard and theories and instruments developed by male researchers using male subjects. When women are the object of inquiry, they are often measured against this standard, either to prove that they are as good as men or that they are different but better than men. Finally, sexuality in the sense of sexual orientation is not addressed directly in either literature.

Calás and Smircich provide an ongoing critique of this and the broader organizational literature spanning more than two decades. They repeatedly state that leadership continually asks the same questions using the same approaches with little critical examination of underlying assumptions. They call for new ways of understanding gender and leadership in order to move this literature forward, but stop short of actually doing so themselves. My examination of debates in feminist philosophy revealed similar debates within feminism. Most pressing seemed to be the one that asks us to choose between the essentialist and dualist understandings of sex and gender that have existed for

centuries and a more recent one that suggests that there is no such thing as 'woman'. Alcoff, for example, proposed the use of identity politics as a way of breaching the divide between these two positions. However, as I suggested above, identity politics does not necessarily allow us to escape from essentialism and dualism. Further it risks consigning research from a woman's perspective, however that 'woman' is defined, to the devalued feminine sphere. In the last section of this chapter, I discussed the ways in which Butler's ideas regarding the performativity of gender and the heterosexual matrix can offer a way out of these dilemmas.

How, then, could Butler's work be used to queer leadership research? Using the framework that I discussed in section 2.4 I answer the questions that I used in sections 2.2 and 2.3 to review the women in management and the psychoanalytic feminist leadership literatures: How are women seen? How is gender seen? How is sexuality seen? What would be the goals of a queer leadership approach? This approach to leadership research would see gender as performative, an enacted self that is never completely achieved. Gender is a becoming rather than a being. At the same time, 'woman' is only part of the definition of the subject. Gender, in the broad sense, would include all three aspects of Butler's matrix i.e. sex, gender, sexuality or, put differently, sexed body, social role and sexual orientation. Further, any one individual is not bound by the heterosexual matrix that confines 'her' to woman-feminine-heterosexual and 'him' to male-masculine-heterosexual. The goals of this approach would be to release people from the heterosexual matrix.

Thus, for this study, building on the above, I ask the following research questions:

1. How do/can people construct identities that transcend the heterosexual matrix? What might a queer identity / one at the border entail?

2. As people construct their identities as leaders, do they seek to reconcile all their other identities into a coherent whole with their identity as a leader? Do they view their leader identities as in any way shaped, influenced or informed by their sex, gender and/ or sexual identities? Or do their leader identities instead come to affect how they see themselves as male, female, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera)?

3. To what extent are leadership, sex, gender and sexual identities 'fixed' or 'static'? Do we play out our sense of ourselves as leaders, men, women, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera) in the same way across time and place?

4. How do queer or borderline identities intersect with leadership? Can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? In particular, in a profession (such as the military or nursing) in which gender roles are still fairly rigidly prescribed, and in which only certain forms of gendered leadership are 'acceptable', can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? If so, what are the effects of such subversion for the leader involved?

For reasons outlined in chapter 1 and discussed more fully in chapter 5, I have added the following research sub question:

4a. To what extent do the differently hypergendered contexts of the military and nursing in the UK, Canada and the UK seem to lead to varying outcomes in this regard?

In the next chapter, to further contextualize these research questions, I examine the way in which leadership has been written about in the military. While I agree with Acker (1990) and others who suggest that all organizations are gendered to some degree, I believe that the hypergendered environment of an organization like the military can highlight the way in which gender intersects with leadership in a much more pointed way. In chapter 3 I therefore discuss the context within which women and men of various sexed bodies, social roles and sexual orientations operate in the military of the three countries outlined in chapter 1 and review the literature that has been written exploring leadership and the military.

3.0 Sex, Gender, Sexuality, Leadership and the Military: Dykes, Whores or Bitches?

3.1 Introduction

The title of this chapter comes from an oft-quoted comment by an unnamed female Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) that has become part of everyday usage in the US military: "[On the] 2nd day of boot camp – [our] company commander said, "Welcome to the fleet. In the Navy's eyes you're either dykes or whores – get used to it."" (quoted in Herbert, 1998, p. 55). In an article in the New York Times Magazine reprinted in the Sunday Times Magazine (2007) the number of nouns had grown to include 'bitches' – perhaps an indication that women in the military could also occupy a space that was not tied immediately to their 'abnormal' sexuality but rather to an unpleasant personality trait instead. This second article noted that the usage of this set of words to describe women's role in the military a number of years after the initial quote above, and as reported by several women who did not know each other, seems to point to the continuing pervasiveness of such attitudes throughout the US military. And this despite the increasing amount of evidence that, first in disguise and more recently openly, women have fought courageously, been wounded, died, saved their comrades under fire, contributed to unit morale and esprit de corps, and in general stood side by side with their male colleagues. One purpose of this chapter, then, is to discuss the context within which women serve in the military in all three countries today.

The first section provides a historical background by describing, in brief, the development of the military of Canada, the UK and the US as it pertains to gender, sex

and sexuality. In order to examine the masculine hypergendering of the military, I will, in keeping with Butler's (1990) framework discussed in the conceptual review, examine three aspects of the heterosexual matrix: sexed body, social role, and sexuality. I will look at how these three aspects of the matrix are hypermasculinized in the military of all three countries.

In terms of the body, an examination of who can join the military, what services are open to whom and who can serve in combat serves as one way to establish the masculine character of the military. Only those with male bodies are allowed to do certain things, to belong to certain services, to claim combat experience. It does not matter whether a person with a female body has the willingness and capacity to do the same things – entrance and promotion are often tied to the 'correct' physical body in explicit and unapologetic ways. In order to examine the social role aspect of the hypergendering of the military, I will look at the qualities that are exhibited, promoted and taught as exemplary in the military. In particular, we will see that the values and attributes that are taught as fundamental to military service not only belong to a stereotypically masculine ideal type, but are also seen as problematic when exhibited by female members. Similar questions guide my inquiry into the sexuality of the ideal military member: what sexual norms are promoted and upheld in the military?, and what are the consequences of having a sexuality that differs from this norm?

The other purpose of the chapter is to review some of the key literature that has attempted to understand how and why particular attitudes towards gender, sex and sexuality developed in the military of Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, and how and why they continue to drive, to a greater or lesser extent, much of the way in

which personnel are recruited, selected, trained, allowed to serve and promoted in these

armed forces. However, one of the failings of much of this literature is that, like much of

the leadership literature discussed in the previous chapter, it focuses on two groups of

people, 'men' and 'women', without any regard for individual differences, or for the

possibility that it is not just heterosexual women who do not fit the military prescription.

Men who are not stereotypically masculine, lesbians, gay men, bisexuals and

transgendered people are also outside the military's "straight, white, athletic, heterosexual,

Christian male" (Harrington, 1999, p. 12)[15] prescription. This is one of the deficiencies

that my project addresses.   This chapter concludes with a description of the implications

of the hypergendered environment for those who do not obviously conform, and then with

a section linking sexed body, social role and sexual orientation in the military to

leadership.

It is useful at this juncture to clarify the terms used with regards to military forces

in this chapter and going forward. I use the term 'branch of the service' to refer to one of

the main types of fighting forces, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Royal Marines. A

unit refers to a particular type of operational group within one of the branches – e.g.

infantry, parachute corps, commandos or submariners. Units whose primary duty is to

engage with and kill the enemy at close quarters – e.g. infantry or artillery – are deemed to

be in the combat arms. Each member of the armed forces belongs to a service, a unit and a

military occupational specialty, the last of which I have abbreviated to 'specialty'. For

---

[15] There are many ways in which certain members of the military do not fit the ideal, even
beyond those that Harrington lists e.g., age, class, 'ability' and ethnicity among others. In
this thesis I have chosen to focus on issues of sex, gender and sexuality alone. It would in
any case be impractical if not impossible to cover all the possible differences in one thesis
and do them justice. Further, the sample of respondents had to be self-selected and thus it
would have been impossible to cover all the possible differences.

example, a member could be an intelligence officer (specialty) in the Intelligence Corps (unit) of the US Army (service branch), while another might be a tank driver (specialty) in the Royal Armoured Corps (unit) of the British Army (service branch) and yet another an engineer (specialty) in the Canadian Military Engineers (unit) of the Canadian Forces (service branch).

3.2 Historical Background

From pre-Roman times until the 17th century, Anglo-Western military fighting forces were composed predominantly of men. Men served as enlisted soldiers, non-commissioned officers and commissioned officers, accessing these positions through voluntary enlistment, forced enlistment, patronage or education in a military academy. According to Adie (2003), however, women have always followed military campaigns as providers of essential services such as cooking, cleaning, caring for the sick or wounded and sexual services. By the 17th and 18th centuries, they were taking up more established positions as quasi-professional providers of these services. During the 19th century, there was a shift as some of these women were no longer relegated to the rear of an advancing army, in the role of followers, but rode at the head in order to scout out supplies.

It was also in the 17th century that some women began to join up as soldiers, usually in order to stay with their husbands in the same military campaign. However, their presence in this role was neither encouraged nor wanted in the military. As a result, women who served were typically disguised as men and their sex was usually not discovered until they were either wounded or killed. Upon discovery, women who were still alive were expelled and returned to their 'natural' environment at home. Wives of officers were often more successful than other women at staying in the military, no doubt

due to the help their husbands were able to provide in their dissembling. For example, Francis L. Clayton enlisted with her husband in 1861 and served in the (US) Union Army for two years until her husband was killed in battle. She then revealed her sex, resigned from the military and was given an honourable discharge (Chapman Catt, 1897).

Adie (2003) points out that the women who had served as soldiers in the 17th and 18th centuries were seen as brave adventurers, even if their presence was not welcome, whereas women who served later began to be seen as 'different' from other women, and eventually as 'deviant'. I would add that these earlier women were not seen as threatening to the prevailing social order because of the way sex and gender were seen as interchangeable and immutable while sexuality was likewise fixed. There were perceived to be only two possible gender identities, the masculine male and the feminine female, with no possibility for alternative expressions of sexuality and therefore no way to truly disrupt the social order. These 17th, 18th and early19[th] century women were therefore perceived simply as women who were misguided in their attempts to join the military. As society moved into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and understandings of gender identity became complex enough to include non-traditional gender roles, women who served in the military began to be seen as <u>deviant</u> and thus threatening to the social order. Indeed, as I will discuss later, many men in the military still object to women's presence on the grounds that it defies the 'natural' order of things.

By the later 19th century we also begin to see women who chose service in the military as an end unto itself as opposed to wanting simply to stay with their husbands. These women, still disguised as men, served in conflicts such as the American Civil War and the Crimean War. Chapman Catt provides many instances of such women in her

pamphlet entitled <u>The Ballot and the Bullet</u> (1897), in which she collected evidence to counter the argument that women should not be given the vote because they could not defend it by military means. For example, she writes the following about Frances Hook who, as Frank Miller, enlisted twice during the Civil War, was taken prisoner, released, reenlisted a third time, fought bravely, was wounded and subsequently discovered to be a woman:

"The Louisville "Journal" gave the following account of her, under the head of, "Mustered Out": Frank Miller, the young lady soldier, now at Barracks No. One, will be mustered out of the service in accordance with the army regulations which prohibit the enlistment of females in the army, and sent to her parents in Pennsylvania. This will be sad news to Frances, who has cherished the fond hope that she would be permitted to serve the Union cause during the war. She has been of great service as a scout to the army of the Cumberland, and her place will not easily be filled. She is a true patriot and a gallant soldier." (p. 28)

In a parallel development, this period saw the beginning of a formalized nursing system and the establishment of a nursing 'corps' dedicated to serving alongside fighting troops in the UK (BBC, 2007), Canada (Canadian Forces [CF] 2005) and the US (WMSAMF, 2008). Moreover, these women were different from earlier military carers in a number of important ways. They held formal positions in nursing, were trained in nursing before being attached to troops and were not prevailed upon to provide any services other than nursing. Florence Nightingale played a key role in the deployment of nurses in the military as well as the development of nursing as a profession more

generally. Her role in the development of the nursing profession is explored more fully in the next chapter.

By World War I all three nations therefore had an established female nursing corps that served alongside the fighting troops. These units were kept on active duty during the 1920s and 1930s as the nursing service of the military. This war therefore turned out to be a pivotal moment for women in the military in that it provided both the need and opportunity for women to take on a formal role in service to their country.

As World War II started, however, there was an increased recognition of the need to find personnel for non-combat functions because so many men were needed just to fight. As a result, new official units were formed in which women played roles other than nursing. For example, in the UK, the Army Territorial Service (ATS) was established as a non-combatant but permanent force of women who performed a variety of support roles, including Military Police and gun crews. In Canada in 1941, 45,000 women were recruited into the armed forces and filled a variety of non-nursing, non-combat roles (CF, 2005), while in the US, several units such as the Women's Army Air Corps (WAAC), Women's Naval Reserve (WNR), the Marine Corps Women's Reserve (MCWR) and the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (WAVES) were formed in 1941 and the Women's Army Corps (WAC) in 1943 (Bellafaire, 2008).

All these women were explicitly assigned to support, rather than combat, roles. However, in reality there were many women whose jobs exposed them to the same risks as men in combat but yet were denied the same status as the men who died on the front lines. For example, over 1,000 women served, with 38 fatalities, in the United States' Women's Air Force Service Pilots (WASPs) between 1942 and 1944. They "ferried more

than 12,000 aircraft of 78 types, served without military benefits, and were paid two-thirds as much as the male civilian ferry pilots they had replaced." (*Air Force Magazine*, 1995, p.1). Yet, it took decades for the women killed while they were serving as WASPs to be recognized as combat casualties and be awarded the same honours, benefits and medals as their male counterparts. Women also provided support services in bases and posts near the front lines and in occupied areas – so they were still in danger and they still suffered casualties, although they were not considered to be officially deployed in combat. As I will discuss below, that situation still exists in the US and UK military today, where women are not officially deployed in combat, but are nevertheless serving in combat zones. I will also explain some of the reasons for this unwillingness to call it 'combat' where women are concerned.

Returning to the historical development of women's participation in the military, we see that the end of the war did not mean the disbanding of the women's units. In this sense, World War II was another pivotal moment for women in that they became a regular part of the military. However, although they were present in large numbers in areas such as nursing and administration, women continued to be excluded from many posts and specialties over the ensuing two decades.

But the societal changes of the 1960's and early 1970's in the three countries resulting from, *inter alia*, the second wave of feminism, began to be played out in the military. Such developments include the increasing participation of women in the labour force, the acceptance that women should be allowed to study or train in whatever occupation they chose and the introduction of non-discrimination legislation covering the workplace environment. Step by step, women made inroads into the armed forces of all

three countries. First, they were allowed to serve in a larger variety of roles and

occupations; next, they were allowed to achieve promotion all the way to the uppermost

ranks. The next major step was the opening of the military academies to women. This is a

critical marker of the progress of women in the military because the academies are the

places where its future policy-makers of the military are educated and acculturated into

their services. In the next sections, I examine the context within which women and men

serve in the military today in all three countries, beginning in Section 3.3 with the way in

which sexed bodies affect the conditions of service.

3.3 The Body: It's a man's world

The situation today with regards to women's occupational options in the military is

similar in all three countries, albeit with some important differences. All the forces are

integrated in the sense that there is no longer a separate 'women's' service. All the forces

prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex and they all have differential physical aptitude

tests that reflect differences in women's and men's bodies. These tests reflect similar

changes in other professions such as the fire services where it has been likewise

acknowledged that physical occupational requirements should indicate ability to do the

required tasks rather than brute strength. This is nevertheless a bone of contention with

some male members, who erroneously believe that it leads to the admission of 'inferior'

women. Table 1 shows the extent to which women are integrated into units and

occupational specialties in the armed forces of the three countries.

Table 1: Occupational Restrictions for Women, 2006

Country	Units excluding women	Rationale given
Canada	No exclusion	

United Kingdom	Army:
	  • Household Cavalry
	  • Royal Armoured Corps
	  • Infantry
	  • SAS
	Royal Air Force:
	  • The RAF Regiment
	Royal Navy:
	  • Royal Marines
	  • Submarine service
	  • Some diving specialties
		Currently, primary reason given is team/unit cohesion
		
		Submarine service reasons include privacy, costs of refitting and effects on fertility

United States	Navy:
	  • SEALs
	  • Submarine service
	Air Force:
	  • Special operations
	  • Combat control
	  • Pararescue
	  • Rotary aircraft
	  • Tactical air control
	Army:
	  • Infantry
	  • Armour
	  • Cannon
	  • Field artillery
	  • Short-range air defense artillery
	Marine Corps:
	  • Infantry
	  • Armour
	  • Field artillery
	  • Certain security teams
		• Physical strength
		• Potential capture
		• Psychological – women deemed not to be aggressive enough
		• Unit cohesion and morale
		• Privacy
		• Submarine service reasons include privacy, costs of refitting and effects on fertility

Source: UK data: MOD (2002); US data: NATO (2006)

As the table shows women may serve in any branch or service of the Canadian

Forces. The last male-only service, the submarines, was opened to women in 2000.

Women may serve in most, but not all, branches, units and occupations in the British and

US military. Both countries still prohibit women from serving on submarines – citing

close quarters with male colleagues, and the potential of breathing potentially harmful

recycled air by women of child-bearing age as reasons (Kane and Horn, 2001). They are also prevented from serving in some of the most elite units, for example, the Navy SEALS and Special Ops units in the US, and the SAS and Royal Marine commando groups in the UK. Women are likewise excluded from forward artillery units, ground combat (infantry) troops and any unit directly on the front line of a combat theatre. This 'combat exclusion' covers any unit that is "required deliberately to close with and kill the enemy face-to-face" (MOD) which effectively covers all forward ground forces and any stealth operations. However, women continue to serve in 'support' roles: as such, they are still wounded, killed or captured by the enemy on a regular basis, but without receiving the same financial and other benefits attached to risking their lives received by their male colleagues. Given the ongoing deployments in Afghanistan and Iraq, this policy of putting women in harm's way but not recognizing that fact seems misguided at best, deliberately misogynist at worst.

To elucidate, the reasons given, either currently or in the past, for the exclusion of women from certain services have been consistent among the forces in all three countries:

1. **Physical strength**: In certain units or occupations, for example artillery, physical strength is a critical component of success, and it is believed that women are not strong enough to contribute in the same way as men. Their inclusion might put their fellow soldiers at risk. However, there is no mechanism by which women who <u>could</u> pass the identical strength tests may attempt to join these units.

2. **Aggressiveness**: Aggressiveness is considered critical in some units or occupations such as Special Operations, and it is again believed that women are not as aggressive as men

3. **Potential for capture**: There is much worry over the potential assault of women captured by an enemy. While women who have been captured have indeed been subject to physical and sexual assault, men who have been captured have also been subjected to these practices. Generally, however, stories of men who have been beaten or tortured in captivity are told as part of a discourse of heroism, e.g. the prisoners of war held at the infamous Hanoi Hilton during the Vietnam War, whereas women who are captured are often talked about as victims, e.g. US soldier Jessica Lynch. For example, US Senator John McCain, who was held at the Hanoi Hilton for two months, often refers to that experience as an example of his patriotism and willingness to sacrifice himself for his country. Stories about him and other survivors of this brutal prison focus on the torture and brutality inflicted by the captors on the one hand and on the resistance to this torture by the POWs. In contrast, the stories about Lynch are quite different. Lynch was captured by Iraqi soldiers in March 2003 when her convoy took a wrong turn and was ambushed by Iraqi soldiers. She was taken to hospital where her injuries were treated by local doctors and she was interrogated by her captors. US Special Ops forces staged a raid on the hospital and rescued her a few days later and she was returned home. After her return to the US, Lynch refused to be called a hero and instead

talked at great length about the ugliness of war and the gratitude that she

felt at being alive. Much of the media discussion meanwhile focused on

whether or not she had been raped, how badly she was brutalized and how

this sweet little girl from Virginia was going to be able to resume her life as

a schoolteacher (e.g. Jerome and Heyman, 2003). Relatedly, another

female US soldier, Melissa Rathbun Nealy, was captured during the first

Gulf War and spent a considerable time as a POW in Iraqi hands. She was

more severely injured than Lynch. Yet upon her return she was treated as

less of a hero and more of an 'unclean' woman. In particular, there were

repeated allegations that she had been sexually assaulted, allegations that

she repeatedly and vigorously denied (Nantais and Lee, 1999). This focus

on potential sexual assault of women is arguably a scare tactic intended to

frighten women away from joining and men from letting 'their' women

join (Miller, 1997) while it also neglects the real potential for sexual assault

of male POW's.

4. **Detrimental effect on morale**: Many in the military continue to insist that

the inclusion of women in combat units, some would say in any active unit,

would be disruptive to the morale and camaraderie that are fundamental to

military effectiveness. For example, in its explanation of the exclusion of

women from combat, the MOD (2000) explains that its men-only units and

services are typically structured into small four or five person teams where

team cohesion is extremely critical to success. These teams operate under

conditions of threat and extreme duress and members rely on each other for

a successful mission and also to stay alive and safe. The MOD contends that the introduction of women, an unknown variable, into such cohesive units has a potentially disruptive and by consequence lethal effect on combat effectiveness. They see no benefit in introducing women into these units and therefore no reason to take the risk. Officers in the US Armed Forces also refer to the detrimental effect of women on the male bonding necessary to unit cohesiveness (Miller, 1997).

5. **Privacy:** This is the main reason for excluding women from submarine service. Both the British and American Navy cite the 'prohibitive' cost of refitting subs to provide private, sex-appropriate berthing and sanitary facilities as the main reason to continue to exclude women from submarine service (Kane and Horn, 2001).

Importantly, moreover, the Canadian military's removal of sex-based occupational restrictions did not come out of a lack of belief in any of the above arguments. Rather, the full integration of the CF came about in response to rulings from the judiciary rather than as a result of initiatives within the CF. The Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms (1982) prohibits discrimination on many grounds, including sex. Employment laws in Canada reflect this in their specification that occupational requirements must be bona fide (BFOR), that is, they must reflect key skills and attributes directly needed to do the job. It is possible to discriminate on the basis of sex if an employer can prove that this discrimination is bona fide, but this is very difficult to do, as there are few occupational requirements that can be directly tied to sex.   Although the CF had cited many of the same arguments listed above as reasons to continue to exclude women from certain

military units, they were not able to prove the validity of those arguments in legal terms, and they eventually had to bow to full integration.

Although the US has a Bill of Rights, it does not prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act is the US federal legislation that deals with discrimination in employment on the basis of race, colour, religion, sex and national origin. The Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) had it been ratified would have perhaps been more influential in this regard. In terms of the military, then, it seems that employment equity measures in the US are enforced when women are already in units, but they have not been able to break the combat exclusion. Similarly, the Sex Discrimination Act (SDA), originally passed in 1975, prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender or marital status in the UK. However, it alone does not seem to provide enough legal ammunition for reversing the occupational restrictions of the British military. The UK does not yet have a Bill of Rights and thus its military has also been able to avoid full integration.[16] Both countries continue to face other societal and judiciary challenges and pressures for full integration. It remains to be seen how long they will hold out.

Given the changing environment, increased interest in issues regarding roles of women and men in the military as well as publicity regarding the participation – or not – of women in armed conflicts of the post Cold War era, it is not surprising that there is an increasing amount of academic work that examines the reasons why women continue to be excluded from certain occupational specialties in the military. Generally, this work focuses on deconstructing one or another of the rationales used to exclude women, either

---

[16] At the time of writing, the UK is set to adopt a Charter of Rights that prohibits discrimination on a number of bases. It will be interesting to note whether and how this will affect the combat exclusion.

by uncovering the sexist bias underlying them or by highlighting ways in which many do not stand up to scrutiny due to lack of 'scientific' evidence or are antiquated in their attitudes towards both women and men. I have chosen to discuss the two articles below in particular because I believe they relate most closely to my project.

First, Miller (1997) points out that in the 1970's the US Army experimented with the integration of women into combat units. They inserted different proportions of women into groups undergoing combat exercises in order to determine at what level they would begin to negatively affect performance of the units. These studies showed that women performed well in such exercises and had no negative impact on the units they belonged to (Army Research Institute, cited in Miller, 1997). But, when Miller discussed these studies with male officers, she was told that the studies proved nothing because they were simulated, not done in actual combat conditions.   Miller argues that this circular argument is symptomatic of what she called entrenched gender bias: only real combat will truly tell how the presence of women would affect unit combat effectiveness, yet women are excluded from combat because they are assumed to have a negative effect in this regard.

In a related publication, Peach (1994) suggests that the presence of women in combat threatens two widely held and "ideologically biased myths about the nature of men, women, and war: the myth that war is "manly" (and thus no place for women) and the myth that men are protectors and women protected" (p. 161). She refers in particular to Stiehm's (1989) protected/protector theory that positions women and men differentially in times of conflict. Men are positioned as protectors of home and hearth and women are seen as the weaker sex that needs this protection, especially in their fundamental roles of giving birth to and raising children. These roles are tied to their biology in an immutable

way and it is therefore neither appropriate nor desirable for women to attempt to take on the role of a soldier/protector.

Peach thus traces the roots of combat exclusion to "notions of proper gender roles that required men to protect women from the horrors of the battlefield" (1994, p.162).[17] Here I again point out that these gender roles are firmly tied to the sexed body. Peach points out, however, that the front is a shifting place in modern combat, given technology that extends the reach of opposing armies miles beyond the immediately visible, making it more difficult to separate out the battlefield. Also, as we have seen, women have always served in combat posts and headquarters which were generally far behind the front line (but within the reach of the enemy) during earlier wars. These are now often among the first targets in an armed conflict. In that sense, these women are just as vulnerable to the enemy as forward troops. Yet, women are prevented from serving on long-range missile crews that are normally situated many miles from their targets. Peach postulates that this is a desire to keep women away from big guns rather than to protect them from danger that underlies the combat exclusion.

Relatedly the protector/protected myth is used within the effectiveness argument when military officials argue that the focus of male members of a mixed unit may be split because they will choose to protect their female colleagues in combat instead of engaging enemy soldiers. The protector/protected argument sees all women as naturally weak and in need of protection and all men as strong and capable of protecting them. It takes no account of the reality that women and men are individuals – some stronger than others, some weaker than others – and should not be categorized by their sex alone. Yet the

---

[17] As noted in the introduction to this thesis, women serving in the military today sometimes also see themselves in this way.

protector/protected argument is also used in discussions of the potential for female soldiers to be captured if they serve on the front lines, without, as Peach suggests, the admission that it would be impossible to protect <u>all</u> female soldiers from capture because they are integrated throughout the military when it is deployed.

Yet this argument is used by top-level military personnel and politicians in conjunction with the "men are manly/war is manly" argument when defending the combat exclusion. For example, General Robert Barrows, the retired head of the US Marine Corps, stated in a congressional hearing that "combat is uncivilized and women cannot do it. Nor should they be even thought of as doing it…I think the nature of women disqualifies them from doing it. Women give life, sustain life, nurture life; they do not take it" (cited in Peach, 1994, p. 210). Peach sees these two myths, the protector/protected and the masculinity of war, as operating in tandem, as a fundamental underpinning of arguments used to bolster women's exclusion from combat. She further demonstrates how the deconstruction of these myths weakens the arguments that are usually advanced in their favour.

As should by now be clear, the arguments that favour the restricted integration of women into the armed forces are based on essentialist points of view that tie both women and men to their biology. Further, they seem to be grounded in an ideology that separates men and women into binary opposites with all men naturally possessing the necessary qualities for the military and all women naturally having the nurturing personalities required and best suited to keeping the home fires burning. In the next section, I will examine how essentialist understandings of the sexed bodies of women and men lead to

essentialist understandings of appropriate social roles and thus contribute to the

hypermasculine ethos of the military.

3.4 Social Roles: Violating gender norms

In the previous section I discussed the way in which the western military is male,

not simply because it is overwhelmingly populated with men, but also because of the

combat exclusion of women in some forces.   But an organization that is predominantly

male is not necessarily hypermasculinized.   For example, professional accountancy was,

until recently, a predominantly male profession. Yet although it was and in many ways

continues to be a gendered institution (Acker 1990, 1992), it does not exhibit the highly

masculine gender ethos of the military.

In this section I discuss the gender ethos of the western military and in particular

its highly masculinized culture – one that is encountered upon first contact, taught and

reinforced in training and day-to-day life. It is the problematic backdrop against which all

members, including those who may not fit into its straitjacket, must develop their own

sense of self and belonging, and ultimately develop and enact their leadership. Until the

20th century and, to a significant extent, up to and including the present day, the ethos of

the almost exclusively male military was characterized by an accompanying masculinity

that highlighted and valued virtues stereotypically thought of as masculine, physical

strength, courage (both moral and physical), honour and loyalty. Men were seen as

having these virtues while women were seen as incapable of having them, in part as a

result of the separation of women and men into private and public spheres of life, and

accompanying essentialist notions of gender. Congruity of body and social role was

thought to be 'natural' and thus it was inconceivable that a person should have a female body but take on a 'masculine' social role.

Indeed, Dunivin states that "the combat, masculine-warrior paradigm is the essence of military culture" (1994, p.534). In this section, I examine the development of this paradigm and some of the explanations for it that have been put forward. Peach (1994) suggests that war has always been a way in which men can prove themselves, and that masculinity has therefore become synonymous with success in this arena. Similarly, Dyer (1991) postulates that the identification of masculinity with war is a direct result of the formation of the nation-state. The state exerts control over all its citizens. It requires soldiers to enforce and protect its sovereignty. It asks men to risk their lives in this regard and, as a reward, offers them control over women. Thus, war and men and masculinity become entwined and exert control over women and femininity, and order is maintained throughout the state.

Certainly, character traits and requirements for success in the military such as honour, courage, and physical fitness have traditionally been seen as masculine traits. These stereotypically masculine traits are cultivated and reinforced in the military within a discourse that renders mostly invisible the ways in which women may exhibit them. Indeed, femininity is seen as the very opposite of what it takes to be a successful soldier, as the following quote shows: "The waging of war…requires professional attributes and characteristics which are the antithesis of what we in this society consider essentially feminine qualities" (Navy Report on Integrating Women into the US Naval Academy, cited in Peach, 1994, p. 183). Training, especially basic training, is intended to break down and rebuild the recruit's identity into a soldier's identity. An integral part of that

involves "becoming a man", or proving that one's masculinity is up to the task of being a successful soldier. In a similar fashion to the culture of male-only organizations such as certain sports teams, unproven recruits are called "ladies" or "girls" until they demonstrate the requisite hypermasculinized behaviour.

Harrington (1999) addresses the hypermasculinity of the contemporary military in her examination of the discursive construction of gender at the US Air Force Academy (USAFA). She argues that, through the texts that are required reading for academy students, the ideal Air Force member (and therefore the ideal Air Force leader) is coded, as seen earlier, as a "white, athletic, heterosexual, Christian male" (p. 12). Harrington analyses the reading lists that are part of the leadership curriculum at the USAFA. She argues that these texts "conflate notions of natural protection with masculine prowess… such discursive representations diminish women or entirely exclude them from the ultimate leadership scenario – war" (1999, p. xi). She further postulates that the literature on war is ultimately tied to leadership and the exclusion of women from war also has the effect of excluding them from leadership. These books represent a "hypermasculinized canon" (1999. p. 11) that offers no female role models and that inculcates cadets with highly masculinized models of ideal behaviour. Harrington also looks at the masculinized nature of other texts and elements of Air Force culture. For example, the Air Force Hymn asks "Lord, guard and guide the men who fly", and "O God, protect the men who fly"; the Air Force song exhorts "At'em boys, giv'er the gun!" and talks about "Souls of men dreaming of skies to conquer"; finally, the inscription over the Academy's gates is still "Bring me men!", (pp. 147-150) more than thirty years after it became a coeducational institution.

The purpose of Harrington's work is to expose the tightly woven masculine net that surrounds and ensnares Air Force members, in particular young cadets learning how to be successful leaders. She points out the pervasiveness of this masculinity not just within the Air Force, but in all the branches of the armed forces, as well as US society at large. One of the most disturbing things about her analysis occurs when she examines the way in which three women soldiers describe and understand themselves in their own words. Her discussion of the biographies and autobiographies of Kelly Flinn and Kara Hultgreen particularly reveals strong, tough women who at the same time have also a conflicting tendency to understand themselves as victims as well.

Flinn and Hultgreen were trailblazers for women in the USAF. Flinn was the first woman to pilot a B-52 bomber, while Hultgreen was the first female to qualify as a fighter pilot based on an air carrier. Unfortunately, both women had problematic careers. Flinn was court-martialled in 1997 for having an affair with a married man and subsequently left the Air Force with a general discharge. Thus she can be regarded as a 'fallen woman' in this context. Hultgreen was dogged by charges that she had been unfairly promoted to her position as part of a publicity exercise. She was killed in 1994 when her plane crashed on landing approach to the *USS Abraham Lincoln*. There was much speculation that pilot error was at fault. Two separate military reports provided different causes for the accident; the Judge Advocate General (JAG) report listed mechanical failure as the primary cause while the Mishap Investigation Report (MIR) listed pilot error as primary. It is interesting to note that JAG reports are publicly available while MIR reports are seldom made public. Nevertheless, the MIR was eventually leaked to the press (Centre

for Military Readiness (CMR), 2002) in this case perhaps in part because Hultgreen's

ascribed gender was assumed to be the cause of the crash.

Ironically, according to Harrington, the Air Force is considered to be the least

hypermasculine of the services in the US military.[18] Yet, Harrington exposes a continuing

tradition of imposing and validating a hypermasculine ideal member. If we accept that the

other services are even less welcoming to women, we must also consider that the

hypermasculinity exhibited therein will likely be correspondingly more pronounced.   In

the next section I examine the ways in which the third aspect of Butler's framework i.e.,

sexuality is presented, regulated and articulated in the military.

3.5 Sexuality in the military

Until very recently, there has only been one acceptable presentation of sexuality in

the military, heterosexuality. In 1992 this changed in the Canadian Armed Forces, and in

2000 in the British Armed Forces. The US has not followed its counterparts in this

relaxation of the heterosexual standard. The Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT) policy

instituted by President Clinton in 1993 prohibits openly homosexual behaviour and

discussion, effectively banning gay men and lesbians from service unless they entirely

deny or repress their sexual orientation. Members who admit to being gay, or who are

discovered engaging in homosexual conduct or dating same-sex partners, are discharged

dishonourably from the service. One of the implications of DADT for this study has been

the difficulty of recruiting participants from the US military. Even if they no longer serve,

habit, fear of reprisal from the Veteran's Administration, including loss of pension and

benefits, and fear of censure by the military more generally has stopped many members

---

[18] Several participants in my project speculated that this is likely due to the unimportance
of brute physical strength in this service. I deal with my empirical data in chapter 6.

from participating in this and other studies that seek to write about lesbian and gay experience in the US armed forces (see, for example, Estes, 2005).

Canada's official policy is that there is no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in the Armed Forces. Until 1988 it was entirely prohibited for lesbians and gay men to serve in the Canadian military. Indeed, members were required to inform their superior officers if they suspected that a fellow soldier was gay or lesbian. In 1988, the requirement was dropped. Although openly gay and lesbian recruits were still turned away, existing members who were discovered to be gay or lesbian were not dismissed after this point. The latter did, however, face an end to further promotions, security clearances, transfers and re-enlistment. The rationale given was similar to that for the combat exclusion for women: decreased effectiveness, detrimental effect on morale, unit cohesion, discipline and privacy (National Defense Readiness Institute [NDRI] cited in Belkin and McNichol, 2000, p.3).

In response to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) and ensuing judiciary rulings in cases of discrimination against gay men and lesbians, the Department of National Defense repealed this exclusion policy in 1992. As a result, the CF adopted an equality stance in all its dealings with service members. No special treatment or accommodation was to be accorded to members, gay or straight, because of sexual orientation alone. This included issues such as billeting and deployment, on-base accommodation, sanitation facilities and eligibility for partner benefits. Members of the same sex use sex-specific bathrooms, for example, and still sleep in all-female or all-male barracks, as opposed to gay/straight bathrooms and sleeping quarters.

Sexual harassment regulations were also amended to include both sexes. Broader training was included on sexual harassment in order to dispel erroneous myths such as those that suggest that lesbians and gay men will make indiscriminate and unwanted advances towards anyone. It was made clear that "Sexual harassment can be exhibited by anyone, regardless of their sexual orientation (Sexual Harassment and Racism Prevention [SHARP] cited in Belkin and McNichol, 2000, p.13).

It is interesting to note that, just as with the combat exclusion, the ban against gay and lesbian members in the Canadian military was lifted as a result of external, judicial pressure rather than an internal change of mindset. In a similar way, there were many opponents within the CF and dire predictions of mass resignations, an increase in sexual harassment by gay soldiers, more gay bashing and the refusal of vast numbers of members to work for or with gay and lesbian soldiers. Research in the intervening years has shown that none of these predictions came to pass. In their research on the effect of lifting the ban on gay/lesbian members, Belkin and McNichol found, years after the fact, that "while the removal of the ban may not be universally liked among heterosexual soldiers, it does appear to be universally accepted" (2000, p.37). Equally, they found that gay and lesbian members were less stressed and more easily able to accomplish their jobs without fear of discovery. The Canadian military has also gained a larger pool of potential recruits.

The British military has had the same positive experience following the lifting of their ban on gay and lesbian personnel in 2000. Until that year, it was felt that "homosexual behaviour can cause offense, polarize relationships, induce ill-discipline, and as a consequence damage morale and unit effectiveness" (MOD, 1994, p.1). Gay or lesbian recruits were turned away and gay and lesbian members were discharged if

discovered. A series of court challenges that began in 1995 ended with a European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) ruling in September 1999 that the ban violated gay and lesbian members' right to privacy (Walker, 2001). In response, the Ministry of Defence developed a new set of regulations that lifted the ban on gay men and lesbians serving in the military. The integration of these members and the guidelines for conduct are similar to the Canadian model.

In their early study of the effects of British military integration, Belkin and Evans (2000) found no adverse effects. Although there are not more recent studies that I have been able to locate, certain facts point to its relatively unproblematic nature. For example, the Royal Navy, which was initially the most resistant, went on a drive in 2006 to increase its diversity by recruiting more gay and lesbian personnel. During Gay Pride Day celebrations in London in 2008, members of all three branches of the UK military marched in the parade, in uniform, with the military's approval (Times Online, 2008). The lack of discussion of this integration in the popular media also points to its lack of controversy, given the usually high profile of the issue in the past.

However, the US differs from Canada and the UK in that service by gay and lesbian soldiers is still prohibited. As previously outlined, service members who admit to homosexual conduct are discharged, often dishonourably, from the military. Until 1993 there was in fact an outright ban on gays and lesbians in the US military. Periodic purges resulted in hundreds of people being discharged every year. As part of his campaign promises, Bill Clinton pledged to repeal the bans on gays and lesbians if he was elected in 1992. When he was in office he began to pursue this course of action. However, Clinton was faced with stiff opposition from senior military leaders and Congress. In a

compromise move, he failed to repeal the ban but instead instituted what has come to be known as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT), mentioned above. Under DADT, gay and lesbian members would be allowed to serve "if they were not open and if they did not engage in homosexual conduct (Frank, 2004, p.7). There are continuous attempts to challenge DADT but the reasons given for upholding it are the usual ones, concerns about morale, combat effectiveness and privacy[19].

In her analysis of the reasons behind the continuing ban on gays and lesbians in the US military, Kier asserts that the principal underlying reason is that "opponents of lifting all restrictions on homosexual service argue that the integration of gays and lesbians would block the development of *primary group cohesion*, which, they say, is critical to military effectiveness" (1998, p.6, emphasis in the original). This argument is, according to her, based on the assumption that primary group cohesion is indeed critical to military effectiveness and that the introduction of gay and lesbian soldiers would undermine this cohesion. Kier contradicts these assumptions, citing meta analyses of military cohesion studies as uncovering nothing more than a small positive correlation (and no proven causality) between cohesion and performance (see, for example, Mullen and Cooper, 1994). She also points out that the high turnover of small group members in the US military, due both to policies that encourage moving personnel around as needed and to

---

[19] President Obama also pledged to repeal DADT during his campaign. However, a number of months after his inauguration there has been no movement on this issue. It will be interesting to see how long it will take before he fulfills his campaign promise, if indeed he does, during his first term in office. It seems that, despite recommendations to repeal the ban that come from former high-profile supporters of the ban like Colin Powell, there is still much resistance to making this change. In the meantime, critical personnel such as Arabic –English translators continue to be discharged because of their sexual orientation at a time when the US military is stretched increasingly thin in Iraq and Afghanistan.

casualties in time of combat, is antithetical to the espoused theory of cohesion as critical to effectiveness anyway. With regards to the effect of introducing gays and lesbians into these primary groups, i.e., the staff teams, Kier draws a parallel with the introduction of women and African Americans. Predictions that integration of these groups would lead to a breakdown in military group cohesion were not borne out.

In a more recent article, Belkin and Embser-Herbert (2002) propose that, in the face of declining evidence corroborating the primary unit cohesion rationale, the discourse has shifted so that privacy has become the primary reason for excluding gays and lesbians from the military. But these authors contend that there is little evidence to suggest that privacy is important in recruiting and retaining soldiers. Further, the US military is in the process of revamping all its housing so that even more junior members have single rooms and semi-private bathrooms. Belkin and Embser-Herbert also point out that gays and lesbians already serve in the military, and thus already share close quarters with heterosexual members. Ultimately, according to these authors, DADT undermines heterosexual privacy by often forcing women and men who may not look or act in stereotypical ways to put on a heterosexual show in order not to be mistakenly identified as gay and have their privacy further breached by in-depth investigations and interviews with close and extended family, friends, neighbours, acquaintances and others whose paths they cross.

Similarly, Frank (2004) points out that "the effort to protect privacy by limiting statements about homosexuality relies on the assumption that straight service members will be more comfortable and more willing to serve with gays if they do not know or hear about their sexual orientation" (p.29). Frank interviewed 30 gay, lesbian and bisexual

members who had served in the Middle East. According to his correspondents, more and more lesbian and gay members are being open about their orientation with their close primary unit members and/or immediate superiors with seemingly no adverse consequences.

Thus, on the one hand, the militaries of Canada and the UK seem to be experiencing no adverse effects from the removal of discriminatory policies against non-heterosexuals while the US military continues to hold on to DADT in the face of research that shows the unproblematic transitions of the other two militaries. Further, it seems that this military is unwilling to accept that there are LGBT members serving openly and yet not disrupting morale, cohesion or any of the other reasons given for upholding DADT. Clearly, the heterosexual matrix wields great influence over policy-makers in this matter.

Thus far, in sections 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5, I have discussed the ways in which the sexed body, social role and sexuality affect and are affected by the context within women and men serve in the militaries of all three countries. This has revealed a hypermasculine environment within which women and men must operate.

In the next section, I discuss the implications of the hypermasculine context in which the military operates.

3.6 Implications of the hypermasculine context

What are the implications of the hypermasculine context within which soldiers operate? There is no research I have been able to locate that explores the experience of men who may not fit the hyper-macho model. There is, however, research that explores women's experiences and women's ways of coping, and research that explores how gay and lesbian recruits cope. In this section, I will first focus on the effects of the

hypermasculinized context and then on women's ways of coping. In the section that

follows, I will discuss the ways in which non-heterosexual members cope.

3.6.1 Ways women cope with military hypermasculinity[20]

The title of this chapter, taken from an often-used description of military women,

underscores the sexualization that is attached to any woman soldier. Nagel suggests that

"when you take young women and drop them into that hypermasculine environment the

sex stuff just explodes. Some have willing sex. Some get coerced into it. Women are

vulnerable sexually" (quoted in Corbett, 2007, p. 25). This is borne out by the available

data. In 2003, the US Department of Defense (DOD) conducted a study showing that one

third of female veterans have been raped or have experienced attempted rape. Of that

number, 37% were raped more than once, and 14% were gang raped. The DOD

investigated 3038 cases of military sexual assault in 2004 and 2005. However, only 329

cases ended in a court martial of the perpetrator and a guilty sentence. When these

statistics are placed in the context of military life, they are particularly distressing. A

soldier must trust and rely on her/his colleagues in order to accomplish tasks, to stay safe

and to stay alive when deployed. When women are deployed, how can they feel safe in

the face of such statistics? It is also worth pointing out that the historical and current

exclusion of women from the military is partly founded on the claim that they will be

sexually assaulted by the enemy.

Indeed, even in peacetime, many female soldiers encounter sexual harassment,

generally from superiors. When this occurs on deployment, it exacerbates the high level

of stress associated with combat. Further, as the Sunday Times Magazine article points

---

[20] This section echoes findings from the broader gender, work and organizations literature,
however, my focus here is on the military.

out, the incidence of sexual harassment and rape increases during wartime. Combat stress and the stress of being raped each can lead to Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. When they happen concurrently, they have a compound effect on women stationed in 'support' positions in combat areas such as Iraq.

However, the sexualization of women is not new to the military. Hampf (2004), in her examination of women and sexuality in the United States WAC during World War II, describes the way in which "women's sexuality was controlled by discourses of desexualization and/or hypersexualization, by policies denying their sexual agency and of their victimization" (p. 13). As we have seen, the WAC was created during World War II in response to an increasing need for clerical and administrative staff in the military. Especially important and valuable to military leaders was their ability to oversee and direct all aspects of the WACs' lives because they were military, not civilian, personnel. The fact that they were military personnel engendered, according to Hampf, fear that the traditional male-female (protected-protector) roles would be disrupted. It was important that women who joined the military stay as much as possible within the 'natural' role of women as protected by their male military colleagues. Women who joined the WAC were seen as potentially deviant because they were joining an organization that was itself the provider of protection, with an attendant masculine (hetero)sexuality, and as such were vulnerable to "sexual exploitation, discrimination and violence" (Hampf, 2004, p. 16). In order to counter this concern over the potential sexual freedom of the WAC, Oveta Hobby, the Director of the WAC, carefully developed an image in the media of an asexual WAC. Thus, women in the military were seen as deviant from 'normal' women – they

were either highly sexual beings (whores) or asexual, or rather a(hetero)sexual (dykes)[21].
This characterization of military women has remained consistent in the decades since.

Miller (1997), however, contends that women in the military face not just sexual
harassment but also what she terms 'gender harassment'. She characterizes sexual
harassment as "unwanted sexual comments or advances" (1997, p.35) while gender
harassment is "harassment that is not sexual, and is used to enforce traditional gender
roles, or in response to the violation of those roles" (*ibid*). Miller points out that it can be
directed at women and also at men who do not fit the military's hypermasculine
prescription. She makes a connection with sexuality by suggesting that, since an
enactment of non-traditional gender roles is stereotypically thought of as homosexual,
gender harassment enforces both traditional gender roles and heterosexuality.

Miller cites five types of commonly occurring gender harassment:

(1) **Resistance to authority**. Male subordinates are slow to follow females'
orders. If the women report this, it is seen as poor leadership on their part.

(2) **Constant scrutiny by peers or superiors**. This makes it hard for women to
bend the rules for subordinates, leading to perceptions of inflexibility on their
part.

(3) **Gossip and rumours**. A woman who dates more than one man is called a
slut, one who doesn't date is called a dyke.

(4) **Sabotage** of equipment belonging to women in mechanical fields.

---

[21] In this instance I suggest that, according to the military norm, only heterosexuality is
legitimate and therefore women who are the opposite of sexual must either not sleep with
anyone or must be sleeping with other women – which counts as not being sexual at all in
this mindset.

(5) **Indirect threats of rape**. This is often part of a discourse on what might happen if women were allowed to join the combat arms (artillery, combat infantry, etc.)

According to her respondents, gender harassment occurs much more frequently than sexual harassment. Miller provides an interesting rationale for this behaviour. She contends that, in many ways, men see themselves as an oppressed group in the military. They perceive that women get certain advantages because of their sex such as differential physical requirements and maternity leave. As a result, they enact resistance strategies in similar ways to other 'oppressed' groups. Miller acknowledges that men are dominant in the military by virtue of their sex (body). However, many men feel powerless in the face of what they see as forced change in the military and, rather than risk censure by openly opposing such change, they turn to gender harassment as a strategy.

While many female soldiers encounter some or all of the above extreme behaviours, I do not intend to suggest that all women face these issues on a regular basis. However, all women in the military are forced to decide how they will negotiate the hypermasculine context within which they serve. Herbert (1998) provides an insightful and thorough discussion of the ways in which women cope with the paradox they are faced with – i.e. "when military women enact femininity, they are subject to accusations that they are not capable of performing tasks that have been labelled as 'masculine.' When military women enact masculinity, they are subject to accusations that range from lesbianism to incompetence" (1998, pp. 123 – 124).

Herbert surveyed and interviewed a large number of women in her research looking at the way women articulate and enact gender and sexuality in the US military. In

terms of gender, Herbert's respondents painted a picture of women who walk a tightrope between stereotypical femininity and stereotypical masculinity. They cope by trying to be masculine enough to do the job, but feminine enough not to threaten gender norms. It is a difficult balance to achieve. A female soldier may choose to wear a skirt as part of her uniform to defuse suspicions that she's a lesbian, but this may also have the effect of her being perceived as sexually promiscuous or trying to trade on her femininity to get ahead. Conversely, keeping her hair short for convenience and adopting a more forthright demeanour in order to be perceived as having valued military attributes may lead to suspicions of lesbianism.

Finally, Mitchell (1994) offers a similar study of women cadets at the US Military Academy at West Point.   Her respondents suggested that female officers can be neither too feminine nor too masculine.   They must "find a third way" and become "a woman loosely disguised as a man" (p. 53). Mitchell compares this to putting on drag within a discourse constructed by and for men in the military. She asserts that there is an underlying link in the military between the phallus and the job of being a soldier. Within the dominant discourse, gays are "posers, not real men" (p. 55) and women lack a phallus. So, if those with this lack can do the job (i.e. be a good soldier), "what's the use of a phallus, then?" (*ibid.*). In the same vein, I suggest that the concern of the hypergendered military is: if 'not-real-men' (i.e. gay men) can do the job, what's the use of a 'real man'? In the next subsection I discuss ways in which gay and also lesbian members of the military cope with this aspect of their organizational environment.

3.6.2 Ways non-heterosexual people cope with military hypermasculinity

For those in the Canadian and British military, it would seem that sexual

orientation has ceased to be an issue, at least at the policy level. However, attitude change

usually lags behind policy changes, so further research is required to gain a better

understanding of this relationship. And for soldiers in the US military who are not

heterosexual, DADT has very serious consequences. There are no accurate figures on the

proportion of gay and lesbian members in the US Armed Forces for obvious reasons:

admitting non-heterosexual orientation would lead to dishonourable discharge with

potential accompanying losses of benefits and pensions. However, it is clear that self-

identified lesbian, gay and bisexual soldiers have served in the US military for decades.

Estes (2005) interviewed gay veterans as part of an oral history of gay and lesbian

service for their country.   His work is also a chronicle of both official and unofficial

military policy towards gays and lesbians since World War II.   Experiences of non-

heterosexual members seemed to vary according to two criteria, whether it was peacetime

or not and the attitude of their superior officer. During wartime periods such as World

War II, Vietnam, the first Gulf War and the current conflict in Iraq, attitudes seem to relax

somewhat, although gay and lesbian service members still take great pains to hide their

sexual orientation[22]. Indeed, the respondents who served in the 1940s and 1950s provided

accounts that were remarkably similar to those of current service members discussed in

Frank's (2004) paper on gay men and lesbians serving in Iraq. Things they have in

---

[22] There are suggestions in informal discussions, for example with online groups that I contacted in my search for participants, that this is probably a matter of exigency for the military, who wish to retain as many members as possible when faced with declining enlistment and loss of trained personnel, although there is, as stated earlier, no official policy loosening DADT. I return to these issues in my data analysis in chapter 6.

common include continued fear of discovery that leads to lies about themselves and their partners and an inability to let other unit members get close for fear of disclosing too much information. Implications for their effectiveness as serving personnel included interference with their capacity to bond with their peers, to develop trust within their units, to discuss personal matters and to achieve maximum productivity in their working lives as fighters and support personnel (Frank, 2004, p. 3).   Also in common with earlier gay and lesbian service members, a proportion of soldiers who served in Iraq in the current campaign have left the military or decided not to re-enlist.   And, as we know, the US military continues to discharge gay and lesbian soldiers under DADT even though it is experiencing a shortage of personnel in key areas required for their current operations.

Thus, when we examine the implications of the hypermasculine culture of the military, we see several common threads. Excluding women from certain services in the US and British military, and gay men and lesbians from serving at all in the US military, results in lost potential for these organizations. In the case of American lesbians and gay men, it also results in lost opportunities for the pursuit of a chosen career and self-fulfilment within that career.   Women's combat exclusion has direct career consequences as well. These types of postings and this experience are considered among the best preparation for leadership in the services, and are usually a required component of promotion to higher, policy-making ranks. Thus women are effectively shut out from leadership positions from which they could influence further changes in the military (Schmitt 1994, p. A5). In the next section, I examine the literature on military leadership and how it speaks to issues around sex, gender and sexuality.

3.7 Sex, gender, sexuality and leadership in the military

Having examined the three elements of the heterosexual matrix as they affect

soldiers in the military context, i.e. the sexed body, social role and sexuality and ways in

which women and non-heterosexual members have been known to negotiate this context, I

now turn to the literature that examines leadership within a military context. Given that

all members of the military must negotiate and find their place within a hypergendered,

hypermasculine environment and given that leadership is a critical part of military life, it

is useful to see what has already been written about the ways in which these two important

aspects of military life interact.

Leadership is expected from everyone starting with the most junior recruit to the

most senior officer. Its importance is highlighted by its presence in education, training

and evaluation of all service members from the day they join up. The curricula of all the

service academies in all three countries covered here include formal courses on leadership

as well as leadership components in other aspects of cadet life.   Leadership is, in effect,

synonymous with being in the military. As such, all service members must learn to

develop and enact their leadership capabilities.

Because leadership and military life are so closely intertwined, much of the

literature on gender and the military is applicable to gender and leadership in the military.

Some studies, however, examine these issues more explicitly. Role congruity theory

(Eagly et al., 1995) is often used to understand the situation that many female military

leaders find themselves in. Just as they feel they must walk a generic tightrope between

appearing too feminine or too masculine, many female soldiers report having to balance

exhibiting stereotypically feminine leadership characteristics such as compassion,

intuition, empathy, approachability, cooperativeness and ability to listen with stereotypically masculine characteristics such as ability to get the job done, to maintain emotional control, to take action, to be aggressive and to be decisive (Febrarro, 2003, p.55). Similarly, Burnat et al. (1998) studied military training groups containing one token female. They found that men were preferred as leaders in these groups and that women leaders who behaved in a masculine (i.e. gender-inappropriate) way were given a very hard time.

In a related study, Boldry et al. (2001) studied groups of cadets in the Texas A and M University Corps of Cadets in order to understand their perceptions of leadership and gender stereotypes. They found that, in general, cadets believed that men have the leadership attributes necessary for success in the military, while women have feminine attributes that detract from military success and effectiveness. When asked to rate the 'typical' and 'ideal' female and male cadet, both female and male cadets saw men as having more leadership and self-confidence, more dedication, physical fitness and diligence than female cadets. These male cadets were seen as more masculine and less feminine, reflecting an association of masculinity with success and femininity with less leadership and motivation to succeed. Paradoxically, the 'character' of female cadets, described as tactfulness, selflessness, integrity, respect for authority and lack of arrogance, was judged higher than male cadets and the objective measures of leadership performance showed no difference between women and men. Thus these young women and men feel they must reject femininity to be more stereotypically masculine and to be successful military leaders, yet there is a strong sense of the accompanying necessity to maintain gender-congruent roles.

Finally, Boyce and Herd (2003) explored, in a military setting, the assertion made by Eagly et al. (1992) that female leaders were devalued more in a male dominated field, especially when they exhibit stereotypically masculine leadership styles. They surveyed a group of cadets at the USAFA regarding their attitudes and perceptions on leadership. Boyce and Herd found that male cadets believe that successful leadership requires stereotypically masculine behaviour, while female cadets saw it as requiring a combination of masculine and feminine behaviours. Further, male cadets were more aware of the differences between women and successful leaders/officers while female cadets saw the similarities. In contrast with studies in non-military settings, exposure to female leadership did not diminish the degree of masculine stereotyping. Further, senior cadets were found to have much stronger masculine stereotypes of successful leadership than first-year cadets, regardless of their sex.

Importantly, these studies point to the lack of change in attitudes and perceptions about masculinity, femininity and leadership in the military. A quarter of a century earlier, researchers had found that male cadets were perceived to be more effective leaders than female cadets (Rice et al., 1977; Rice et al., 1980) even though they found no difference in actual leadership effectiveness (Adams, 1980). It is interesting to note that Morgan (2004) found very few gender-related differences in leadership performance or style in cadets of the West Point class of 1998. Thus we see that, although both style and work outcome of male and female cadets may be similar, they are perceived differently because of their gender.

While all of the above studies examined perceptions and performance of female versus male leaders, they were unable to explore these issues in a newly opened role for

women in the military, that of combat. The only study that offers such insights at the time of writing is Febrarro (2003). The author discusses the experiences of the 26 women in the Canadian combat arms, a set of specialties closed to women in the US and the British forces. These women, both staff team members and leaders, saw the need for both feminine and masculine behaviour in a good leader, just like many, although not all, of the women in the studies above. They did see it as problematic for women to behave in only feminine ways or to present a hyperfeminine appearance. However, in contrast to other studies, Febrarro did not find that her participants were censured for exhibiting masculine leadership characteristics, as long as they were not <u>too</u> loud or assertive. The female leaders did not feel they had to become more masculine to be effective leaders in the combat arms, although the female staff team members disagreed. There was a consensus that women leaders needed to develop their own, unique leadership style that integrated both feminine and masculine characteristics, even though one quarter of the women also felt that they walked a fine line between being too feminine and too masculine.

What are the implications of the above studies? Women, by virtue of visibly not adhering to the prescribed hypermasculinity of the military, have to negotiate a delicate balance in order to be perceived as effective leaders – and often that perception is at odds with their actual effectiveness as leaders. There is also <u>no</u> work that examines the relationship between sexuality and leadership – and it is unclear why this is the case when (hetero)sexuality is enforced just as rigidly through the hypermasculine discourse discussed earlier in this chapter.

3.8 Summary

The literature discussed in this chapter attempts to understand varying aspects of sex, gender and sexuality as they affect the military, including leadership in the military. Much of it parallels and replicates the literature on leadership in general and on gender issues in organizations. As such, it shares both strengths and weaknesses of that literature. The literature on gays and lesbians in the military is unique, in that much of it addresses an organizational peculiarity, i.e., regulations that openly and unapologetically forbid membership in this organization on the basis of sexual orientation alone. Certainly, all these literatures have contributed to a greater understanding of the difficulties that many people face in their professional military lives because of their sex, their gender and/or their sexual orientation.

However, there are certain points that, as suggested earlier, can be raised in a critique of this literature. First, like the broader gender and leadership literature, we find research on the military that groups all women together and all men together. Even when assessing decisions to act in stereotypically feminine or masculine ways, no account is taken of the range of femininities and masculinities expressed by individuals. Further, virtually all the literature on gender (social role) and the military focuses on the ways in which women try to deal with hypermasculine culture: no studies have tried to examine the ways in which men who are not hypermasculine – or even men who conform to these expectations – negotiate this environment.

The research on sexuality and the US military is constrained by DADT, and therefore the difficulty in finding respondents who are of differing sexualities – not just gay and lesbian, but variations of gay and lesbian, bisexual and transgendered identities. Very little research has been done on gay and lesbian service members in the Canadian

and British Forces either – ostensibly because there has not been significant fallout from the lifting of the 'gay ban' in these services and thus little discussion or impetus for research.   However, the fact that only 17 service members had applied for same-sex partner benefits in the CF several years after the lifting of the ban suggests a reluctance to come out publicly and thus bears further investigation.

There is likewise overall little acknowledgement in these studies that 'gender' (as it is denoted in this research) is more complex than one's sexed body or masculinity/femininity or the label one attaches to one's social role or sexual orientation. There is also little examination of the way in which this complex set of characteristics informs and intersects with the leadership that all members of the military are expected to learn, develop, interact with and improve throughout their careers. Research that uses the approach I described at the end of the previous chapter would begin to address some of these issues. Indeed, the reviews so far of several strands of literature on leadership, sex, gender, sexuality and the military underpins my focus on how members who don't fit into the prescribed hypermasculine norms enact their leadership in the military.

We can see from the above that the literature addresses each of the threads of this project independently, to a greater or lesser extent, but fails to look at the places where they intersect. Much has been written about how women negotiate daily life in the military, considerably less about how non-heterosexual people do this. Much has also been written about the supposed essential differences between women and men as leaders, and about the differential ways in which women and men are perceived as leaders by their peers and their subordinates in the military. However much less has been written about the way in which people actually enact their leadership in the military, especially in

consideration of having to lead within a hypergendered context such as the one that I have been discussing in this chapter. Virtually nothing has been written about the way in which gay men and lesbians are perceived as leaders or the ways in which they enact their leadership. The military thus provides an interesting critical case for the examination of the intersection of gender, sexuality and leadership – on an enacted as well as a theoretical level.

However, the military is an incomplete case, in the sense that it only represents one possible example of hypergendering in an organization or institution. Loughlin and Arnold state that "The masculine nature of the military exposes barriers facing many women elsewhere" (2007, p. 147). In that sense, my project exposes the ways in which women leaders negotiate difficulties in enacting leadership elsewhere. However, as I point out in chapter 2, it is important to move beyond looking at all women as if they were the same, and all men as if they were the same, and try to understand the ways in which the sexed body (sex), social role (gender) and sexual orientation (sexuality) intersect with other aspects of organizations. Thus, in order to gain a more complete understanding of the ways in which sex, gender, sexuality and leadership intersect, I chose to also examine an institution that is hypergendered in a different way – nursing. Nursing is a profession that has been coded as feminine since its inception, and it thus provides both contrast to and support for the conclusions already reached about military organizations. In the next chapter I therefore perform an analysis of the nursing profession that is similar to my analysis of the military.

4.0 Sex, Gender, Sexuality and Nursing Leadership: The Lady with the Lamp

4.1 Introduction

The title of this chapter refers to a popular image of Florence Nightingale ministering

to sick and wounded soldiers at Scutari during the Crimean War. The original

woodcut by an unknown engraver, published in 1855, is part of the archive collection

at the National Portrait Gallery (NPG) in London and was the basis for the adapted

portrait of Nightingale that adorned £10 notes from 1975 to 1993 (BBC, 2002). Its

standing at the NPG and its use in banknotes are both testament to her prominent

place in British culture and in the history of nursing. The lamp is symbolic of the way

in which Nightingale 'shed light' on the 'darkness' of the largely uninformed,

unsanitary and unprofessionalized nursing practice of her time. It is also meant to

remind us that she led the way forward into a modernized nursing practice where

professional training, reformed sanitary conditions and an expectation of service and

care from nurses helped hospitals to become places where people could actually find

hope of recovery as opposed to being fearful of succumbing to disease and infection.

The lady is symbolic of the feminine gender ethos that has permeated and continues

to permeate the nursing profession in the UK, Canada and the United States since

Nightingale's time. The purpose of this chapter, like the previous one on the military,

is to understand the context within which women and men work as nurses today in a

profession so clearly and closely identified with this 'lady'.

The first section thus provides a historical background for my project by

describing, in brief, the development of the nursing profession in the UK, Canada and

the US. Then, in order to examine the feminine hypergendering of nursing, I will, in

keeping with Butler's framework discussed in the conceptual review (chapter 2) and

used in chapter 3, examine three aspects of this gendering, the sexed body, social

role, and sexuality. I will look at how these three elements of Butler's heterosexual

matrix are hyperfeminized in the places where nurses work in the three countries.

In terms of the body, an examination of the ways in which women and men

follow different career paths and are steered into different specialisms can shed light

on the hypergendered nature of the nursing profession. Typically, men who enter

nursing are encouraged to seek administrative and managerial positions rather than

serve as ward nurses. They also tend to be found in much greater proportions in

psychiatric units and 'high velocity' environments such as emergency that are

characterized by rapid decision-making, high risk situations and often the extensive

use of medical technology. In order to understand the social role aspect of nursing I

will examine the qualities that are associated with and have become synonymous

with nursing. In particular, I highlight how the feminine, caring ethos of nursing

contrasts with the masculine, curing ethos of the physician's world, and how this

femininity has become intimately tied to notions of appropriate behaviour and self-

presentation for nurses. Finally, although the sexuality of nurses is not regulated in

the same way as that of members of the armed forces, an examination of the way in

which male nurses in particular confront stereotypes about their sexuality allows us

to understand that, in its own way, nursing is as heterosexist as the military.

One of the threads that runs through much of this chapter is the way in which

male nurses, who are in a minority, have a vastly different experience from the

women who are in a minority in the military. Instead of being cut off from the top, or having their progress on the career ladder impeded by an unchanging view of the place of women and men, male nurses find that they are afforded an easier and quicker path to power and prestige.[23] In the last part of this chapter I look at some of the literature in nursing that attempts to understand how members of this profession, both women and men, negotiate their leadership in this hyperfeminized environment, and how a profession that is facing serious leadership challenges due to looming retirements tries to move beyond gendered expectations and volatile environments, all the while being still stuck within a mostly patriarchal medical field.

4.2 Historical Background

In this section I provide a brief history of the development of nursing in the three countries. Ironically, the first nurses on record were men, not women, who were members of monastic orders as early as 4 AD (Evans, 2004). But it was the crusades that brought about the first formally designated hospital carers. In 1048, the Knights Hospitaller of St. John of Jerusalem, as part of their mandate to defend Jerusalem, provided protection and care for pilgrims travelling to the Holy Land. Their present day incarnation, the Sovereign Order of Malta, still performs medical and humanitarian missions, as do other organizations linked to the Knights, including, in many countries, the St. John's Ambulance. Members of the Nightingale School of Nursing at St. Thomas Hospital in London nowadays wear a pin with the Maltese Cross on it to symbolize their humanitarian work and to remember the link with these long-ago nurses (Rode, 1989). Similar orders were formed in Europe at this time, among them the Knights of St. Lazarus and the

---

[23] Williams (1992) calls the phenomenon the "glass escalator effect" (p.264).

Teutonic Knights. The Knights were not, however, the only nursing orders: there were also non-military religious orders such as the Brothers of St. Anthony, founded in 1095 (Mericle, 1983), that also provided nursing care during this period.

The next major surge in nursing orders in the west came in response to the devastation of the Plague during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Orders like the Alexian Brothers, founded in 1472, provided nursing care to "beggars, lepers, 'morons' and 'lunatics'" (Kaufman, 1976, p. 23). After the eighteenth century the primary care responsibility of the Alexians became the mentally ill, a connection that persisted into the twentieth century when they ran hospitals and schools to train men in psychiatric nursing. The Alexian Brothers still provide nursing care in the US, the UK and Europe.

In the UK, the dissolution of the monasteries in the mid-sixteenth century left the provision of nursing care largely in the hands of individuals, as opposed to organizations. Nursing at this point was mostly about care*taking* as opposed to caring – nurses kept patients out of trouble if they were violent or dangerous, and perhaps handed out medication, but had little else to do with looking after them. This approach to patient care persisted until the mid-nineteenth century when Victorian ideas about public health, along with emerging theories about sanitation and medicine, began to create a need for people who actually cared for patients.

The advent of several key Victorian social institutions, i.e., the charity hospital, the workhouse and the asylum, began to create corresponding niches for nurses. For example, charity hospitals such as the Manchester Royal Infirmary housed sex-segregated groups of women and men patients (MacKintosh, 1997). Individuals were now needed to be custodians of the relatively large populations of these

hospitals. Typically, men were employed for custodial care of male, often alcoholic,

violent or mentally ill patients (Mericle, 1983) and women for the care of female

patients. As suggested earlier, this trend of hiring male nurses to care for violent

and/or mentally ill patients continues today, where many male nurses are tracked

into psychiatric nursing careers. Private asylum nursing was equally specialized and

sex-specific, requiring brute physical strength due to the violent nature of many

inmates, and here the hired men acted more like guards than carers. Workhouse

infirmaries, on the other hand, had the least use for outside nurses, given that

inmates often took care of each other in sex-segregated wards (White, 1975). All of

these types of institutions offered little pay and no sense of providing real care or

helping to cure illness. As a result, they were not able to attract very good

candidates, eventually leading to the development of a "low and dubious reputation"

for nursing (Evans, 2004, p. 233).

During this time religious nursing orders continued to perform nursing roles

in Europe and there were early but ineffectual attempts at reforming the profession

by these orders in the 1840's. However, it is generally agreed that the reform of

nursing into a reputable and effective health care profession in Europe and indeed

elsewhere effectively began with the British nurse Florence Nightingale's actions

during the Crimean War (1853-1856) and her subsequent post-war work. Her

efforts were to have far-reaching effects not only on the way nurses carried out their

duties, but also on the very way in which the nursing profession is perceived.

Nightingale's definition of nursing as an extension of women's 'natural' ability to care

for others underlies the gender relations and gender ethos of nursing today in much of the Western world.

Indeed, Nightingale influenced both the institution of nursing and health-care practices in general. She wrote on the importance of clean air, clean water, proper drainage, clean rooms and good lighting in caring for sick people: "It [nursing] has been limited to signify little more than the administration of medicines and the application of poultices. It ought to signify the proper use of fresh air, light, warmth, cleanliness, quiet, and the proper selection and administration of diet – all at the least expense of vital power to the patient." (Nightingale, 1860, pp. 2-3). She broadened the scope of nurses' ward work from cleaning floors and administering medicine to the systematic and professional maintenance of a high standard of hygiene and care that reduced mortality rates among the wounded soldiers at the Scutari barracks during the Crimean War. Upon Nightingale's return to the UK she opened the Nightingale Training School for Nurses at St. Thomas Hospital in London in 1860. The school's graduates subsequently worked as nurses in hospitals all over Britain, implementing her theories about nursing practice and health and hygiene as they went. Through visits to hospitals, lectures and writing, Nightingale continued to disseminate her theories about both nursing and health care practices regularly and to anyone who would listen until her death in 1910.

Importantly, and as aforementioned, Nightingale believed that nursing was a natural occupation for women, being an extension of their 'natural' role in life. She believed that women were 'natural' caregivers whose roles as daughters, wives and mothers relied upon the deployment of these qualities. They were thus, in

Nightingale's opinion, uniquely suited to work as nurses, provide they received

training in how to apply those talents to the sickroom or hospital ward. Through her

work during the Crimean War and in British hospitals she also saw a dire need for

nurses who were professionally educated. She strove to make nursing into a

respectable profession for young middle-class Victorian women who would fill that

need. They would be a far cry from the poor, ill-informed and uneducated, often

themselves alcoholic and/or psychologically disturbed, individuals who had often

performed this role until then. Nightingale established schools of nursing that were

female only, in which the educational model was based on residential apprenticeship

in hospitals – a model that was to have an eventual effect on the perceived

professionalism, or lack thereof, of nurses in a far more degree-conscious twentieth

century.

By the end of the nineteenth century, then, nursing was firmly established as a

female, and feminine, occupation in both general hospitals and workhouse

infirmaries. Asylum patients were still sex-segregated and therefore asylum nursing

was the one place where both female and male nurses were found. While the

Crimean War provided the background for Nightingale's experiences and subsequent

influence on the practice of nursing, World War I was a second watershed for the

profession. In 1919 the Nurses' Registration Act was enacted and acted as the first

official gatekeeper to the profession. It engendered the formation of the UK's General

Nursing Council (GNC) that offered full membership only to women who had been or

became trained as general nurses. Nursing thus became, according to MacKintosh,

the "first self-determining all-female occupation" (1997, p. 234). Between September

1921 and December 1938, 97,028 women were registered as general nurses, versus

435 men who were separately added to a complementary register (MacKintosh,

1997, p. 234).

By 1937, male nurses had formed a separate organization, the Society of Male

Registered Nurses, as an avenue of mutual support and adherence to the principles

of the GNC. One aim of this society was to correct imbalances in training. For

example, at that time, female nurses received thirty to thirty-six months of nursing

education, while male nurses received only half of that. Also, only female nurses

received training on diseases (Mericle, 1983).

The modern trajectory of nursing in Canada[24] begins with a much earlier

figure than Nightingale, Jeanne Mance, a French woman living in the province of

Quebec (then Lower Canada) during the seventeenth century. She opened the first

hospital in the country, Hotel Dieu, in 1642. The Grey Nuns, also known as the

Sisters of Charity were founded in 1737 by Marguerite d'Youville and became

Canada's first visiting nurses (Rogers, 2008). These nurses were mobile as well as

stationed in hospitals. This was a novel way of providing nursing care to a sparse

population that was scattered over a vast terrain. Distances between homesteads

and hospitals could be so great as to make it impractical for many people to receive

the nursing care they required. By moving the nurse instead of the patient the Grey

Nuns made it possible for a much larger proportion of the population to receive care.

For the next two centuries nursing was traditionally the domain of religious orders

like the Grey Nuns who opened the first hospital in western Canada in 1871 and

---

[24] Unless otherwise specifically cited, all the dates and events describing the evolution of
nursing in Canada and the US are taken from Kunz (2009).

between 1891 and 1916 opened medical missions in Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories.

The first training school for nurses was opened in St. Catherine's, Ontario, in 1874 and was attached to a hospital. In 1881 Toronto General Hospital opened its school for nurses' education which continues to be a major institution of nursing education in Canada. A later director, Mary Agnes Snively, helped to set up the first professional organization of nurses, the Canadian National Association of Trained Nurses (CNATN) in 1908. In 1924 the CNATN became the Canadian Nurses Association (CNA), the name by which it is still known today (CNA, 2009).

Canadian nurses began to play a large role in caring for soldiers in conflicts such as the Northwest Rebellion of 1885 and the Boer War (1899 – 1902). During the latter war they received the rank and pay equivalent to that of a lieutenant of the Army. In 1904 the Canadian Army Medical Corps created a formal nursing service and, in keeping with earlier practice, conferred officer rank on all nurses, a practice that continues until today.

Canada also became a pioneer in nursing education in the British Empire with the establishment of the baccalaureate degree programme in nursing at the University of British Columbia in 1919. However, nursing education during most of the 20th century continued to be split between hospital-sponsored programmes, community colleges and university undergraduate degrees. There are no longer any hospital sponsored programmes. Moreover, over the past two decades, provinces have been shifting away from college programmes towards undergraduate education in their quest to professionalize nursing further.

In the US, Nightingale's "Notes on Nursing" were used as a guide by women who cared for soldiers wounded in the Civil War. These seem to have been the first American women to identify as members of a separate nursing profession. In 1873 the first formal nursing schools were founded in New York, Connecticut and Boston. By 1900 there were 432 nursing schools in the US. All these schools were attached to hospitals and followed the apprenticeship model of teaching discussed later in this chapter.

In 1897 the American Nurses' Association was formed and became the first women's professional group in the US. Their objectives were to set professional standards, regulate the training of nurses and set up a nurses' registry. The Yale School of Nursing, established in 1923, became the first autonomous nursing school, i.e., that had its own administrative and pedagogical structure in the same way as the other university faculties. Other universities began offering nursing diploma and undergraduate degree programmes in the 1920s and 1930s. However, nursing education in the US continued, like Canada and the UK, to be split between hospital-based programmes, colleges and universities. In 1948, a national study called Nursing For the Future recommended moving nursing education away from hospitals and into colleges and universities exclusively. That is still the case today, although there is movement away from college programmes towards university programmes exclusively.

In reading about the development of the nursing profession in all three countries, it also becomes clear that, either paradoxically or predictably, wars have had a significant effect on a profession dedicated to the care of the sick and suffering.

The crusades marked the beginning of formalized nursing orders such as the Knights

of St. John. Centuries later, the Crimean War was the background for Nightingale's

writing and efforts to reform nursing into a profession, albeit one suitable only for

young women. The American Civil War, the Northwest Rebellion and the Boer War

all provided opportunities for women nurses to be recognized as critical caregivers

on the battlefield, as well as the impetus for the formation of nursing schools and

associations.

Latterly, World War I afforded women who volunteered as nurses the

opportunity to work in unfamiliar environments and demonstrate their ability, as

nurses, to hold their own and to contribute in a significant way to the care of soldiers.

Nurses from all three countries served in World War I although they were always not

treated equally to men. For example, it was not until 1920 that, with support from

the physicians who had served with them, nurses were able to achieve equivalent

rank to men in the US Army.

World War II also provided the opportunity for large numbers of nurses to

contribute to the Allied war effort. Canada sent 4,500 nurses overseas, while in the

US 75,000 out of 274,405 nurses volunteered for military duty (Cummings, 1995).

Nurses were also important providers of medical care during subsequent conflicts

such as the Korean War and the Vietnam War. Cummings asserts that the

participation of nurses in war led to the improvement of nursing education,

highlighted the value of nursing care and led to the development of new medical and

caring techniques. However, she also concludes that nurses' participation in wars

"did not significantly impact the image of nursing as a predominantly female

profession." (1995, p. 21). Thus, even as they were working alongside male soldiers and mostly male physicians, often just behind the front lines, and earning equivalent pay, nurses continued to be identified with the feminine. I discuss this feminization of nursing and its implications later in this chapter.

Wars were therefore pivotal in the historical development of both the military and nursing. For women in the military, wars provided the opportunity to serve openly as women and to eventually move into a larger variety of military occupations. War also opened up senior ranks to women. For nurses, war brought the opportunity for the profession as a whole to be recognized as a health care profession rather than simply a collection of women performing the same type of caring that women generally performed at home as part of their role in the family. Further, wars enabled nurses to prove that they were able to withstand the difficult environment of a war zone and perform their duties under pressure. This garnered respect for the women themselves and for the profession as a whole.

As in the previous chapter, having discussed the history of nursing as a profession, I now turn to the hypergendered character of nursing. Thus, I use Butler's (1990) three elements, sex (the body), gender (social role) and sexuality (sexual orientation) to discuss the ways in which nursing became and, to a large extent, remains a profession with a strong hyperfeminine gender. In the proceeding section I examine the ways in which women and men have been included, excluded or limited in their membership of the nursing profession of all three countries. In section 4.4 I discuss the feminine gendering of nursing, while in section 4.5 I examine

the ways in which a homosexual orientation has been stereotypically associated with male nurses.

4.3 The body: women's work?

The participation of men in the nursing profession in all three countries since its reformation by Nightingale has been both restricted and specialized. For example, until the Second World War men were restricted in their choice of nursing specialisms in all three countries. However, in the UK, during the 1920s and 1930s a greater variety of occupational choices had opened up for women, thus leading to a shortage of nurses. At the same time, the rise in the number of general hospitals increased the need for nurses to fill posts. This opened up general hospital nursing to small numbers of men for the first time. Moreover, the continuing need for more nurses during World War II, both at home and abroad, led to more acceptance of male nurses, which in turn led to shortened registration requirements for returning service nurses after the war.

In 1949 the UK Nurses' Registration Act formally ended the sex segregation of nursing, allowing men the opportunity to work in any nursing specialty. According to MacKintosh (1997) however this had some problematic consequences. Because nursing was still viewed as a naturally female occupation, the entry of men seemed to "disturb the respectability of the profession"(p. 235). This led to the feeling that men who entered this profession were not 'real' men, because it was not a 'natural' occupation for them. MacKintosh also points out that poor working conditions, i.e., low pay, low status, hard, sometimes unpleasant work and long hours with little recognition, were just as undesirable for men as they were for women, thus limiting the success of attempts to increase numbers in the profession overall. Those men who did enter nursing also still found it hard to

shake the earlier disreputable reputation associated with the male asylum nurses of the nineteenth century. As a result, their prospects for promotion remained poor until the changes brought about by the Salmon Report (1967). This Report engendered health-care reform by encouraging the use of more business-like, effective and rational methods for health care delivery. The fact that these approaches are associated with stereotypically male behaviour reversed the fortunes of male nurses and paved the way for their fast tracking to the upper echelons of nursing management. I explore this development further below in the section on social role.

In contrast, however, by World War II severe shortages of nurses in the US and Canada had not led to increased admission of male nurses into the profession nor to a shorter route to certification for returning service members afterwards (Becker Library, cited in Evans, 2004). It was not until 1955 in the US and 1967 in Canada that men were even allowed to become nurses in the predominantly male armed forces (Evans 2004). By 1960, only 1% of American nurses were men (Mannino, 1963). To this day nursing remains a largely female occupation: in the US, only 5.7% of RN's are male (NSSRN, 2004), in the UK, approximately 10% (Ryan and Porter, 1993; PSI, 2007) and in Canada 5.5% (Stats Canada, 2006).

One way that men were excluded from the nursing profession was through nursing schools that did not admit male students (Bentley, 1959). The reasons given were usually either lack of residential accommodation for men (Hamilton, 1979) or lack of bathroom facilities (Bentley 1959). It is interesting to note that these are the same arguments used by the Armed Forces of the UK, Canada and the US to exclude, at various times, women and gay people, as discussed in the previous chapter. Even when men were able to train as

nurses they found it difficult to find employment, according to Wedgery (1966), who also notes, for example, that US hospitals preferred to hire male orderlies to perform any physical labour required on wards.

In 1971 the American Assembly for Men in Nursing (AAMN) was formed. According to Lewis (1997), this male-only association was in response to the exclusion of men from professional nursing associations. Unlike its British counterpart, the Society for Male Registered Nurses (SMRN) which was formed 34 years earlier, the AAMN's goals were not to simply connect with its sister organizations, but rather to champion the cause of male nurses attempting to become fully-fledged members of the profession (Poliafico, 1998).

Interestingly, unlike their American and British counterparts, Canadian male nurses have never formed a separate professional body. Although men could theoretically train as nurses, by 1961 only 25 out of 170 nursing schools accepted male applicants (Hunter, 1974). Even into the 1970s male students had difficulty gaining admission to some schools due to a lack of residential accommodation (Evans, 2004).

An examination of the sex composition of nursing specialties and hierarchies as well as an understanding of typical female and male career paths further highlights the sex divide that still exists in nursing today. In some ways, the earlier career paths that linked male nurses with psychiatric/asylum work and female nurses with general ward work continue. Female nurses are more likely to work in wards, community nursing and education – areas that bring lots of contact with patients but limited promotion opportunities. Men are more likely to be found in psychiatric nursing and emergency medicine, areas that offer faster paths to promotion and are generally faster moving per se.

Although there are easily available statistics on the sex composition of the nursing profession in all three countries, it is much more difficult to find statistics on the sex composition of nursing <u>management</u> positions. However, we do know, for example, that in the UK, the Policy Studies Institute found that "they [men nurses] are also significantly more likely to be found in the higher nursing grades than female nurses" (PSI, 2007) and this advantage increases as they become more senior. Less than ten percent of nurses are men (Ryan and Porter, 1993; PSI, 2007), yet they comprise more than thirty percent of these in senior management positions (Holyoake, 2001). To put that in perspective, in 1970, thirty-three percent of male nurses held top UK nursing jobs, even though they composed only ten percent of the nursing population (Bradley, 1989). Nearly forty years later, the imbalance in proportional representation of male nurses in top jobs remains the same.

As already established, in the US, 5.7% of RNs are male (NSSRN, 2004). The majority of them work in high-visibility, high prestige areas like intensive care units (ICU), emergency rooms (ER) and operating theatres (OR). These specialties are recognized as having more potential for promotion to leadership and managerial positions than ward work or community work (Squires, 1995). In Canada, in 2006, 5.5% of the 314,900 registered nurses were male (Stats Canada, 2006). Here also, male nurses were found mostly in ER, psychiatric nursing and administrative posts. It was not possible to find recent statistics on the sex composition of nursing management positions for either the UK or Canada.

Hospitals themselves often play into sex-based stereotypes. For example, in the UK in 2006 a male nursing student successfully sued the NHS because he was banned

from performing procedures on female patients, even though female nurses could perform intimate procedures on both sexes. The provisions in the SDA regarding special occupational requirements were not applied to this case. Although the NHS does not have a specific policy of allocating tasks according to sexed body, this type of informal policy continues to reinforce stereotypes about the appropriateness of men performing 'feminine' work (*The Guardian*, 2007).

Ironically, in the US, the privacy argument that is used by the military to keep out lesbians and gay men is often used to prevent male nurses from working in specific areas of hospitals such as labour and delivery. As we saw in chapter 3, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (CRA) prohibits discrimination in employment with regard to race, colour, religion, sex and national origin. The only exception to this is "*bona fide* occupational qualification (BFOQ) reasonably necessary to the normal operation of that particular business or enterprise" (CRA, 1964, sec. 703). According to Kapczynski, this exception is "intended to be narrowly interpreted." A sex-based BFOQ should have a "'factual basis' to believe that 'all or substantially all women [or men] would be unable to perform safely and efficiently the duties of the job involved,'" or, alternatively, demonstrate that the qualification in question relates to "the 'essence,' or to the 'central mission of the employer's business.'" (2003, p. 1257) Kapczynski points out for example, that customer preference is not intended to be interpreted in this way when hiring sales staff. However the use of female actors for female parts in the theatre or the use of female agents in particular undercover operations are legitimate and correct interpretations of this exception to the BFOQ rule. The related concept of same-sex privacy is also put forward as a BFOQ exception and has been successfully used to segregate washrooms,

nursing homes, and youth centres on the basis of sex. It has also been used successfully as suggested to exclude male nurses from labour and delivery rooms in the United States.

Nonetheless, it is clear that, in contrast to the military, nursing is a hypergendered profession in which the non-prescribed sex seems largely to <u>benefit</u> from its difference. Women in the military are at a disadvantage when it comes to senior ranks and promotion. Yet in nursing it seems to be easier to become a senior manager for men than it is for women, the prescribed sex. In the next section I examine the ways in which nursing is constructed as feminine and look at the implications of this gender ethos.

4.4 Social role: the femininity of caring

In trying to understand the hyperfeminine social role that imbues the nursing profession in the three focal countries here, and more generally, we must look at two key issues, the patriarchal structural arrangements of health care and the effects of efforts to make health care delivery more business-like in the latter part of the twentieth century. The feminization of nursing began with Nightingale's vision of nursing as an extension of women's 'natural' role in life, discussed earlier. It was strengthened by the apprenticeship residential model that she established for nursing education, which persisted well into the twentieth century (Palmer, 1983). Until the 1950s, nursing students in all three countries apprenticed in a sex-segregated, residential hospital setting in similar ways to Nightingale's students. Within this system they were part of the hospital 'family': they were the weak, submissive female partners in health care, following orders handed out by strong, directive male physicians (Cummings, 1995).

The apprentice model serves two main purposes, to train aspiring nurses in the technical aspects of their jobs and to socialize them to fit into the existing hospital context.

Indeed, Nightingale's nurses took their place as apprentices in a health care system patterned after the Victorian family (Ashley, 1977). As Cummings (1995) explains, the physicians, who were almost all male, were equated with strength and thus held the role of the father. Nurses, on the other hand, who were female, were equated with weakness and thus held the role of the mother or helper to the physicians, thus continuing their subordinate, apprentice role. Patients were, of course, the children who needed guidance and curing from their physician fathers and care from their nursing mothers. Nurses were imbued with the requisite "feminine values -- motherly nests, femininity, service and efficiency" (Cummings, 1995 p. 19). According to Cummings, the apprentice model "was considered an appropriate method of facilitating nurses' training so [female] student nurses would continue their traditional [feminine] gender socialization" (p. 22).

Nurses lived in the hospital and learned on the job by observing other nurses and attending a small number of classes, the latter usually taught by physicians. There was no sense of a separate body of medical nursing knowledge -- their place was to support and assist the physicians who did the 'real' healing work. The patriarchal structural arrangements of nursing left little room for men to be nurses, for women to be self-determining, or for patients to be actively involved in making decisions about their care. Even when the profession began to move towards independent schooling, the clinical component of nurses' education was still controlled by hospital clinicians, not academic instructors, and thus continued to be partly educational and partly gender role socialization. It was not until the 1960s and 1970s when nursing care began to separate from medical care and women became physicians in greater numbers that the gender socialization of nurses was gradually, but not entirely, stripped away from their education.

Porter (1992, p.512) uses Hearn's concept of the 'patriarchal feminine' to describe the nursing profession: "feminine because it accords to the feminine 'caring' stereotype; patriarchal because in doing so it reinforces female subordination". These structural arrangements continue today within a patriarchal, physician-dominated health care system (Evans, 1997). Even though there are increasing numbers of female physicians in all three countries, doctors are still associated with the active, technical, stereotypically masculine ethos of curing – in stark opposition to nursing's feminine ethos of caring. This opposition is exacerbated by the differences in educational requirements for each profession. Typically, physicians require several years of university study to earn an undergraduate medical degree, followed by a varying number of years of training and professional examinations. Specialists or consultants can have as many as eight or ten years of formal education. Even though there is a strong clinical component to physicians' education, it is considered to be quite different from the apprenticeship model discussed above or even from current nursing training, which typically is seen as requiring 'only' a three or four year undergraduate degree at best.

Admittedly, efforts in the past decades to legitimize nursing have, as indicated, included the replacement of residential apprenticeship models of training with more formalized degree programmes in all three countries. For example, Project 2000 in the UK has sought to professionalize nursing education. In Canada, the provinces have gradually shifted to a university level education model for nurses, with only three provinces still allowing hospital or college-based training and the Canadian Nurses Association recommending an undergraduate university degree as the minimum requirement for qualification. In the US nursing training still takes place in colleges and

hospitals although this is being replaced by university programmes with the support of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN).

However, a lingering effect of the early model has been that nursing arguably continues to be perceived by many as a low-value, low-skilled occupation that does not get much respect in a wider society that is itself patriarchal (Porter, 1982; Palmer, 1983). Nurses continue to be seen as subordinate to physicians, merely carrying out their instructions. They are not perceived as having their own, specialized body of knowledge – unlike other health care groups such as physiotherapists for example – even though nursing care is indeed quite different from the 'curing' activities of physicians. For example, as medicine has become more complex, physicians have had to share their curing duties. Nurses have become more specialized, learning to work with new technologies for example, so that nursing care and medical care have become more and more separate (Cummings, 1995). Now nurses' area of expertise often combines caring, curing and managerial components while physicians continue with specialized curing and managerial roles alone. As a result, there have been many autonomous nursing roles that have developed – for example, nurse practitioner, clinical nurse specialist and nurse anaesthetist. These new positions clearly demonstrate very specialized medical knowledge in combination with the traditional caring roles. However, the caring role, with its overriding feminine coding, overshadows these technical aspects such that 'feminine' nurses are still valued less than the 'masculine' physicians they work with.

The second major contributor to the gendering of nursing has been the effort to make health care delivery more "business like". In the UK, for example, the Report of the Committee on Senior Nursing Staff Structure (Salmon, 1966), recommended steps to

improve nursing care by implementing industrial management theories and practices. The most direct result was that there was now more equal access to nursing training and posts for men and women. However, according to Bradley, management jobs in nursing also became "ripe for male capture" (1989, p. 197). The association, in a management context, of leadership and management with stereotypically masculine attributes was superimposed on nursing management. Thus, male nurses, by virtue of their sex and its associated social role, were perceived as having the necessary attributes to become supervisors, leaders and managers in nursing. Just as women were perceived as 'naturally' feminine, and therefore suited to be nurses, men were perceived to be 'natural' managers. This was, of course, a convenient way to situate men whose place within this feminized profession was uncomfortable and problematic. According to Williams (1995) men who presented as masculine enough were therefore able to take advantage of their sex <u>and</u> gender and secure managerial positions more easily. These positions "emphasized leadership skills, technical competence and unconditional dedication to work" (Evans, 2004, p.326), qualities all masculine men were automatically assumed to have. Overall this has exacerbated the vertical segregation discussed in section 4.3.

It is ironic that efforts to professionalize nursing and that result in moving away from the 'caring angel' image towards 'a health care provider' image has made it easier for men, not only to enter the nursing profession, but also to move into management positions more easily. Also ironically, female nurses supported in great part these efforts to change nursing into a more legitimate profession in all three countries. They too saw men as more career-driven and dedicated, probably a result of the division of labour in most families. Male nurses did not have to take time off for family reasons and so were

perceived as being more serious about nursing as a career rather than just a job. Thus

even today female nurses themselves continue to actively channel male nurses towards

managerial and leadership positions, in part as a way to enhance the legitimacy of their

profession. As Evans (2004) points out, however, these attitudes reflect unacknowledged

hidden institutionalized advantages for men and disadvantages for women. It seems that,

like the military, the nursing profession believes that men are more suited to leadership.

The fact that the military is predominantly male while nursing is predominantly female

does not seem to make a difference.

What are the implications of this identification of nursing with a feminine gender

role? As discussed in the previous section, men and women choose or are steered towards

different jobs within nursing both vertically and horizontally. One reason for this is the

association of masculinity with leadership and certain "active" positions such as ER and

psychiatric nursing while femininity is associated with caring. Another is the association

of masculinity with more technical specialties such as anaesthesiology and OR nursing.

What follows is a review of the literature that examines how its incumbents perceive and

experience nursing as a result.

Muldoon and Reilly's (2003) work on career choice in nursing students showed

that students are highly aware of the sex-typing[25] of nursing specialisms when they decide

on their own career path. The authors used the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem,

1974) to classify 384 students into feminine, masculine and androgynous psychological

---

[25] I use the term 'sex-typing' and 'sex-typed' in this discussion to reflect the fact that this study was based on the use of the Bem Sex Role Inventory which itself uses the term 'sex' instead of 'gender'. However, the issue is the way in which participants perceive a particular specialism, or themselves, to be tied to a particular social role, masculinity, femininity or androgyny. Muldoon and Reilly sometimes interchange the words female and feminine, assuming, for example, that female sex typing is feminine.

types. They then asked these students to rate a list of nursing specialisms according to whether the specialisms were feminine, masculine or 'gender-neutral'. Muldoon and Reilly found, for example, that nursing specialisms were skewed towards female typing, being either highly feminine, feminine or gender-neutral. They further found that, although the most popular specialisms were highly female sex-typed, they were of least interest to masculine students. Masculine and androgynous students were much more interested in 'gender neutral' specialisms such as nursing manager, surgical nurse, ER nursing or mental health nursing[26]. This study is interesting in that it focuses on gender-role identity. Thus both male and female nurses with an androgynous gender identity, for example, preferred the same specialisms. The other interesting result is that female and male nursing students shared nearly identical views on the typing (and therefore appropriateness) of specific specialisms, regardless of their own identity. By and large, most saw nursing as being 'women's work' – a probable reason, according to Evans (1997), for the way in which male nurses strive to separate themselves from more traditionally feminine-typed nursing specialisms (see also MacDougall, 1997).

Another explanation for men's nursing career choices is offered by Evans (2002), who suggests that male nurses themselves choose specialisms that involve less close contact with or touching of patients. The reasons for this include a concern that their touch may be perceived as sexual or threatening by female patients or as indicative of non-heterosexuality by male patients, something I return to in section 3.5 as regards nursing's persistent heterosexism. Even though male and female nursing students both cite the

---

[26] Generally, as we have seen, specialisms such as ER and mental health nursing are considered appropriate areas for male nurses, which suggests they are considered 'masculine'. It seems, from this study at least, that it is possible that they are not necessarily considered 'masculine' specialisms, but simply 'not feminine'.

desire to help others as an important motivator for entering the profession (Cyr, 1992; MacDougall, 1997), the male participants in Evans' study expressed a need to learn to become comfortable with touch at the beginning of their training. They suggested that, as touching is an important part of caring, yet not something that men tend to do with non-intimates before they come into nursing, it is another skill they have to learn. In particular, they felt it was "important to learn when it's safe to touch" (Evans, 2002, p. 444), both in terms of patients' perceptions and in terms of other (female) nurses' perceptions. I discuss this issue in further detail below. In terms of the 'glass elevator', Williams (1995) found that, even though male nurses putatively face discrimination as a minority group, they still end up with top positions in nursing. She found, when interviewing 33 male nurses, that men are hired more easily than women overall, except in obstetrics and gynaecology. While they end up in top jobs, their female colleagues are steered towards lower prestige, lower paying and lower power nursing jobs.

These conclusions are supported by the results of Simpson's (2004) study. She interviewed forty men who worked in female-dominated professions, including fifteen nurses. She was seeking to understand why these men enter female-dominated professions, what their aspirations and experiences are and the effects of working in these professions on their gender identity. She found that men in these professions were steered toward management jobs, even when this was not their chosen career aspiration. Many men claimed that they received preferential treatment because of their gender, something Simpson ascribes to what she calls the 'mother/son' dynamic that operates between older women and younger men newly hired in the organization. Yet Simpson, like Cross and Bagilhole (2002) before her, found that these men had entered these professions for a

variety of complex reasons that often included both a love of the profession, belief in its purpose <u>and</u> a desire for promotion. They also seemed to be aware of this differential treatment and simply accepted it as part of the status quo.

Interestingly, Simpson and Cross and Bagilhole also found that men in female-dominated occupations employ certain tactics to masculinize both themselves and their jobs. Simpson found, for example, that men masculinize their jobs by "re-labelling, recasting the job content and distancing from the female" (2004, p. 361). Tactics for male nurses include emphasizing the adrenaline-charged nature of jobs in emergency rooms or focusing on their ability to deal with high stress situations on a regular basis, a characteristic that is stereotypically masculine – at least to these men. In a similar vein, Cross and Bagilhole (2002) found that the participants in their study also emphasize the masculine aspects of their jobs. Further, they distance themselves from their female colleagues in an attempt not to be perceived as feminine. This distancing is both personal and professional, in that they see themselves as having long-term careers while women in these occupations, according to these men came and went according to other priorities.

Thus the literature points to several key aspects of the gendering of nursing. First, nursing has been and continues to be perceived as a feminine profession. This comes out of the initial structural arrangements and residential apprenticeship educational model. Further, this feminine gendering is equally perceived and equally perhaps accepted by female and male nurses, who self-select or are informally encouraged to enter gender-appropriate specialisms on a vertical and horizontal basis. Much of this gender-typing is based on stereotypical ideas about the supposed femininity of caring and the masculinity of curing and leadership.   In the next section I look at the ways in which the third element

of Butler's (1990) framework, sexuality, interacts with the hyperfeminine context of
nursing.

4.5 Sexuality and nursing: No need to ask, I'll tell you

Unlike the military, nursing has never had formal regulations regarding the
sexuality of its members. A search of the literature failed to uncover any research on the
sexuality of female nurses – at least regarding sexual orientation. However, popular
culture has often depicted the female nurse as highly sexualized in recent decades, for
example the *Carry On* films. These films offer an extremely sexist and heterosexist
portrayal of nurses (who are all female). Kalisch and Kalisch (1982a, 1982b, 1982c)
provide an interesting discussion of cultural portrayals of nurses in this regard. For
example in their examination of images of nurses on US television between 1950 and
1980 they used content analysis to examine whether these portrayals had changed over
that time period. They found that until the 1960s nurses were portrayed as earnest but
unprofessional women who were helpers to male physicians. During the 1960s nurses
were shown as having more professionalism, autonomy and willingness to engage in
differences of opinion with physicians where the care of patients was concerned. These
nurses arguably engendered respect in the viewer for their professional outlook. However
Kalisch and Kalisch found that, as the 1960s gave way to the 1970s, there was an
"increasing, blatant use of nurse characters as sexual mascots for groups of men, usually
physicians" (1982a, p. 267). They also found that "with the relaxation of censorship
standards, television programs exploited their new freedom with the liberal use of sexual
innuendo and provocative costuming for female nurse characters" (*ibid*.).

The same authors (1982b) performed a content analysis on films between 1930 and 1979 that included portrayals of nurses. They claim to have looked at English-speaking films; however only US films were included in their study. Kalisch and Kalisch's analysis of these films suggested that "the last 20 years have witnessed the complete destruction of the once proud and noble film image of a nurse" (1982b, p. 610). They cite the example of films such as *Operation Petticoat* (1959), in which a group of nurses is taken on board a Navy submarine and proceed to have trysts with crew members and hang their nylon stockings on vital equipment, and *M*A*S*H* (1970), in which the senior nurse, Army Major Margaret Houlihan, is portrayed as a sexually frustrated and then sexually promiscuous butt of male officers' jokes. Kalisch and Kalisch concluded that "nurses almost always appear as sexual mascots of healthcare world, appearing more interested in linen closet trysts than in professional development"(1982b, p. 611). Finally, Kalisch and Kalisch, in their content analysis of 207 English language novels written in the 20th century, found that the pinnacle of the portrayal of a nurse was in the 1940s and 1950s. They postulate that the war exploits of nurses, which were dramatized in many of these novels, led to the respectful and professional portrayal of nurses that reflected their real-life experiences. They also point out that "before the 1960s nurses routinely appeared as chaste young women involved in mutually satisfying romantic relationships, but not in casual affairs" (1982c, p. 1224) but that after this time portrayals of nurses as promiscuous became much more common.

Muff (1982) suggests that this sexual stereotyping of nurses stems from myths "generated by male fear of the feminine other" (p. 521). Porter, on the other hand, argues that Muff's explanation "tends towards an ahistorical and immutable conception of

mythical stereotypes." (1992, p. 521). He suggests instead that sexual liberation allowed women a freer expression of their sexuality but also "brought into stark relief the subordination of women through their sexual roles" (p. 522). Porter argues that "if male power and supremacy is expressed through sexuality … then openness about sex will exacerbate its significance for male domination" (*ibid*.). He adds that the historical context in which men and women exist determines the portrayals that are used to justify women's oppression by the dominant masculine culture. Thus, he argues, in the 1950s the "domestic and caring roles of women" (*ibid*.) were more visibly used to justify their oppression in those sexually repressed times. However as the times became more sexually free it was the sexual role of women that was used to oppress them. Porter also suggests that nurses are in a particular position because they are involved intimately with bodies and bodily functions and the fear of this intrusion into others' physicality is countered by demeaning (i.e., sexualizing) nurses' own bodies.

Certainly, the highly oversexed and sexualized portrayal of female nurses described above is not as prevalent or as acceptable today as it was in its heyday of the 1970s. However, it is still out there. For example, the British television series *No Angels* (2004-2006) portrayed the professional and personal lives of four NHS nurses. A look at the covers of the DVD sets for each series yields interesting insights into the way the series dealt with the nurses' sexuality, in both senses of the word. The cover for series one shows four women striking casual poses on the steps of a house. One is wearing a nursing uniform, two are in blue jeans and casual shirts, and one is wearing a sleeveless dress or perhaps a long towel (it is difficult to say because her arms cover most of the top). They look like four ordinary young women, possibly housemates, smiling for a friend's

snapshot. The cover for series three is quite different. The same women appear but that is

the only similarity with the series one cover. Each is made up fairly heavily, two are

straddling a gurney in suggestive poses, one is leaning forward towards the camera while

holding an oversized hypodermic needle and smiling suggestively and the fourth holds out

a blue stethoscope with a red star in the middle of the chest piece. The tag line is: "The

Final Sensational Episodes from the Naughty Northern Nurses" and further below: "The

Bad Girls of the NHS are back!"   Clearly, the sexualized portrait of these nurses is a far

cry from the serious professional look in the first season.

　　　Nevertheless, while it might be interesting to examine how nurses today negotiate

such sexualized notions of female nurses in their everyday leadership experience this is

not a focus of this thesis.   Instead, although the above portrayals are undeniably

heterosexist, I am interested specifically in the way that sexual <u>orientation</u> and nursing

intersect. The most prevalent issue in this respect is the way that male nurses seem to

often be stereotyped as gay by patients, fellow nurses and society at large. This

stereotyping, which is viewed as stigmatizing by many of those concerned, has

implications both in terms of how male nurses behave and the jobs they choose to do.

　　　The stereotyping of men who enter nursing as gay has its roots in the seeming

opposition between the 'natural' masculinity of men and the 'natural' femininity of

women. Further, according to Harding (2007), hegemonic masculinity lies at the heart of

the problematic nature of the stereotyping. According to Connell hegemonic masculinity

is "the form of masculinity that is culturally dominant in a particular setting. Throughout

Western culture hegemonic masculinity is white, heterosexual and middle class" (cited in

Harding, 2007, p. 637). Harding suggests that normative heterosexuality is, relatedly,

positioned as opposite to "transgressive homosexuality" (2007, p. 637). Harding also

draws on Butler's ideas regarding the heterosexual matrix in a discussion of the ways in

which the heteronormative context within which male nurses operate functions to produce

their perceived homosexuality. Harding used a discourse analytic approach to interview

18 New Zealand nurses, all male but not all gay, in an attempt to understand how they

dealt with their stereotyping as gay. Three main themes emerged in her analysis. First,

these men all experience such stereotyping as well as the corollary that gay men are sexual

predators. Second, these men had experienced homophobia from their colleagues.

Finally, these men engaged in strategies to project heterosexuality such as wearing

wedding rings, playing sport and discussing sport. The effects of this are threefold

according to Harding. First, Harding postulates that the fear of stigma reduces the number

of men entering nursing full stop. Second, men in nursing, especially in psychiatric

nursing, tend to behave in more stereotypically masculine ways: they are "trapped in a

macho discourse which requires physical aggression" (Harding, 2007, p. 641). Finally,

according to Harding male nurses experience homophobia from colleagues that is often

subtle or covert – i.e., gay male nurses receive the message that it's all right to be gay as

long as they keep it to themselves. Interestingly Harding also found that gay nurses are

often the ones who have the most problems accepting their own homosexuality. This

internalized homophobia is not an unusual reaction to working or living in a heterosexist

culture, as I also discuss in chapter 5.

One rationale for stereotyping male nurses, as has been implied in previous

discussion, proceeds along these lines: 'real men' don't like to touch, especially other

men. So, if a man chooses a profession which involves touching and caring, he must be

gay. Evans (2002) takes this further and states that by extension these men are also seen as sexual predators. Another argument suggests that 'real' men don't belong in women's work – so, if a man works as a nurse, he can't be a 'real' man, he must be gay. This also ties into the military points of view discussed in the previous chapter. In the military, many think that only 'real men' can be combat soldiers – clearly they cannot be nurses. This creates unique problems for male nurses in the military, in that they are perceived on the one hand as 'real men' who are entitled to be in the military, but at the same time as doing 'women's work'.

There are interesting links here to the heterosexual matrix. Male bodies that do not take on masculine <u>professional</u> roles are seen to be just as problematic as male bodies that do not take on masculine <u>social</u> roles primarily because of the ways in which professions are gendered / given a social role. Both are seen to be subverting the matrix and breaking its causal loop and therefore, according to the matrix, they must therefore not be heterosexual – that is reserved for those who fulfil the first two parts of the matrix (male body and masculine social/professional role). Of course, these men will be seen as the abjects that Butler describes and that I discussed in Chapter 2.0.

Their stigmatization as gay has several effects on male nurses and nursing students. It is partly responsible for the career choices men make in nursing, as discussed in the section on the sexed body in relation to touching. It also results in specific behaviours when male nurses interact with patients - and indeed with researchers. For example, Williams and Herkes (1993) stated that male nurses were careful to confirm their heterosexuality during interviews and make disparaging remarks about gay men in nursing

– especially to Herkes, who is male. Whittock and Leonard (2003) experienced the same phenomenon when interviewing participants for a similar research project.

Male nurses also may moderate their caring behaviour with male patients by being cautious and engaging in humour that is "bawdy and sexist in nature and not appropriate for women" (Evans, 2002, p.446). Evans points to the role of similar humour in British public schools as a practice of affirmation of masculinity (Kehily and Nayak, 1997) and male bonding (Frank, 1992). Moreover, it would seem that male nurses have good reason to present as hypermasculine and hyperstraight. However, it is only the men who present as traditionally masculine and heterosexual who benefit from what Williams calls the hidden advantages for men in nursing. Straight men are also preferred because it is assumed that they have a wife who takes care of home and family obligations so that they can concentrate on their jobs. As we have seen, male nurses also find ways of signifying their masculinity and heterosexuality by wearing a wedding band (Williams, 1995; Harding, 2007), for example, or alluding to girlfriends – whether or not they are indeed straight.

The assumption that male nurses are gay and the stigma attached to this difficult to escape assumption, plus the attendant stereotypes about the macho nature of male heterosexuality, also has effects on the nursing profession as a whole. Men who are promoted to leadership or managerial positions confirm their heterosexual masculinity in specific ways. They employ supposedly masculine styles of leadership that are task-oriented, 'rational', linear and goal-oriented. These behaviours serve to distance them from the femininity of nursing, and they also contribute to the double oppression of female nurses. Even though they are in the majority, female nurses end up being

dominated by physicians and also by their fellow nurse managers, many of who are men. Thus sexed body, social role and sexuality intersect and (re)produce the hypergendering of nursing, which is inevitably reflected in the expectations and experiences of nursing leaders. I explore this phenomenon further in the next section.

4.6 Sex, gender, sexuality and leadership in nursing

Much of the work on leadership in nursing tries to understand how to lead within a profession that is locked into the patriarchal feminine model discussed in preceding sections. At the heart of these attempts is Kanter's (1977) work on the structural underpinnings of power in organizations. In particular, Kanter's work on tokens and empowerment is most often applied to an analysis of nursing's gender relations in order to provide suggestions for improved leadership. This work is complemented by approaches that use Freire's (1971) writing on oppressed groups to understand issues and problems that are specific to nursing. A third set of articles proposes transformational leadership as a way to revitalize nursing. This is because of the link in leadership literature between transformational leadership and empowerment. The latter, of course, is also linked to both Kanter and Freire's work.

Kanter's (1977) structural theory of power in organizations posits that empowerment in organizations comes from access to information, resources and support, as well as opportunity. For Kanter, structure is the greatest source of power in an organization. Thus an individual's location within organizational structure influences their behaviour far more than personal attributes, traits or attitudes. Organizational members' structural position influences their access to opportunity

and power. Opportunity in this case refers to the possibility for advancement, for accessing work that is challenging or for increasing their skill set. Power refers to resources, information and support. Thus individuals who can access enough power can perform well for the organization because they can get things done. They also gain the ability to empower those around them. Insufficient access to these structural components inhibits satisfaction and more importantly leads to feelings of powerlessness. For example, people with limited access to opportunity exhibit limited aspirations, less commitment and greater resistance to change (Kanter, 1977).

Chandler (1986) first applied Kanter's theory to nursing. The nurses[27] who participated in her research perceived themselves to hold little power in their jobs, which Chandler attributed to the lack of empowering structures in their organizations. In Canada, Laschinger (1996), along with her colleagues at the University of Western Ontario, has done extensive work on the application of Kanter's theory to nursing in such areas as commitment, satisfaction and leadership (see, for example Wilson and Laschinger, 1994; Havens and Laschinger 1996, 1997; Laschinger and Haven, 1997). These papers provide support for the idea that, in a hospital setting, the behaviour and attitudes of nurses are affected by access to structures of opportunity and information, resources and support (Havens and Laschinger, 1996, 1997). Laschinger (1996) found, for example, that nurses need to access information/knowledge in order to carry out good nursing care and those

---

[27] When discussing this and other studies that include nurses as participants, I specify the sex of the respondents when and if that has been stated in the paper. Often the term 'nurses' is the only descriptor offered.

who have good access also feel empowered. She also found that nurses felt that they were only moderately empowered and only somewhat satisfied with their jobs. This work by Laschinger and her colleagues has led to the identification of the greater empowerment of nurses as an important priority for nursing leaders.

The other way in which empowerment has been identified as a key issue in nursing is as suggested through the application of Freire's theories in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968). According to Freire, dominant groups identify norms and values as the 'right' ones and then enforce them on subservient groups. The dominant group differs in an important way from the oppressed group (e.g. on the basis of sex or ethnicity) and they are valued more highly than the oppressed group. Over time, the oppressed group internalizes these values. Members grow to believe that becoming like the oppressor will lead to power. These 'aspiring' individuals are referred to as marginal because of the position they choose to occupy – not quite within their own oppressed group, but unable to truly become a member of the dominant group (at least as it is assumed to map to sex or ethnicity, for example).

Sometimes the differences are less visible, e.g. religion, and so it is easier for a marginal person to 'pass' as a member of the dominant group[28]. It is more difficult when the difference is something overtly visible like sex. Freire posits that oppressed groups develop self-hatred and have low self-esteem as a result of having to reject parts of themselves in order to become more like their oppressors.

---

[28] Sexuality is another characteristic which is not immediately visible and thus lends itself to passing. Indeed, it is unfortunate that many non-heterosexual people pass as heterosexual and take on the most homophobic characteristics in order to ensure that they are not outed. We have seen some evidence that gay male nurses may fall prey to this in the previous section.

Consequences of this include hiding evidence of membership in their own group,

displaying passive-aggressive behaviour and engaging in horizontal violence – i.e.,

violence against members of their own group. For queer people, for example, this

can result in internalized homophobia that leads to behaviour such as working

against workplace initiatives that provide benefits to employees' same-sex partners.

All this leads to the maintenance of the status quo because the oppressed do not feel

they can revolt: "Although they desire authentic existence, they fear it. They are at

one and the same time themselves and the oppressor whose consciousness they have

internalized" (Freire, 1968, p.31). Freire points out other mechanisms that maintain

the status quo: educational systems; the according of privilege and/or rewards to

marginals because they agree with the oppressor's values and devalue their own

group's; and token rewards given to the whole oppressed group that stops the

momentum of change initiatives. Moreover, Freire states that "It is a rare peasant

who, once "promoted" to overseer, does not become more of a tyrant towards his

former comrades than the owner himself.   This is because of the context of the

peasant's situation, that is, oppression remains unchanged" (*ibid*). The way to

liberation from oppression, for Freire, lies in oppressed peoples' recognition of their

oppression, development of pride in their own characteristics and then actively

working towards their own autonomy and liberation.

It is easy to see how this theory could be applied to nursing. Roberts (1983,

1997) does just that, noting that nurses' lack of autonomy, accountability and control

over their own profession is evidence of their oppression. She points to the way in

which nurses have internalized the values of the dominant group (male physicians)

who have controlled western nursing education for over a century. The values associated with mechanized, 'rational' medicine and institutionalized care have superceded the autonomous healing ethos of earlier values of women healers, according to Roberts (1983). She continues to outline the ways in which nurses have no access to power in the health care system at large and how nursing managers and academics are encouraged to take on the values of physicians in the (false) hope that this will give them genuine power and status.

Importantly, Roberts finds fault with nursing leaders who have benefited from becoming marginal and taking on the values of physicians. They see little problem with a system that has rewarded them for doing so. This leads to competitive and divisive behaviour which, of course, promotes the status quo.   Roberts calls on nursing leaders to recognize the oppression (of both themselves and others) as a first step toward changing it. Further, almost fifteen years after she first made the connection between Freire's work on oppression and the nursing profession, Roberts (1997) was still exhorting nursing leaders to recognize that nursing continued to be an oppressed profession requiring empowerment of its members in order to change. Other researchers have also used Freire's work to point out that female nurses in particular behave like members of oppressed groups (see for example, Heden 1986; Evans, 1997).

What is interesting is that we can see two levels of oppression here: (mostly female) nurses oppressed by (mostly male) physicians within a physician-dominated health care system and (mostly female) ward nurses oppressed by (mostly male) nursing managers. In each case the oppressed group's leaders are often marginals who take on the oppressor's values and exhibit their behaviours. This is exacerbated

by issues discussed earlier in this chapter such as the need that male nurses feel to prove their masculinity and heterosexuality and the stereotypically masculine models of management and leadership that are espoused and promoted in the health care sectors (and indeed in the wider organizational context) of all three countries.

Relatedly, Porter-O'Grady discusses the reverse discrimination that male nurses face. He contends that favouring male nurses for leadership positions is problematic because it reinforces "more male-based techniques of decision making" instead of much-needed "more feminine and appropriate meta techniques for relationship building and for making decisions" (1995, p.58). Porter-O'Grady believes that masculinizing yet one more area of health care is not productive. He urges female nurses to include their male colleagues in non-leadership, 'just-nursing-issues' deliberations while urging male nursing leaders to modify their leadership behaviours to account for the differences between the female-dominated field of nursing and the male-dominated other fields they may have been used to before becoming nursing leaders.

It is also easy to see why transformational leadership theories have been looked at as a solution to the powerlessness felt by most nurses, whether one uses Kanter's ideas or Freire's to explain its origins. For example, Gunden and Crissman (1992) categorically state that effective nursing leadership must empower others. McDaniel and Wolf (1992) tested the link between transformational leadership and nurse satisfaction and commitment (recall that, according to Kanter, these are outcomes of structural empowerment). They found that, in a hospital in which leaders behaved as transformational leaders, nurses exhibited higher satisfaction and low turnover. McDaniel and Wolf make the connection clear, not just between

leader behaviour and these outcomes, but also with the enabling structures necessary to support transformational leadership such as decentralization and team-based nursing.

Indeed, in the most recent scholarship, the challenge of retaining an ageing, burnt-out workforce and recruiting new members to the profession have been identified as priorities for nursing leaders. The need to deal with the felt powerlessness of nurses, intimately tied to the gendered aspects of this profession discussed throughout this chapter, is understood as critical to meeting these challenges. Thus, for example, Mahoney (2001) suggests that leadership should be a "nurse empowering skill" (p.270) and that "nurse leaders need to develop the skills necessary to empower patients and staff" (*ibid.*) and in order to attract and retain nurses. Upenieks (2003, 2003a, 2003b) links the shortage of nurses to incumbents' dissatisfaction with "their roles in the hospital settings" (2003, p.83). She investigates the way in which certain 'magnet' hospitals are able to attract and retain nurses more easily by developing elements of Kanter's structural theory such as access to information, opportunity and resources as well as decentralization as sources of empowerment for nurses in these hospitals. Additionally, nurses identified professional autonomy, "respect and value of professional nursing practice and systematic communication between clinical nurses and the leadership team" (Upenieks 2003, p.96) as key contributors to their feelings of empowerment. Further, Upenieks makes the link between nurse leaders' own empowerment and their leadership success. She points out that a nurse leader who is herself

empowered is successful as a leader and also increases organizational effectiveness.
This leader

> "shares the resources of power and opportunity. In return, these
> nurses [her staff] accomplish their jobs more successfully and are more
> satisfied than employees who do not have access to these structures.
> Empowerment leads to autonomy, which leads to job satisfaction" (p.84).

Other studies follow this pattern of identifying future nursing shortages and
retention of younger nurses as key issues and then offering empowering
transformational leadership as a solution (e.g. Thyer, 2003; Sherman, 2005). In the
next section I discuss the implications of the studies.

4.7 Summary

What are the implications of the above studies? It seems that many nurses feel
overwhelming powerlessness in their working environment and look to leadership as a
solution to this problem. However, the hyperfeminine, heterosexist nature of nursing,
with its roots in a highly patriarchal system, has created an almost schizophrenic working
environment. On the one hand, the stereotypically feminine values of caring and
nurturing seemingly define the 'essence' of a nurse's role. On the other hand, adherence
to stereotypically masculine ways of behaving lead to better jobs and promotions. The
literature fails to address these tensions, tending to focus instead on "empowerment" of <u>all</u>
nurses by <u>all</u> leaders as a solution to <u>all</u> problems.

This literature is similar to the bodies of literature discussed in the previous
two chapters in that it treats all women as the same and all men as the same. Unlike
the literature on the military, it does acknowledge that there is a range of possible

masculinities (perhaps as a result of male nurses themselves having to work out their own masculinity as they work in a female and feminine typed profession) but fails to do the same for femininity. Much is written about the challenges of leading within an oppressed group, the importance of transformational leadership (itself coded as feminine), men's difficulties when working as ward nurses and the dissatisfaction of many nurses with their profession and their leaders. However, there is no work that examines, for example, the way in which gay men function within an environment that views homosexuality as stigmatizing, while at the same time expecting them to all exhibit the stereotypically feminine characteristics at the heart of nursing's gender identity. Equally, there is little exploration of the way in which nurses can be leaders without taking on the masculine values espoused by management-driven health care models; the reliance on and evocation of transformational leadership neatly sidesteps this question.

Certainly this literature has been successful in highlighting the problems that have developed as a result of nursing's gender identity and its effect on nurses' lives. However, its reliance on transformational leadership as a cure-all leaves much unexamined. Research that attempts to understand the lived experiences of nursing leaders who exhibit a variety of gender identities would help to address this.

Thus, nursing provides another 'critical case' to examine the ways in which leadership, gender, sex and sexuality intersect. It provides a contrast to the military in its opposite, feminine hypergendering. However, it is also interesting to note that, while the minority sexes may be different in these two professions, some of the effects of being either male or female are quite similar. Williams states that "men take their gender

privilege and sexual power with them" (1995, p.80) into women's work and are therefore

an advantaged minority. Yet in nursing they operate within a profession that is itself

disadvantaged. I chose to examine the enactment of leadership in this profession in order

to be able to better tease out the ways in which the sexed body (sex), social role (gender)

and sexuality intersect with other aspects of organization. In the next chapter, I outline

again the research questions that have evolved from my three reviews of the literature

(chapter 2.0, 3.0 and 4.0) and then lay out the methodology I use to answer them.

5.0 Methodology

5.1 Introduction

In the previous three chapters I presented the conceptual framework for this project as well as a review of the literature that addresses leadership and the military and leadership and nursing. These three chapters have enabled me to locate my project at the intersection of several streams of literature and as aforementioned to ask the following research questions:

1. How do/can people construct identities that transcend the heterosexual matrix? What might a queer identity / one at the border entail?

2. As people construct their identities as leaders, do they seek to reconcile all their other identities into a coherent whole with their identity as a leader? Do they view their leader identities as in any way shaped, influenced or informed by their sex, gender and/ or sexual identities? Or do their leader identities instead come to affect how they see themselves as male, female, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera)?

3. To what extent are leadership, sex, gender and sexual identities 'fixed' or 'static'? Do we play out our sense of ourselves as leaders, men, women, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera) in the same way across time and place?

4. How do queer or borderline identities intersect with leadership? Can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? In particular, in a profession in which gender roles are still fairly rigidly prescribed, and in which only certain forms of gendered leadership are 'acceptable', can people escape the heterosexual

matrix in their leadership behaviours? If so, what are the effects of such subversion

for the leader involved?

> 4a. To what extent do the differently hypergendered contexts of the military and
>
> nursing in the three countries seem to lead to varying outcomes in this regard?

In this chapter, I explain and discuss the methodological approach that I used in

order to answer these questions and I reflect on my experience of doing this project.

Creswell (2003; 2008) suggests considering the following when selecting a research

approach: the researcher's philosophical approach i.e., their ontological and

epistemological positions; the general strategy of inquiry; and the specific methods

involved i.e., sampling, collection and analysis. These are the areas that I will discuss in

sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4. I begin by exploring the fundamental ontological and

epistemological positions that I brought to this project (section 5.2). I then continue by

discussing the research strategies that I employed, especially in light of the sensitivity of

this research (section 5.3). In the following section on research methods (5.4), I include a

discussion of the issues that Lee and Renzetti (1993) suggest are important to consider

when researching sensitive topics: methods, technical issues, ethics, politics, legalities

and the effects of doing the research on the life of the researcher. I then continue the

chapter by describing the sampling and data collection process as well as the process of

analysis and interpretation. I end this chapter by reflecting on the methodological issues

that were raised for me through this project, the difficulties that I had, the opportunities

that were presented, and the lessons that I take into future research projects.

5.2 Ontology and Epistemology

In this section I discuss the ontological and epistemological positions that underpin all my methodological choices for this project. I will not provide a discussion of all potential ontological and epistemological positions possible (which would in any case be predictably impossible) but rather focus on my own positions, how these affected the choice of methodology and methods, and the implications of this for my project. The philosophical underpinnings of this project fall within the constructivist paradigm (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; 2005), with an ontology that is constructivist and a subjectivist epistemology. Thus, in answer to the ontological questions regarding the nature of social phenomena – i.e., how do these phenomena come about? how are they perpetuated? – I would answer the following. Social realities are "apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions" (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 110). There is no one single social reality 'out there' that needs to be 'captured' or indeed can be. There are, rather, multiple understandings of phenomena such as leadership that are constructed and perpetuated by those who engage in and with it. Thus leadership (and indeed sexed body, social role and sexual orientation are all realized – made 'real' – by these constructions. This is, of course, in marked contrast to a positivist ontology that sees reality as objectively existing out there, ready and able to be captured through the appropriate 'objective' research strategies.

Epistemological questions address the way in which we can gain understanding and knowledge of these phenomena. We can ask questions such as: What can I know about these phenomena? What is my role as a researcher? What is the relationship of the knower to the knowing? Guba and Lincoln suggest that an appropriate epistemological position, given a constructivist ontological position, is one that sees the researcher and

participant as interdependent (1994; 2005). Given that the aim of a constructivist inquiry is "understanding and reconstruction" (2005, p. 194), the researcher and participant interact so that "the findings are literally created" (1994, p. 111).

There are some important points to be made in this regard. First is that from these positions, just as ontology and epistemology are inextricably intertwined, so are the researcher and the participants in the quest for understanding. Second is that the best I can hope to achieve as a researcher is some form of shared understanding with participants that has some relationship to what happens/ed outside the interviews that we shared. I am therefore working towards achieving an intersubjective understanding of leadership, sexed body, social role and sexual orientation that comes out of my interaction with my respondents, but is at the same time limited by the differences in our experiences. This leads to two further points. I, as researcher, am not 'interpreting' the participants' understanding as if it somehow objectively existed inside them and I were able to pry it out of their heads (a point also made in Bowring and Brewis, 2009). Rather, who I am, my own experience, is an important part of this 'interpretation'. As Denzin and Lincoln suggest,

> "Any gaze is always filtered through the lenses of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity … There are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the worlds of – and between – observer and the observed the … all they [subjects] can offer is accounts, or stories of what they have done and why" (1994, p. 21).

The 'facts' – i.e., the words my participants said, the quotes that I reproduce in this thesis – are as they were told to me. However, the interpretation is mine and mine alone.

Another researcher, working with the same words, may have come to a different interpretation, mediated by their own characteristics and experience.

This leads me to another important observation made by Alvesson and Deetz regarding hailing identities (2000, p. 124). I addressed ('hailed') my respondents as military or nursing leaders and focused our discussions on issues of sexed bodies, social roles, sexual orientations and leadership. The questions that I asked and the interactions that we had before, during and after the interviews were all directed by these aspects of identity. A different researcher, for example one who was interested in issues of race, would have begun with different categories of exploration and would have ended up with a different outcome in their analysis. This is all perhaps best put by one of my respondents. Tanya, a retired lesbian officer in the US military, had been concerned about revealing her sexual orientation as a result of the data collection because of the possible repercussions for her. After a number of emails in which I outlined the anonymity and confidentiality procedures of the study, she agreed to participate, with this caveat:

"As long as you realize that what you get will be my account of what happened to me in the military over a number of years, filtered though my memory of those events and structured by the questions that you ask. I don't know if that's authentic enough for you."

I assured her that it was. In the next section, I outline the ways in which ontological and epistemological positions influenced the choice of approach for this study.

5.3 Research Strategy

In this section I discuss the research strategy that underlies the specific methods that I used. I explain how, located within a constructivist, subjectivist philosophy as

outlined above, I made choices regarding an overall research strategy (qualitative, quasi-grounded) and then focused on addressing issues raised by the sensitivity of the topic that I was studying (Renzetti and Lee, 1993).

5.3.1 Qualitative

I approached this project with a desire to understand the sense that participants made of their leadership experience and that is a goal which is typically most closely aligned with qualitative methodology. However, instead of viewing qualitative and quantitative approaches as binary opposites, I view them as occupying places on a continuum along which it is possible to position oneself relatively closer to or further away from either extreme. Morgan and Smircich (1980) suggest such a way of visualizing these two approaches. However they still see qualitative and quantitative methodologies as having certain essential qualities that contribute to their incommensurability. Prasad and Prasad (2002), on the other hand, explore the blurrings between these two approaches. They point out that qualitative approaches are indeed non-quantitative, but on a philosophical basis not necessarily not-positivist, thus breaking with the more simplistic quantitative/positivist vs. qualitative/constructivist divide that often characterizes methodological discussions.

In particular, Prasad and Prasad assert that ontology and epistemology do not, in some 'natural' way, underpin a choice of approach. For example, ethnostatistics is an example of a quantitative methodology (i.e., using quantitative data) combined with a constructivist ontology and subjectivist epistemology, while content analysis is an example of the reverse, i.e., a qualitative methodology (using qualitative data) with a positivist and objectivist philosophy. Their most important point is that ontology and

epistemology must be explicitly considered, beyond simply stating that a methodological approach is qualitative or quantitative and assuming that the rest is given.

As established then, my own ontological and epistemological positions fall most closely in line with constructivist and subjectivist approaches. As Denzin and Lincoln (2000) point out, research approaches like these rely on an understanding of reality as socially constructed; a belief that the knower cannot be separated from the knowing; and an understanding that social inquiry is value-laden and shaped by the situational constraints within which the participants and researcher find themselves. Given this kind of philosophical foundation a qualitative strategy would appear to be a good fit. Other reasons led away from quantitative methods and towards qualitative approaches. For example, Creswell (2003) suggests that qualitative approaches are appropriate when there is little known about the problem or topic being studied: such is the case with this project. Further, Prasad and Prasad (2002) suggest that qualitative approaches are appropriate when trying to understand "the way in which participants make sense of their socially-constructed world and especially by enhancing our understanding of, among others, the symbolic dimensions of organizational life" (2002, p.4).

A different argument is made by Gamson (2000), who points to the history of quantitative strategies in research on non-heterosexual people as a reason to make a different choice. According to him, "there has been a well-founded suspicion that positivist sciences, and some scientific professions, have been at odds with the interests of self-defining homosexuals – pathologizing, stigmatizing, seeking the 'cause' of deviant sexualities and, by implication, their cure" (Gamson, 2000, p. 348). He goes on to suggest that qualitative approaches are appropriate for research about lesbian and gay

people because they lend themselves to "a critical focus on the social construction of sexual categories and identities, and then a 'queer' focus on the broad role of the homo/heterosexual binary in contemporary life" (*ibid*.). Moreover, there is a general dearth of qualitative research into LGBT experience of organizations (Bowring and Brewis, 2009).

In a caution against using qualitative approaches, Murphy and Nightingale (2002) point out that they can be more difficult or challenging when researching sensitive topics because they require the researcher to get closer to the participants than if they were using quantitative approaches. However, given that getting closer is required in order to ask people to talk about their sexuality in the context of my study, I used their cautionary argument not as a reason to turn away from qualitative approaches, but as a reminder that there would indeed be a rapport between me and the participants that I would have to take into account, especially when debriefing after the interviews were over. In the next section I discuss the quasi-grounded design that I used within this qualitative approach.

5.3.2 Quasi-grounded

Having decided on a qualitative approach, I developed a quasi-grounded approach because "the flexibility of qualitative research [usually] permits you to follow leads that emerge. Grounded theory methods increase this flexibility and simultaneously give you more focus than many methods." (Charmaz, 2003a, p. 14). This is because grounded theory methods allow the researcher to keep an eye on the big picture while focusing on the specifics that come up during the research process. Grounded theory approaches were initially developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in order to address the problem, as they saw it, of forcing data to fit theory instead of allowing theory to reflect data. Their

goal was to have researchers inductively evaluate the fit between emergent data and their research interests instead of deductively forcing data to fit into preconceived categories, theories and ideas. The following are characteristics of traditional grounded theory methods (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1992):

- Simultaneous data collection and analysis

- Deriving analytic codes and categories from the data as opposed to developing them from preconceived hypotheses

- Constructing mid-range theories (Merton, 1968) to explain behaviour and social processes i.e., theories that lie in between the extremes of grand theory on the one hand and specific, localized empirical studies on the other

- Working with comparisons between data and data, data and concept and concept and concept

- Theoretical sampling instead of random sampling (Glaser and Strauss, 1967)[29]

- Not conducting a literature review until after initial data analysis

The combination of qualitative and quantitative methods within grounded theory designs is another characteristic of a variant of grounded theory as advocated by Strauss and Corbin, who see this as an "interplay" between the two approaches – i.e., a way of seeing how data and methods from each can feed into the other (1998, p.31). This is quite different from triangulation (Denzin, 1970), which attempts to use different methods to validate or check results. This highlights the flexibility of grounded theory approaches as well as the necessity to be clear that all aspects of research design require choices instead of assumptions about expected ways of doing things.

---

[29] I discuss theoretical sampling further in section 5.5.2

Indeed in this project I follow some of the above-mentioned core assumptions of grounded theory, specifically those that have to do with letting the theory fit the data and treating research as an emergent process through the use of theoretical sampling and simultaneous data collection and analysis. However, I am not attempting to generate mid-level theory. Rather, I am simply interested in understanding how people make sense of certain aspects of their identity and how they enact those aspects in their organizational life. Neither did I delay my literature review until after initial data analysis. Thus I would describe this project as quasi-grounded.

So to be more specific and to reiterate the points I made in section 5.2, in the case of this project I proceeded on the assumption that people construct the meanings of sex, gender, sexuality and leadership within a historical and social context. They engage with the world based on these meanings. My task, as a researcher, is to attempt to enter this world, with the understanding that my own experiences, background and meanings affect my interpretation of that world. This required moving away from traditional grounded theory towards what Charmaz (1995; 2000; 2003; 2003a; 2006) calls constructivist grounded theory. The core assumptions that Charmaz outlines are as follows:

- Multiple social realities exist

- Data reflect the researchers' and the participants' mutual constructions

- The researcher, however incompletely, enters and is affected by participants' worlds. To this I would add that the researcher affects participants' worlds as well, as I discuss in the reflections at the end of this chapter.

- The researcher's aim is to understand as far as possible the implicit meanings in the participants' experiences and to build a conceptual analysis of these meanings.

This approach fits in with the ontological and epistemological positions that I outlined in section 5.2. It also fits in with the conceptual framework developed in chapter 2. In particular, it fits with Butler's understandings of the performativity of gender in that it is a way to develop an understanding of the gender performances that participants repeatedly engaged in and how these intersect with leadership.

5.3.3 Sensitive Issues

Another critical aspect of this project was the sensitivity of the topics that participants were going to discuss and the ways in which the research design would have to take this into account. According to Lee and Renzetti,

"A sensitive topic is one that potentially poses for those involved a substantial threat, the emergence of which renders problematic for the researcher and or the researched, the collection, holding and/or dissemination of research data."(cited in Renzetti and Lee, 1993, p.5).

They continue with a list of four areas of threat or controversy that I have summarized below, along with their relevance to this project.

Table 2: Application of Lee and Renzetti's criteria of sensitivity to this project

Lee and Renzetti's criteria	Characteristics of this project
Intrudes on the private sphere; delves into some deeply personal experience	• Sexuality is, in Western culture, an intensely private issue; • Experience of coming out is profoundly personal and carries personal risks as well as rewards
Explores issues of deviance or social control	• Non-heterosexual identities are often considered deviant by the mainstream; • Sexuality and gender identity is tightly controlled by the military

	and to a lesser extent in nursing
Impinges on vested interests of powerful or exercise of coercion or domination	• Non-mainstream gender identity and sexuality often impinge on the vested interests of powerful elements in an organization • Sexuality per se is considered to impinge on those interests as well by its very acknowledgement in a workplace that, according to many mainstream points of view, should be 'non-sexual' and that sexuality therefore belongs in the private, not public, sphere • The military in the US formally dominates members' gender and sexual identities through Don't Ask Don't Tell and coerces heteronormative behaviour from all members
Deals with things sacred to those studied	• Most people's identity, especially their gender identity and their sexuality is considered to be 'sacred'

On a common-sense level, of course, asking people to talk about their gender identity and their sexuality could be considered sensitive, even without Lee and Renzetti's indicators. In the mainstream cultures of the UK, Canada and the US, these are private issues. Sexuality in particular is to be discussed only with intimate friends or family. The plethora of books and videos that are intended to facilitate such discussions is only one testament to the difficulties of opening up to others on these matters. Most people's gender identity and sexuality are also considered to be sacred in the sense that these are integral to the way in which they see and understand themselves. Asking them to discuss these aspects of themselves runs the risk of making them profoundly uncomfortable if not worried about revealing things they may not wish to reveal, especially to a stranger in the context of a more or less 'formal' research interview.

Further, asking members of the military to talk about their gender and sexuality within the context of institutions and professions that find certain manifestations of these problematic, if not reasons for dismissal, makes these issues that much more sensitive. Equally, for nursing participants, a stigma attached to male nurses, whether gay or straight, indicates the potential sensitivity of asking them to discuss their gender identity and sexual orientation.

Moreover, people may be sensitive about discussing their perceived femininity or masculinity *per se*. And for gay men and lesbians in particular, discussions regarding the development and understanding of their own sexual orientation and when, and if, others came to terms with it, often require them to reflect on very difficult moments in their lives. People certainly have felt relief, pride, happiness and excitement at coming to recognize their sexuality. However, these feelings may also be accompanied by feelings of shame, fear or disappointment and these may also be relived when coming out stories are recounted, even if they no longer apply in the present. Further, I was concerned about the potential internalized homophobia that policies like DADT may have engendered in lesbian and gay military participants and the effects on them of becoming aware of this via the interviews.

In all these ways, then, this project is indeed one that addresses sensitive issues that I have considered when making my methodological choices. I ensured that this sensitivity was addressed in the following areas, as suggested by Renzetti and Lee (1993): methods, technical issues, ethics, politics, legalities and the effects of doing the research on my life. In each of these areas my purpose was to demonstrate respect for the sensitivity of the topics I was asking participants to discuss, for the potential

vulnerabilities created by their participation and for the wider implications of that participation both for them and for me. In the next section I discuss the specific methods that I used for this project, keeping in mind the issues I have just listed and the way in which I dealt with them.

5.4 Research Method

In this section I explain and elaborate on the specific method that I used as well as the rest of the issues raised by Lee and Renzetti. My purpose is to offer a justification of my choices as regards the specificities of this method, as opposed to the more overarching methodological and philosophical issues covered hitherto, and to explain how I tailored those choices to fit the specific issues and potential participants at hand.

5.4.1 Intensive interviews

I decided at the outset that I would not conduct an ethnographic study, as is often considered to be typical of constructionist subjectivist approaches, but would use interviews instead. This was for a number of reasons. First, I knew that I would be interviewing a variety of people who were both actively working and retired, many in workplaces that either required security clearance or were impossible to access for a number of reasons to do with confidentiality or logistical concerns. As well, the participants would come from three countries and there was no indication that even two would be from the same workplace or indeed geographical location/city. Moreover, observing retired forces members or nurses either at home or in other sorts of workplaces did not suit the particular foci of my project on hypergendered organizational environments. Thus, ethnography seemed to be an inappropriate method for these reasons. Also, I was less interested in understanding and observing the interactions

between leaders and their staff teams than I was in understanding the way in which

leaders of various sexes, genders and sexualities understood and experienced leading.

Thus, interviews seemed be an appropriate way to try to understand participants'

meanings and the way in which they saw themselves and their sex, gender, sexuality and

leadership.

Having decided upon interviews I had to choose between unstructured, semi-

structured or structured interviews and possibly also focus groups. I initially discounted

focus groups because of the sensitivity of the topics involved in this study. I was

concerned that participants would be hesitant to share private information in a roomful of

other people they did not know. Also, because of the distance involved both between

myself and the participants and among the participants themselves, focus groups seemed

even less practicable. When deciding which type of individual interview to conduct I

was guided by the understanding that semi-structured interviews allow the researcher to

pursue their research interests while at the same time leaving room for topics to emerge

as important from a participant's perspective (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Indeed, I had learned this in a previous project (Bowring and Brewis, 2009) where

I discovered that the way in which participants self-identified sexual orientation, for

example, was far more complex than I had initially assumed. In that study I had not

intended to explore the varying ways in which participants defined their sexual

orientation. However, after the first few interviews I realized that people described their

sexual orientation in far more varied and subtle ways than the simple gay/lesbian/bisexual

labels. I changed the interview guide for the subsequent interviews to explore this

further. In contrast, while unstructured interviews can be quite intensive and certainly

allow for a great deal of flexibility on the part of interviewers, they are not as useful when trying to ensure that the same set of topics is discussed with each participant. They can, in fact, be experienced as akin to psychotherapeutic interactions by participants and this makes them stressful and therefore not well-suited to a potentially charged project such as this one. On the other hand, a structured interview guide would not allow the flexibility to pursue ideas and topics that came from the participants themselves during an interview.

Semi-structured interviews are typically designed to give both flexibility and structure to the interview. An interview guide is prepared so that the researcher can be sure to cover all the points that are of interest in the study. However, there is also the opportunity to break away and follow new topics or points of interest that come up during the interview and then return to the guide and continue. They are therefore appropriate when conducting a research project where the researcher is clearly focused on a particular topic and wishes to address a particular set of issues in every interview (Bryman, 2004) while at the same time allowing for the emergence of issues that participants see as important. Bryman also suggests that they are useful when doing what he calls multiple case study research and when researchers "need some structure in order to ensure cross case compatibility". (p. 315). While my study is not exactly a multiple case study project, it does have some similar characteristics in that participants come from two different professions, the military and nursing, and from three different countries. In these circumstances it can indeed be useful to have a structure that allows comparison between these different contexts and environments, and indeed one of my research questions (4a) speaks directly to such a comparative endeavour.

While semi-structured interviews can be used in a variety of contexts, one type of semi-structured interview is intensive interviewing, also called in-depth interviewing, which "permits an in-depth exploration of a particular topic or experience and, thus, is a useful method for interpretive inquiry" (Charmaz, 2003a, p. 25). Charmaz advocates an in-depth exploration that asks for the participants to interpret their experiences because "the interviewer seeks to understand the topic and the interview participant has the relevant experiences to shed light on it" (*ibid*.). For me, this signalled a subtle shift in attitude, away from the traditional model of interviewing that implies a one-way divulging of information by the interviewee to the interviewer, towards one where the interpretive aspects of interviewing are acknowledged. Each interview thus becomes a series of interpretive acts, where participants interpret their experience and, in telling it, reinterpret it, whereupon this experience is again interpreted by the researcher. There is no sense of an objective reality that the researcher sets out to capture, but rather a reality that each party to the interview (re)constructs and (re)interprets. The goal for the interviewer is to come as close as possible to understanding the participant's interpretation, within, of course, the inevitable limits to intersubjectivity.

Intensive interviewing involves comments, questions and probes that allow the interviewer to go 'below the surface' and explore topics that come up, get clarification and then stop only when suitable and sufficient data have been collected (Charmaz, 2003a, p. 26). Intensive interviews are both "open-ended yet directed, shaped yet emergent, paced yet unrestricted" (Charmaz, 2003a, p. 28). Charmaz points out that we can also ensure that "later interviews cover probing questions that address theoretical issues explicitly" (2003, p. 318). Thus, as I describe below, during the interview phase I

revised the interview guide a number of times to reflect topics and themes that had come up in prior interviews.

5.4.2 Interview Guide

I developed an initial interview guide that was intended to address the principal research questions, keeping in mind that these are overarching issues intended to inform the whole project and not specific empirical guides. I therefore developed specific interview questions that fell under each broad research theme. I also sent out a preliminary questionnaire, attached in Appendix 2, which asked early participants for some information about themselves and their work history[30]. I did this in order to get a sense of the kind of people that would be participating and to see whether there were areas and questions that I had not thought of that would be salient. Once I had received eight of these I realized that they were no longer needed. This was because subsequent participants came from referrals from previous participants who gave me a certain amount of information about each of the people they referred. The final version of the guide for lesbian and gay respondents mapped onto the research questions as follows:

Table 3: Interview Guide and Associated Research Questions

Introductions, getting comfortable; basic job information. Historical evolution of leadership responsibilities
1. Let's start by talking a bit about your job. Please describe your responsibilities. 2. How long have you been working at your present job? 3. What qualifications did you need for this job? 4. Describe your typical workday. 5. Who do you interact with on a daily basis? 6. Describe your military / nursing service for me: how long, in what capacity(ies)? 7. What leadership roles have you fulfilled during your service? 8. What influenced your decisions to join the armed forces / become a nurse? 9. What did you hope to accomplish? 10. To what extent has the job met your expectations?

---

[30] My actual sampling procedure is discussed in section 5.5.2

Research Question 2. As people construct their identities as leaders, do they seek to reconcile all their other identities into a coherent whole with their identity as a leader? Do they view their leader identities as in any way shaped, influenced or informed by their sex, gender and/ or sexual identities? Or do their leader identities instead come to affect how they see themselves as male, female, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera)?

11. What role models did you have for leadership: real-life or from books, movies, television, other popular culture?
12. How did you develop your leadership qualities?
13. How did you see yourself as a leader at the beginning of your service?
14. How does that compare to how you see yourself as a leader now?
15. What is expected of you as a [male / female] leader? Where does this come from?
16. What do you need to be a good leader in this organization? Is it generic? Can anybody do it?
17. Tell me a bit about the best leader that you've had in the forces / in nursing. The worst. Tell me why that's so.
18. What makes a great leader? Can you give me an example?
19. Can anybody be a great leader? Why or why not? If so, how?
20. What kind of a leader do you think you are / were?
21. What kind of a leader do / did your subordinates think you are / were?
22. Does / did your leadership change with particular people, circumstances, situations?
23. Do different types of subordinates see your leadership differently?

Research Question 1[31]. How do/can people construct identities that transcend the heterosexual matrix? What might a queer identity / one at the border entail?

Research Question 3. To what extent are leadership, sex, gender and sexual identities 'fixed' or 'static'? Do we play out our sense of ourselves as leaders, men, women, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera) in the same way across time and place?

24. Now, I want to shift a bit and talk about your gender and your sexual orientation. How do you identify?

---

[31] The interview questions related to research questions 1 and 3 are placed this far into the interview in order to allow for rapport to develop between me and the respondents. This was important because of their sensitive nature and in order to put more nervous or uncertain participants at ease.

25. How would you describe yourself in terms of masculinity, femininity?
26. Has this identity shifted over time? How?
27. Is it constantly shifting, or does it shift in stops and starts?
28. Describe your coming out process.
29. Do you feel pressure / need to conform to a particular vision or view of what it is to be a lesbian or a gay man? in what way?
30. If you do, how does this affect you?
31. How does it play out in your leadership?
32. How do / did you manage your sexual orientation in the forces / in nursing? To what extent was it an issue?
33. If not out at work, then: how do / did you present at work?
    a. Private, so Don't Ask Don't Tell?
    b. Assumption that you were straight?
34. Do / did people know? If so, who knew, and how did they react? How did this affect you? Your subordinates?
35. If not, how did keeping quiet affect you?
36. Did it affect the way you lead? If yes, elaborate.

Research Question 4. How do queer or borderline identities intersect with leadership? Can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? In particular, in a profession in which gender roles are still fairly rigidly prescribed, and in which only certain forms of gendered leadership are 'acceptable', can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? If so, what are the effects of such subversion for the leader involved?

Research Sub-question 4a. To what extent do the differently hypergendered contexts of the military and nursing in the three countries seem to lead to varying outcomes in this regard?

37. Do you see yourself as filling a leadership role in other areas of your life? Tell me a bit about that.
38. How does your leadership in that (those) areas compare to your leadership in the military / nursing?
39. What do you think is the relationship between your sex / gender / sexuality and your leadership?
40. How does being a lesbian or a gay man affect your leadership?
41. How does being a leader affect your identity?
42. How can a lesbian or a gay man be a leader in the forces / nursing? Conditions of / limits on possibility.
43. Military: In Canada and UK – lesbians and gay men can be out now, what effect would that have? In US – Don't Ask Don't Tell- what effect?
44. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss regarding the way in which you have developed as a leader in the military and how that has affected or been affected by your sex, gender and / or sexual orientation?

The interview guide was slightly different for heterosexual participants. The differences were concentrated mainly in the sections on sexual orientation and reflected their heterosexual identification. For example question 43 above that speaks to the effect of either being able to be out or not being able to be out was not relevant to these

participants. Also, questions regarding coming out and managing sexual orientation were not relevant in the same way. On the other hand, questions regarding femininity, masculinity and the management of those aspects of identity for example were of course just as relevant for these participants. I have included the heterosexual interview guide in appendix 3 at the end of this chapter. The questions from this guide map onto the research questions in a similar way as those above. As expected, however, there were interviews that varied from the guide to a greater or lesser extent. For example, question 28 from the guide for heterosexual participants would not apply to military participants who were male and masculine or to nurses who were female and identified as feminine. I also used the opportunity to ask probing questions at appropriate junctures so that participants could elaborate on the things that they brought up. Further alterations were made to the interview guide during the data analysis process as I describe in section 5.5.1. The guides that I have reproduced here and in the appendix represent the final versions. In the next section, I discuss the ethical issues that I faced and the ways in which I addressed them.

5.4.3 Ethical issues

There are several levels at which the ethical issues of this project were addressed. First, at the most superficial level, I had to comply with the ethics guidelines of the University of Manitoba because I was on faculty there when I first started this project. Thus, I had to fill out a research ethics protocol that focused mainly on three issues, informed consent, anonymity of participants and confidentiality of data – with a view to recognizing and mitigating against any potential harm to participants. To ensure anonymity, there was to be no identifying information on any records. Further, all

participant names were replaced with pseudonyms. To ensure confidentiality, I kept all voice recordings, transcriptions, field notes and any other additional notes in a locked drawer or cabinet at all times. Further any relevant files on my computer were password-protected.

Following the procedure of the University of Manitoba, I prepared the statement of informed consent combined with an invitation to participate (Homan, 1991; Punch, 1998), reproduced in appendix 1, that each participant was required to sign. It outlines the purpose of the project, the data collection and analysis methods, the potential presentation and publication venues, and anonymity and confidentiality issues as above. It includes the assurance that all conversations would remain confidential and that any identifying information would be removed from transcripts or descriptions of results in the thesis and also any related presentation or paper. I indicated that I might quote participants, but again without identifying information. I also undertook to keep notes and transcripts secure and to destroy transcripts three years after I finished writing up the project. Other aspects of informed consent included describing the purpose of the study and the intended output venues. Participants were offered the interview guide ahead of time so that they could consider their answers before committing themselves to continuing with the project. Further, I made it clear that they could refuse to answer any question, ask to stop the recorder at any time, add to or clarify their responses even after the interview and withdraw from the process at any time, even after the interview was over. Of all the participants, only the two transgendered participants chose to withdraw. I was in addition aware that potential participants might not want to sign their real names to the consent statement. I therefore secured approval to allow them to either sign with a

pseudonym, agree by sending an e-mail from an address that did not identify them (e.g. blank@hotmail.com) or, if that was still too threatening, to simply read over the form and then confirm verbally at the start of the interview that they had read it and were willing to go ahead.

However, even though informed consent is an important consideration in research ethics (Christians, 2003; Fine et al., 2003), I recognized readily that these practices did not get entirely to the heart of the ethical issues involved. I asked myself the following questions as a guide to potential ethical problems:

1. What am I asking people to talk about?

2. How could this affect them?

3. What about the people who work or worked under DADT in particular?

To answer the last question first, I was scrupulous in the processes that I used to preserve the anonymity of my participants. There are no links between email addresses and identities that could lead to them being identified. That is, I did not annotate, file or in any other way alter emails so that the real identity of the person could be tied back to their email address. Thus, for example, although Tanya and I corresponded by email a number of times before and after the interview, the name she used to sign her emails appears nowhere else in my files. Further, from the beginning I used pseudonyms when working with any interview data so that I would not inadvertently identify anyone.

I was also aware, however, that I was asking people to reflect on and talk about their sexuality and that this had both potential risks and consequences. I knew that these were sensitive topics that in discussion could bring up strong feelings for participants as established earlier with regards to Lee and Renzetti (1993). I am not a counsellor and did

not see myself as in any way qualified to deal with those feelings if they became problematic for participants. However, I did recognize that I had a duty to spend some time after the interview discussing the effects of these discussions if a participant so wished. In the analysis chapter which follows this one I discuss one specific instance where I had several telephone and email conversations with a participant because she had found our initial interview to have a bigger impact on her than anticipated. This brought home the fact that there were consequences to asking the questions that I was asking and that my responsibility was to ensure several things, to remind people they had the right to refuse to answer a question if they became upset, to remind them that they did not have to continue if they became upset, and to remind them of my availability to discuss issues further if that would be useful, once the interview was over.

I also felt it was important to build in some debriefing time at the end of the formal interview anyway, during which we could get out of the interview and back into regular life. In this I was guided by Oakly (1981) who suggests that traditional interviewing, in which the interviewer defines the rules of engagement and focuses simply on getting what they want out of the interviewee, puts all the power in the interviewer's hands – somewhere I did not believe it should rest. Oakly further suggests that this leads to bad interviewing, and that only when the interviewer is willing to disclose something about themselves can they develop a relationship with the interviewee and thus end up with good interviews. I followed this advice in all my initial discussions with potential participants, not in order to develop a 'relationship' with them as such but to make a connection beyond the expedient and instrumental. Indeed, I found that when, at the beginning, I was able to make a connection, perhaps through common sexual

orientation, common interests or common friends, for example, the interviews were richer and more open. This connection also better facilitated, at the end of the interview, the transition away from interview mode to 'regular life'.

5.4.4 Other issues relating to sensitivity

There were some other issues to be considered, as informed by Renzetti and Lee (1993): legalities, politics, and the effects of doing the research on the life of the researcher. For example, although I was not aware of any legal ramifications for me, I did understand that all participants were bound by security and / or patient confidentiality constraints. Thus, I was careful not to inadvertently ask them questions that might breach those boundaries, nor to reveal any information regarding posting or location that would breach anonymity of participants or patients / military units. However, I am not a member of the US military and I am therefore not bound by DADT. I thus had no legal obligation to do anything with regards to the participants' revelation of their sexual orientation.

There were some interesting potential political effects to consider, especially as they might impact the life of this researcher. I knew that choosing to conduct research on issues of sex, gender and sexuality might lead others to perceive me as either 'not a serious' researcher or as one interested in 'secondary' issues. Further, I was also aware of Brewis's (2005) contention that others often see us as somehow being like the people or issues that we research and that they might jump to the conclusion that I was like my participants. It was not the leader angle that was potentially problematic – I have been a leader in the past although never in the military and I have never been a nurse - but rather

the queer one. I do not have a problem with being queer, but I knew at the start that this project, by highlighting queer identity, would most likely reveal my own sexual orientation simply by virtue of the topic at hand. In the often-conservative climate of business schools this has the potential of making me *persona non grata* in some places, especially should I choose to seek different employment in the future. However, I felt that this project was important enough to pursue nevertheless.

I was also fortunate to work in a faculty that did not care about these issues at the University of Manitoba. I continue to be fortunate at the School of Management at Leicester in receiving support and encouragement for doing research, whatever the issues and problems that I choose to investigate. Finally, I have also had the opportunity to present preliminary results from this thesis project at an international conference and at a business school in Canada, and have found no indication that people were interested in anything other than the research and its results. Simply put, no one seemed to care about my sexual orientation, and that is truly remarkable – in a very positive way. Having discussed the research philosophies and strategies that guided my work, the specific methods I used and the ways in which I dealt with the various issues that came up, I now continue in the next section with a discussion of the process of data collection.

5.5 Data collection process

In this section I explain the process that I used to collect the data for this project, including the technical issues that I resolved in order to be able to proceed with my interview guide and the sampling technique that I used to obtain participants. I employed a fairly straightforward data collection process, cycling back and forth between the data

and new interviews. In many ways, the beginning was the most difficult time because I

was concerned about finding participants. As I mentioned above, unlike many studies

involving organizational members, this process involved trying to find people who shared

an <u>experience</u> as opposed to an organizational <u>site</u>. I was aware that "because

interviewing is essentially a personal relationship, who the participants are matters."

(Esterberg, 2002, p.20). They mattered in the sense that I knew who I was looking for,

but I was also asking people to trust me about a sensitive matter. Following Zarella

(1996) who let participants know of her ethnic identity and status as a working mother

when she was interviewing Mexican-American workers, and Gagne (cited in Tewksbury

and Gagne, 1997) who shared her experiences in an abusive relationship when

interviewing Appalachian women, I shared my sexual orientation with potential queer

participants in both occupations and my experience of teaching and supervising nursing

students with nurses. Other forms of connection such as common university attendance,

common academic or professional interests and common friends helped make a

connection in many cases when the other two points of connection were not possible. I

discuss this aspect of the data collection process further in section 5.5.2.

As mentioned above, I began with three pilot interviews. I initially sent out a call

for participants to several online groups in which I had not participated for a number of

years. These groups have nothing whatsoever to do with the military yet I knew from

many previous interchanges that they included a number of current and former military

members. I joined a discussion list at the Minerva Center focusing on issues of equality

in the US military in the hopes of getting American participants. I also approached a

number of former students who were in nursing and explained my project. Although a

number of people expressed interest they were difficult to 'nail down' for an actual time and place for an interview. However, one Canadian and two British women, both from the military, agreed to be my first participants. In a fortuitous coincidence, I was in the UK for a working visit with my supervisors prior to my relocation to the UK when the two British women contacted me and we were thus able to conduct these interviews in person. The Canadian interview was conducted in person upon my return to Canada.

I transcribed those three interviews and went through an initial coding process. As suggested, I then amended the interview schedule by adding some questions and modifying others. For example, question 13 asked participants to describe the best and the worst leader that they had in the armed forces. I quickly realized that people had a lot more to say about good leadership than simply describing one person. They had obviously thought about this issue a great deal, especially as they sought to develop their own leadership identity and capabilities. After the first three interviews I also noticed that there were remarkable similarities between the answers people gave to this question. I therefore modified this question and added to it, by asking the following:

1. Tell me a bit about the best leader that you've had in the forces / in nursing. The worst. Tell me why that's so.

2. What makes a great leader? Can you give me some examples?

3. Can anyone be a great leader? Why or why not? If so, how?

This set of questions ended up yielding some of the richest and most interesting data and also became the focal point for the beginning of my analysis and the arguments that I construct in the next chapter.

Over the course of the data collection phase I continued to interview small clusters of people and then return to data analysis before interviewing a few more. This was in keeping with the iterative process that is fundamental to the approach that I was using. It allowed me to pursue themes that came up, as outlined above, and also allowed me to go back and look for themes and issues that I had not picked up in earlier interviews. In the next section I discuss the technical issues that I took into account in order to conduct these interviews.

5.5.1 Technical issues

There were some technical issues to consider but no great technical difficulties. I decided to audiorecord the interviews for several reasons. I wanted to have an accurate record of each interview. I also wanted to be able to focus on what was happening in the interview rather than try to write down comprehensive notes. In this way I could jot down important notes but also allow the interview to be as organic as possible, flowing both from the interview schedule and from topics that came up as we proceeded. Finally, audiorecording would allow for the transcription of interviews, an option that I wanted to have available as discussed below. Several participants declined to be recorded, and I thus made the most detailed notes I could, both during and after these interviews.

I tried to conduct as many face-to-face interviews as possible. In this case, there were technical considerations with regards to location. I asked participants to select the interview setting, and tried as much as possible to comply. Several took place in public settings such as coffee houses or pubs. These locales provided some challenges because of ambient noise or large echoing spaces. In order to minimize this disturbance I invested in a high-quality digital recorder with a directional microphone and some noise-

cancelling properties. I was intrigued by the fact that there were participants who were willing to talk about such sensitive and private issues in a public space. I can only surmise that they felt comfortable within the noise and anonymity of a pub or a coffee house in a way that was perhaps easier to handle than a quiet setting where they were the sole focus.

Twenty interviews, however, were conducted by telephone, using an audiorecorder and an adaptor so that sound was recorded directly through inline input[32]. This improved the quality of the recording, although three interviews were of poor audio quality due to a loud buzzing interference, even though I tested the recorder before each conversation. I concluded that some cordless phones provided poor audio and asked later participants not to switch to cordless phones if possible. That seemed to solve the problem. One interesting result of the telephone interviews was that I quickly realized that it would be useful to know what people looked like, especially since this seemed to be salient to their social role and the way in which they expressed their gender and their leadership at work. Because I could not see them, I started to ask them to describe themselves.

The digital recorder made it easy to back up interview data on a memory stick, a second hard drive and on two different CDs. Of course, there was no identifying information on these files. I made up a master list of pseudonyms that was kept separately, locked in a drawer in my office, so that I could easily attribute quotes during analysis and write-up while being consistent. Digital recordings were also easier to clean

---

[32] Whenever possible I interviewed participants in person, something that I was able to accomplish through travel to a conference and to a number of cities during the timeframe of this study. When it was not possible to meet face to face, I used the telephone.

up and provided easy transcription sources using a Wave replay pedal attached to my computer.

I transcribed the first five interviews verbatim, being very careful not to miss the nuances in each interview. This was for several reasons. The first three interviews were effectively my pilot study and I wanted to make very sure that I identified any issues that were not included in the interview guide, whether the interview guide was getting at the issues that I wanted to get at for this study, and that I was not inadvertently hurting or creating problems for participants by asking questions that were unclear or of an uncomfortably problematic nature for them.

Once I revised my initial guides I transcribed the next two interviews very carefully, again in order to ensure that the effect of the changes I had made was what I expected it to be. After these first five interviews I switched to a practice of only transcribing parts of interviews. I would take notes during each interview and write field notes after each interview. I would then listen to the interview at least once through while it was still fresh and write additional notes. As I started to go through batches of interviews in the analysis process, I would note the chronometer times of particular sections that I would later transcribe. These were usually sections where I found powerful stories, useful quotes and thought-provoking answers. I discuss transcription further in the section below on analysis process. However, in the next section, I discuss in more detail the specific sampling techniques that I used in order to obtain a rich and varied group of participants.

5.5.2 Sampling

Overall I used purposive sampling (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p.202), to gather the sample that I needed in order to conduct the project. That is, the sampling was driven by the purpose of my study which was to understand how people of various sexes, genders and sexualities experience and enact leading within the military and nursing. Thus, to reiterate, I was looking for participants who shared a common experience as opposed to, for example, a specific organizational setting. I also wanted to explore the way in which the differently hypergendered contexts in the three countries affected participants in this regard, and thus needed to find participants in several countries in terms of the military focus. I selected Canada because I am Canadian, was working in Canada at the beginning of this project and wanted to understand these issues in a home country context. I added the UK and the US for different reasons, the US primarily because I wanted to understand the effect of DADT on leadership and the UK primarily because it afforded an opportunity to compare a context with both similarities and differences from the other two – similar yet different ideas regarding leadership and similar and different policies in the military. For example, like Canada but unlike the US, the UK military does not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation. However, like the US but unlike Canada, the UK military has a combat exclusion for women. In terms of nursing, I used a similar rationale for choosing Canada. In contrast to both Canada and the UK the US does not have a public health care system and I was curious to find out how this might impact members of the nursing profession. However, it is unfortunate that in the end I was not able to find nursing participants from the US.

I therefore specifically set out to find people who had worked in the military or nursing, had at least one year's experience and had fulfilled some sort of leadership

position. I did not limit myself to officers in the military or to people who had positions that included some sort of managerial title. This was because I was interested in understanding leadership, and leadership is enacted and exhibited by officers and noncommissioned members in the military and by people at many levels of nursing.

The criteria for participation were simple: active or retired members with experience in the armed forces of one of the three countries, regardless of specialty, and/or experience as a nurse in one of the countries, plus a minimum of one year's experience in a leadership role, regardless of rank (military) or job title (nursing). The one-year requirement was intended to ensure that participants had had some opportunity to enact leadership in actual work situations for long enough to have to think about outcomes, networks, problems and successes. Given that most performance appraisal systems have at least a yearly cycle, it seemed like a good minimum indicator of on-the-job leadership experience because I assumed that participants would have had to, at some point, think about and discuss their leadership as part of a performance appraisal process.

I also used a type of snowball sampling (Heckathorn, 1997) because I knew from prior experience that "it often represents the only way of getting a sample" when researching sensitive topics (Lee, cited in Renzetti and Lee, 1993, p.6). Thus, I knew that one way of dealing with this difficulty was to ask people who had already agreed to participate whether they could suggest other potential participants. As explained above, I was able to start the pilot study with three participants. I also sent the invitation to former students and friends who had heard about the project and indicated that they might have friends who would be interested in participating. Each time I found someone who would be willing to participate I asked them to suggest others who might be willing. A number

of potential US respondents asked a lot of questions about anonymity and then declined

to sign the consent form and participate, stating that they were too concerned about

repercussions if the US military found out that they were lesbian or gay. In particular,

they were worried about discharge and / or losing pension and health care benefits. They

made certain to point out that this was not so much a reflection of a feeling that my

confidentiality procedures were inadequate as a concern that the Internet was too

vulnerable to government surveillance.

I was also very careful to ensure that potential participants in the military were

aware of my own sexual orientation as a way of underscoring my special understanding

of the necessity of anonymity and confidentiality. The military is a closed world in many

ways. Many participants spoke of it as a 'brotherhood' where people closed ranks

against outsiders, even if they fought amongst themselves. Because I had no prior

military experience I was aware that I ran the risk of not being able to enter that world.

However, as mentioned earlier I was conscious of needing to make a point of connection

with participants and of perhaps sharing an aspect of myself as a way to make that

connection. Prior experience in interviewing LGBT participants (Bowring and Brewis,

2009) had led me to understand that I could perhaps enter their world more effectively by

finding common ground in our sexual orientation if not through a shared military

experience. Thus, I made sure to identify my non-heterosexuality as a way to connect

with such participants and was able to enter their world, however briefly, in a highly

specific and circumscribed way. In a few circumstances it was my academic credentials

that allowed me to enter. This was particularly true with heterosexual members of both

professions, who were not interested in my sexual orientation as much as they were in my professional qualifications.

Interestingly, a number of heterosexual people I approached were at first also hesitant to participate. I had initially provided them with the aforementioned invitation to participate that explains the project. Upon reading it they responded that they had nothing to offer because "I'm not what you're looking for". When pressed, they explained that their military leadership experience was not what they considered unusual. They also felt that they had nothing to offer in the way of sexual orientation because they were straight. Even after I explained that I wanted people of all sexes, genders and sexualities to participate, three people, all men with military experience, all straight, declined to participate before we even discussed signing the informed consent form. My own reflection on this is that they perhaps did not want to be associated with a study on LGBT issues and the military.

As aforementioned, I also initially secured the participation of two transgendered individuals, one male to female (mtf) and one female to male (ftm). Although they seemed quite interested in the project, they were hesitant and spoke to or e-mailed me a number of times to discuss their situation, the questions, and other aspects of the project. In the end, both of these participants failed to sign the informed consent form and requested that I not include them or our discussions in my research. Of course, I agreed with their request. Upon reflection, I do believe that, in the end, I was not able to establish a similar point of connection with them and that was why they did not join the other participants. Previous experience interviewing transgender participants for another

study (Bowring and Brewis, 2009) confirms my speculation that their transgender status was of a particularly sensitive nature to them and that this underpinned their reticence.

Ironically, though, it was much more difficult to find participants in nursing than it was to find participants in the military. Fortunately, I had made some contacts during a previous research project and through my career that were useful in finding initial participants. Former students and friends likewise recommended potential participants. I also posted my invitation to participate on a number of online lists but had virtually no response in this regard. A number of nurses who agreed to participate were also constrained by confidentiality and ethics approval protocols in the settings in which they worked and in the end were unable to continue with their participation.

Who, then, were the leaders that participated in my study? There were 22 members of the military and 12 nurses[33]. The disparity in numbers was due to the following reasons:

1. **Ease of finding participants.** The process that I described above where I used my membership of online lists as an initial point of contact was useful for finding military participants but much less so for finding nurses. I did not have one response from a nurse through that medium. In Canada, furthermore, nurses in most regions must go through their regional health authority in order to participate in a research study, in order to ensure that patient confidentiality is maintained. There are other health authorities that allow nurses to participate as private individuals. Thus, after going over the interview guide with me, several

---

[33] I provide a very brief description of each participant in Appendix 4.

nurses agreed to participate because they felt they were able to answer my questions within those parameters.

2.   **It's not about how many …** In this type of project, the number of interviews is guided not by a specific formula, but by the results. When one reaches the point when the interviews start to yield similar data, it is time to stop. In this I was guided by the principles of theoretical sampling which Bryman describes as "using theoretical reflection on data as a guide to whether more data are needed". (Bryman, 2004, p. 324). That is, I continued sampling until I achieved theoretical saturation (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1992; Strauss and Corbin, 1998). This was the point where "no new categories, concepts, dimensions or incidents emerged during the theory development process". (Bryman, 2004, page 324). When I reached this point, I had the number and proportion of interviews that I have described.

3.   **Complexity of issues**. The issues that came out of the initial military interviews seemed more complex and varied, due to different services, different rules about sexual orientation and different experiences according to timeframe. These issues thus warranted continued exploration. In particular, as I discussed in chapter 3, sexual orientation is an issue that has been under discussion in the armed forces of all three countries for decades. It is addressed in regulations, it polarizes people, and it can lead to sanction and dismissal. People therefore have to think about it, and they usually have a lot to say about it and how it affects their work lives. However, the nursing profession does not overtly or formally at least regulate the sexuality of its members, nor does it differ much between the three

countries in this regard. Thus, the issues that arise from sexuality are perhaps less central to nurses, and this was reflected in the way in which I began to hear the same issues come up in these interviews much more quickly than in the military interviews. Thus, I reached theoretical saturation more quickly with the nursing sample than I did with the military sample.

4.   **Leadership requirement**. As aforementioned, leadership and the military are virtually synonymous and therefore there were many more potential participants than in nursing. Anyone from a private up practises leadership, whereas nursing, on the face of it, has many followers and fewer leaders. Thus, it was more difficult to find nurses with what they understood to be leadership experience. I believe that part of this was due to the fact that members of the military are sensitized to the leadership aspects of their jobs very early in their careers, whereas nurses are not encouraged to think of themselves as leaders until they actually fill a formal leadership post. Leadership qualities and behaviour are formally evaluated in the military from the very beginning of a soldier's career regardless of the rank that they hold. Thus it seemed easier for potential participants from any rank in the military to see themselves as having fulfilled leadership roles than for potential nursing participants.

5.   **Networks of leaders**. I received many more referrals from military people than from nurses as the former seem to be more closely networked. Part of that is due to there being many more leaders in any one military site than in one ward or community clinic. It is also due to the camaraderie in the military that encourages networking and close ties. It is interesting that almost all military

participants at least suggested another potential participant, even if that suggestion did not result in an actual participation. However, not one nurse suggested another potential participant.

6. **Personal interest**. Finally, and to be fair, as mentioned in chapter 1.0, I was also much more interested in the experience of military participants because sexuality is so central to the armed forces' regulation of its members. It was for me the ideal situation in which to explore the issues of leadership identity and sexuality that I wrote about in earlier chapters. I knew going in that these issues would likely be more complex and more dramatic than in the nursing profession. That is not to say that nursing does not entail interesting and complex issues that arise out of the patriarchal structuring of the profession. However, those issues have been, and continue to be, explored in many studies done by nursing academics, for example Laschinger's work on empowerment (e.g. Laschinger, 1996; Laschinger and Haven, 1997) or Upenieks' work on empowerment of nurses (e.g. Upenieks 2003, 2003a, 2003b) as discussed in chapter 4. But overall, the nurses were always intended to provide a counterpoint to the soldiers. Of course, had I seen any indication that sexuality played a larger role, I would have pursued more nursing participants. However, as I mentioned above, the same issues began to come up fairly quickly in the interview process.

As already established, I actively sought out participants from three countries, Canada, the UK and the US. In the end, nurses were from Canada and the UK only, because I was unable to obtain the participation of American nurses. Soldiers were from Canada, the UK and the US. The youngest participant was in her early twenties while the

oldest was in his mid-sixties. While I did not ask specifically about racial background, given that it is not a focus of this study, there were participants from various, sometimes mixed, races, white, black, Asian and Native American among others. Composition was varied in terms of social role and sexuality. There were women and men who identified as feminine or masculine to varying degrees and as heterosexual, lesbian, gay or bisexual. Participants often provided modifiers to further define the complexity of their gender identity such as Andrea who described herself as a "sporty lesbian, soft butch". Several also concluded the descriptions of themselves by saying "I'm just me". I discuss this further in the data analysis chapter.

There were three female and three male nurses from Canada and the UK respectively (i.e., six from each country). They had between three and twenty years' nursing experience, in a variety of specialisms: general wards in hospitals, community nursing, public health, A and E and specialized units such as burn recovery. The distribution of soldiers was as follows: two women and three men from the UK, nine women and two men from Canada and five women and one man from the US. Canadian military participants were from all branches of the service, i.e. Army, Navy and Air Force. British participants were from the Army and Navy, while Americans were from the Army, Navy and Air Force but not the Marines. Ranks varied from the first rank above the lowest enlisted rank through non-commissioned members (NCM) all the way to General. Military occupational specialties ran the gamut from music to Military Police and included members from the combat arms in the Canadian Forces, those who served in 'combat support' positions in the other services and the intelligence services among others. There were also two officers who were nurses. Both have been included in the

nurses' count above as they saw their nursing experience and responsibility as being primary from a professional point of view. Military respondents had served as little as two years up to over twenty years, over a span of time that runs from the 1960s until the present day. They had been deployed at domestic bases and abroad in such diverse areas as the Canadian Arctic, the Mediterranean, Northern Ireland, Eastern Europe during the Cold War, Bosnia, the first Gulf War, Afghanistan, Iraq and other peacekeeping missions and military conflicts. Many were still on active duty and some will eventually deploy to either Afghanistan or the Gulf. In the next section I describe the process that I used to analyse the interviews that I conducted with these participants.

5.6 Analysis process

Analysis followed the constant comparative method. As suggested above, I did not transcribe all the interviews, only some completely and others in parts. Charmaz (2003) advocates transcribing all interviews and field notes in order to be able to conduct a proper analysis. Glaser (1998), on the other hand, suggests that complete transcription is not necessarily an effective use of time and can lead to the researcher getting lost in the data as opposed to actually being able to code effectively. I found transcription to be useful in the beginning because it made it easier to spot themes and compare themes and issues as per the constant comparative method. However, I also found that the written expression of ideas was not as nuanced as the oral one, and I found myself returning to the sound files as a way to get closer to the interviewees and the data. As the project progressed I found it much more effective to listen repeatedly to recordings and make copious notes as a way of analysing the data. I only transcribed parts of interviews that I

felt were going to be used verbatim, or that I felt contained material that would open up new categories and themes.

I followed an open coding process (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) in order to draw out and develop themes from the data. In this process I followed Charmaz's (2006, p.47) advice and asked the following questions:

1.   What is this data a study of? (Glaser and Strauss, 1978, p. 57)

2.   What does the data suggest? Pronounce?

3.   From whose point of view?

After an initial pass through one segment of data I would return to conduct more interviews, looking for themes that had come up and continuing to work with the interview guide that I had developed. Once all interviews were finished I listened to all of them again and worked through the data again, in order to see what themes had come up repeatedly and to begin the writing up process. In this aspect I was especially guided by the third question above. In the next section –the last in this chapter – I reflect on the methodological choices that I made and the challenges that I faced during the completion of this study.

5.7 Challenges and reflections

There were several challenges in completing this project that I have discussed above, the difficulty in finding participants, the difficulty in gaining their trust and the awareness that I was treading on sensitive ground. I have discussed above how I tried to handle these challenges. It was particularly difficult to find nursing participants, something that surprised me. I had worked with many nursing students in the past and

did not expect this difficulty. However, once I was made aware of the institutional constraints on participation because these former students and their contacts all worked in places that would require them to go through a lengthy approval process, I realized that I could not draw upon these resources. In the end, it was easier to find soldiers, and I continue to have military people email me and offer to participate because they have heard of my project from someone else. This was indeed a surprise, especially because I did not expect to be able to include many soldiers initially. So, my first lesson was that participants do not always come from where you expect.

My second lesson reaffirmed one I had learned in an earlier project, that finding a point of connection with potential participants was crucial. Indeed, I strongly suspect that the lack of this connection was one of the factors that made it difficult to find nurses to participate and also to find transgender participants. In the aforementioned previous project that involved interviewing LGBT people (Bowring and Brewis, 2009) only one out of three potential transgendered participants who expressed an interest in my study actually participated in the end. That person and I shared both a common acquaintance and an interest in researching the effects of sexual orientation on LGBT employees. The other two potential participants in that study had contacted me after reading my invitation to participate but did not share either of those points of connection with me.

Other challenges had to do with working on a project that was really groundbreaking, not in a boastful sense, but in the sense that no one has ever asked these questions before. This was both exciting and problematic, because no prior research meant being able to make an original contribution but also not having much prior writing

to work with, especially with regards to developing interview guides and working out themes.

As I reflect on the methodology I used I believe that this was an appropriate research design for this initial foray into this topic. However, in retrospect I would do some things differently. For example, I would endeavour to spend some actual work time with participants to get a sense of their leadership through observation and to talk to their staff teams as well. This would likely require some degree of sponsorship for a study through institutions such as the UK MOD or the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, for example. I have made some contacts in the militaries of a number countries during the completion of this study that might provide potential points of entry. As well, I have gained some added credibility by presenting my work at a military conference and an international academic conference and having a paper accepted in a book on gender and the military. Of course, such sponsorship would require understanding and negotiating the potential conflict of interest and the effects of sponsorship on the ability and willingness of participants to be open and frank. However, like all other ethical issues that are involved in any research project, awareness of their existence is the first step towards resolving them in a satisfactory manner.

I would also become much more familiar with military context and protocol in order to be able to ask more pointed questions about leadership and sexuality. I would spend some time observing and living on a base in order to get a better sense of the daily lives of personnel. I have made contacts who have expressed a willingness to share a more detailed understanding of military life and protocol with me as part of my 'military education' and as background for future research projects. Finally I would try to find

more US participants by making connections with academics who conduct research into sexual minorities and the military and who have already made these connections. There is a large number of material that would be interesting to explore by talking to queer soldiers who operate(d) under DADT, for example, the ways in which they manage their social role and their sexuality depending on who knows about their sexual orientation. I was fortunate to be able to find queer participants who had served in the US military and agreed to participate in this study, something that has not been accomplished in many other studies. However, none of them were active members of the military. There are some academics who have managed to get inside this group and it would be helpful to gain their collaboration.

In this chapter I have discussed aspects of the methodological approach I brought to this project. I began by outlining the ontological and epistemological positions at its heart. I continued by explaining the research strategies that I used given these philosophical positions. I then continued with an explanation and discussion of the specific methods that I used, the interviews, the interview guides and the issues that were important to consider as I developed the methods. I then outlined the process that I used to collect the interview data including an explanation of the sampling procedure, and briefly described the process of analysis. Finally, I reflected on the 'doing' of this project, the challenges that I came across and the ways in which I might do some things differently next time. In the next chapter, I analyse the data that I collected. In particular I discuss the themes that emerged from the data, and the insights that they offered. This leads to the final chapter in which I return to the research questions and summarize the answers to them that I found in the data.

6.0 Data Analysis

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I provide an analysis of the interview data and notes[34] that I

collected during the project. I begin by discussing the answers to the questions "What, for

you, is a great leader?" and "Can you give me an example?". I chose to begin with this

discussion in part because the participants' answers revealed a relatively consistent set of

characteristics of great leadership, regardless of the respondents' sexed body, social role,

sexuality or organizational affiliation. What was also particularly interesting about this

ideal leader was the mostly gender-neutral quality of the traits, characteristics and

behaviour that were put forward. This gender-neutral portrait of good leadership thus

prompted me to ask myself the following question: "If most people are agreed on

seemingly gender-neutral great leadership, why do people of different genders and

sexualities have such different experiences of leadership, and markedly so in these

hypergendered organizations?". In particular, the emergent portrait of great leadership

seemed to contradict or at least put into question claims discussed in the literature review

that suggested that both women and men tend to see the characteristics associated with

great leadership as being masculine characteristics (e.g. Schein, 1973; Powell and

Butterfield, 1989; Powell et al., 2002). At the very least, there is the suggestion that the

issue is more complex than is portrayed in previous research.

---

[34] As mentioned in chapter 5, the notes consist of observations and reflections about
participants and interview experiences, and additional information about participants such
as appearance, as they related to their involvement in this study.

In the second part of this chapter I focus more directly on the participants'

organizational experiences, especially of leadership. In particular, I examine the ways in

which the participants developed and negotiated their leadership identity, given their ideas

regarding good leaders and the realities of their organizational contexts. I then examine

the outcomes and implications for the participants. I frame this discussion using themes

that emerged from the interviews and in doing so link these to the recurring body/social

role/sexuality framework that characterizes my conceptual framework, as presented in

Butler's (1990) heterosexual matrix. In the next chapter, I will return to the overarching

research questions and discuss the ways in which the results of my project answered these

questions.

6.2 What is a great leader?

In this section I discuss the participants' understanding of great leadership.

Originally, these questions (11 and 12 on the interview schedules) were simply intended

to solicit ideas that participants held with regards to what makes a good leader. Although

in some ways prompted by the prevalence of this type of question in leadership research, it

became an integral focus of the later interviews. Because I was using a constant

comparative method and intermingling analysis with ongoing data collection, I was able to

see some emerging similarities in responses early on in the process. Thus, this became the

first emergent category to be explored in the iterative analysis process.

In contrast to many mainstream projects that examine perceptions of effective

leadership I did not restrict or shape the potential answers in any way – I did not specify

leadership as comprised of actions, or character traits, or physical traits or attitudes, for

example. Rather, I asked participants to describe great leaders, both ideal and actual, and asked them to link those descriptions with their own leadership and their own leadership aspirations.

My participants seemed to share a belief that great leadership requires both an ability to do the jobs that were required and a willingness to do the same jobs that subordinates were asked to do, whether or not leaders actually did those jobs in practice. It was interesting to note that loyalty was an important component of great leadership for many participants and by loyalty they meant loyalty to subordinates, as well as loyalty to the organization. Also included in the characteristics of great leadership were an ability to get the job done – that is, an ability to acquire resources and manage processes in order that objectives were accomplished – and a degree of competence that was superior to that of subordinates and engendered their respect. These results were in contrast to those obtained in other studies in which respondents were asked questions that were tied into discrete categories and characteristics of leadership, for example Schein (1973) and sex-role characteristics; Eagly et al. (2003) who examined transformational versus transactional leadership; Grant (1988) and Rosener (1990) who examined women's ways of leading; and Fletcher (1994; 1998) who examined the relational aspects of leadership. In each of these studies, leadership was set up to map onto a specific set of characteristics linked to sex or gender and then data collected to confirm or deny these ties. In my project, where no *a priori* ties were presumed to exist, participants likewise neither confirmed nor denied sex- or gender-related leadership characteristics – they simply offered their own ideas regarding leadership.

Further, I asked people to provide examples of great leadership, they generally provided specific examples of people they had served or worked with, or who had been top level leaders of their organizations or units. Thus, for example, Jane, a retired lesbian member of the US military, provided General Norman Schwarzkopf as one of her models of great leadership. Even though she had never met him, she was exposed to him at a distance during the time that she served in the first Gulf War, and felt the effect of his policies and his personality in her day-to-day interactions with fellow soldiers and the day-to-day missions in which she participated. Interestingly, there was no visible pattern in the sex of role models that people offered. Participants had rather been exposed to these women and men in some way and had tried to learn from if not emulate them in their own efforts towards good leadership.

In the following subsections, I discuss each of the themes that came out of this portion of the interviews, many of which were articulated by Jane in her description of one of her former commanding officers (CO): "Know your responsibility, be willing to listen, be willing to do the job that subordinates can do, and be fearless, don't worry about making others happy or offending others". I have tried, wherever possible, to include links to the existing leadership literature. However, as will become apparent, many of the themes articulated by my respondents are not addressed in this literature. In subsection 6.2.8 I address the implications of this absence.

6.2.1 Do as I do, not as I say

The first and most common theme to emerge was the idea that great leaders lead from the front – i.e., they do not ask their followers to do something that they would not do themselves. This did not mean that great leaders repeatedly do things instead of their

followers. Rather, participants indicated that these leaders were willing to pitch in when needed and were willing to put themselves at risk alongside their followers. The risk was not necessarily military risk in the case of military members nor medical risk in the case of nurses. Rather, risk in this instance meant risk from all quarters – the task's characteristics as well as people higher up in the organization, political risk as well as physical or emotional risk. For example, when Susan, a retired lesbian soldier in the British Army, described Alberta, a former commanding officer whom she cited as an exemplary leader, she pointed out that "She didn't ask someone to do something she wouldn't do herself", even though Alberta commanded a large number of people and was at the top rank of her posting. Thus, even though Alberta would rarely engage in the actual work of her subordinates, according to Susan those subordinates still believed that she did not hold herself above them and did not feel she was 'too good' to perform those tasks if required.

For other military participants, leaders demonstrated this occasionally by actively participating in common tasks even though they were not required to, especially in trying conditions such as late night arrivals at camps or short turnaround, last-minute changes in orders for the whole unit. For nurses, this meant that leaders would help with everyday hospital tasks when the team was overwhelmed instead of standing back and just watching nurses try to cope with a hectic or difficult situation. Participants generally saw this characteristic as part of leading by example and a willingness to acknowledge subordinates' worth in an egalitarian, although not necessarily equal, way. That is, even though there was still an acknowledgement that leaders were higher up the organizational

hierarchy, due to either rank or position, good leaders were seen to value team members' contributions and treated them fairly.

This 'do as I do' aspect of leadership was illustrated in the way some of the participants developed their own style of leading. For example, Camille, a straight female officer in the Canadian Forces (CF), described one of the ways in which she garners respect for her abilities when dealing with a group of new recruits: "I do the morning runs with them. I'm the first to rappel down the walls". This seemed to tie in with her own perceptions of the leader whom she had offered as a great role model: "He represents everything he's asking his people to do". Sally, a retired lesbian member of the Canadian Forces, also felt that leading by example was a key attribute of good leaders: "Lead by example, be clear about what you need, be fair but firm. I learned how <u>not</u> to lead. It should never be 'do as I say', but 'do as I do'. It should never be 'because I said so'". Sally also explained that leading from behind was, in her experience, one of the hallmarks of poor leaders. She went on to say that, in the years since she left the Canadian Forces, leading by example (or not) has often been the difference between the good and bad leaders she has encountered in other walks of employment. In her own development as a leader, Sally has worked very hard at following the 'leading from the front' approach. It is interesting that Sally learned what she considers very important leadership lessons from negative rather than positive experiences. It is also interesting that I was not able to find this 'do as I do' attribute addressed in the literature on leadership.

6.2.2 Take care of your people

The second characteristic of good leadership discussed by participants was the way in which great leaders took care of their followers. This caring took many forms: physical

care, protection from political pressure or organizational pressure and shielding them from political games within the organization. For example, as mentioned above, Jane cited General Norman Schwartzkopf as one example of great leadership: "He was a soldier's general, his biggest concern with us [the troops]."

Included in this category was the willingness of great leaders to take the time to understand their followers, in particular what those followers needed from them. For example, "Just get[s] on with the job … [she was] wise, not out of touch, took time and took interest." (Marcy, a straight female member of the CF). For Caleb, a retired gay member of the US military, taking care of followers meant paying attention to the needs of these individuals, while for Leon, a gay male nurse, it also means following through on commitments made to one's team. Henry, a gay male nurse in the British military who was responsible for a large number of nurses and had been deployed in a number of hostile locations, including Afghanistan and the Gulf, repeatedly talked about this aspect of leadership. He was very insistent that his job was to look after his "boys and girls", whether that meant making sure they had the resources they needed, protecting them from politics, or ensuring their physical safety as much as possible. Henry explained: "Your job as a leader is to facilitate their job without them having to deal with any of the crap that comes along … That's how I've always run the [operating] theatre". Interestingly, Henry felt that this caring was an extension of the responsibilities that he had been taught as a young man from a family that could be considered landed gentry. The family had inculcated in their children the idea that position and wealth carry responsibility as well as privilege and Henry carried that outlook into his leadership persona as much as his

personal one. For him, nursing leadership carries responsibility along with the privilege it brings.

It is perhaps possible to see this attribute as a part of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Tichy and Devanna, 1986; Bass and Avolio, 1994) in that the relevant literature emphasizes the leader's role in helping subordinates release and achieve their potential. However, my sense of the participants' understanding of this attribute was that it had more to do with protecting their team members from political and other risks and accessing the resources that were required for them to accomplish their objectives.

6.2.3 Do not play politics

The extent to which all participants agreed that great leaders do not play politics was perhaps not surprising. This is because many of these participants saw first-hand the effect of politics on their organizational units. In particular, the military personnel discussed the way in which politics tended to affect promotion, training, visibility and reactions to their sexuality. For the nurses, politics often affected access to resources, especially with regards to funding for programmes such as community outreach that they were involved in. Almost all participants mentioned this aspect of great leadership, which clearly points to integrity as an important characteristic of leaders for them.

Politics seemed to be also tied to loyalty and trust. For example, Sandra, a straight woman in the CF, expected great leaders to be loyal in both directions, towards followers as well as toward those above them in the organization. For George, a straight male nurse in the UK, and Caleb, trustworthiness was an important aspect of great leadership. George also explained "It's not about hierarchy, it's about the team". That is, loyalty is due to the immediate team members, not to those above in order to ingratiate yourself with

them, while Rose, a straight nurse in the UK, concurs that great leadership is about

cooperation, "not [being] too authoritarian".

The admonition to forego politics is also tied to the previous great leader

characteristic, taking care of followers. For example, Henry was adamant that "I don't do

politics. It would demean me". He explained that leaders who engage in political

behaviour have lost sight of their primary goal, which for him is taking care of his people.

With regards to the literature, the political aspect of organizations is generally addressed

quite separately from leadership. I was not able to find any articles that specifically

addressed the role of leaders in organizational politics and the way in which they impact

staff teams.

6.2.4 Be an expert and get on with the job

This characteristic is similar to issues discussed in subsection 6.2.1 in the sense

that participants felt that great leaders had the knowledge required to do their job. This

did not necessarily mean that they needed to know the minutiae of every staff team

member's job, but rather that they were experts in their own jobs. Getting things done

included making sure that followers were able to get on with their jobs by providing

resources, guidance and expertise. My participants also saw a link between expertise at

doing a particular job and expertise at being a leader. For example, Henry believes that

good nursing and good leadership are tied together: "They're mutually dependent. People

who are strong in one role are generally strong in the other". He believed that leadership

in nursing required the credibility that comes from being a good nurse oneself.

Rose explained the problem with leaders in nursing who did not have nursing

expertise: "In health services, lots of people from outside come in as managers [without

any health care experience]. They tend to be the less successful leaders". She continued to explain that these leaders place less emphasis on nursing and more on business; that is, "they think in terms of money and the patients get forgotten". This attitude has left Rose feeling "disheartened, a bit jaded" about her workplace. She had left her previous unit because her manager had been replaced with what she termed a "poor manager". Clearly, the quality of leadership that she received was an important factor in her choice of workplace.

In the military, expertise in combat is generally considered to be necessary for moving into the higher ranks. As I discussed in chapter 3, women often have more difficulty achieving senior ranks because they do not have this experience, at least officially. This perceived lack of expertise seems to factor into the way in which women leaders are perceived in the military. Indeed, in my data many of the female participants who included expertise as a characteristic of great leadership also explained that, unlike their male counterparts, every time they started a new leadership posting they had to prove their own expertise in order to earn the respect of their followers.

Relatedly, many participants pointed out that, instead of standing around and talking about things, great leaders just get on with the task at hand. For example, Miranda, a lesbian member of the US military, explained that a good leader "isn't the one screaming orders; she's the one quietly in the corner getting things done". Interestingly, most of the military participants were like Tanya, who explained that even in a social situation like a potluck dinner she will move things along in order to ensure that everyone fills their plate instead of simply milling around while the food gets cold. For the soldiers who have left the military, their leadership attributes and skills are also an important part

of success in new positions. Jane, for example, stated that "in civvy street you can't just

order someone to do something." So, even if one could mistake that for leadership in the

military, one cannot fall back on it in civilian life.

6.2.5 Listen and be empathetic

Interestingly, although these may seem to be stereotypically feminine

characteristics, listening and empathy were offered as characteristic traits of great leaders

who were both female and male. For example, Sandra, who cited retired Canadian

General Lou MacKenzie as a great leader who "never takes credit for himself, has an

imposing presence, [is] physically fit", noted that he also "took the time to listen to others

and showed great compassion", while Andrea, a lesbian who has retired from the UK

military, stated that "a great leader has compassion and understanding". Another former

British soldier, Tim, a straight man, stated that being a "brilliant listener" was an

important characteristic of great leaders, while Charlotte, a lesbian member of the

Canadian Forces, explained that a great leader "pays attention to the needs of individuals".

She cited her current CO, a man, as an example of great leadership, pointing to his "quiet,

thoughtful leadership style".   Carla, a bisexual woman in the CF, similarly stated that

compassion and understanding were an important part of being a good leader.

Nurses shared this point of view. For example, Leon described a former manager

whom he considered to be a great leader: "She was very good at relationships. She knew

a little bit about everyone she met". He continued to explain that he was using her as a

role model: "In trying to grow as a leader I'm learning to take more of an interest in

people."

6.2.6 Have presence

Interestingly, although many of the military participants mentioned presence as an attribute of great leaders, many of the nurses did so as well. When asked to provide more details, they generally described aspects of physical presence: a crisp uniform for the soldiers, proper bearing and a confident carriage were most often cited. When asked to elaborate on 'proper bearing', both soldiers and nurses described people whose dress and demeanour reflected those qualities regarded as indicative of being a good nurse or soldier. This links with the ideas in subsections 6.2.1 and 6.2.4; all point to the necessity of great leaders to embody the very best characteristics and behaviours to which all team members are supposed to aspire. These respondents' idea of presence had nothing to do with physical strength, but more to do with presenting a confident appearance and demeanour that personified the ideal presentation of a soldier or nurse, depending on organizational affiliation. This fits in with Camille's earlier comment regarding one of her role models: "He represents everything he's asking his people to do".

It was also clear that this idea of presence was not tied to a particular sexed body or social role, but rather to the way in which the person projected their professional persona. Carla for example explained "It's [great leadership] 90 percent how you present yourself". Similarly, Marcy's CO "took pride in being a female in uniform and that made us proud".

6.2.7 Be a mentor, a guide and a teacher

Finally, an important characteristic of great leaders in these data was their willingness to share their expertise with staff team members. Great leaders were not afraid to be 'outdone' by those who they mentored, nor were they afraid to give them credit for their learning and achievements. Sandra explained that her role model of great

leadership, General Lou MacKenzie, "never takes credit for himself" while George's great leader model "walks alongside you, guides you". Also, participants felt that good leaders take the time to show followers how to develop their own leadership skills. Further, they find ways to encourage that development. For me, this tied in closely with subsection 6.2.2, taking care of team members, by helping them to learn from the leader's example. Of course, as I discuss in the next section, this aspect of leadership is also an important aspect of so-called transformational leadership.

6.2.8 Summary

In summary, it seems that, for these participants, great leadership is about acting with integrity, regardless of whether one is female or male, and regardless of one's occupation. There were some indications that presence and charisma were also important but, in general, great leaders were seen to behave consistently with integrity, while exhibiting the behaviour that they expect from their followers. Certainly, some of the criteria of great leadership listed (e.g. 6.2.4 and 6.2.5) can be seen as task-related (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977). According to Hersey and Blanchard, task behaviours consist of one-way communication from leaders to 'followers' in which they tell them what to do and how to do it, while relational behaviour consists of two-way communication that offers social support to these followers. In the case of my participants, however, behaviours such as 'get on with the job' were not presented as a prescription to focus on the task at hand exclusive to all else, nor were they an indication of directive, one-way communication towards followers. Instead, these pointed to the way in which great leaders are able to accomplish tasks and help staff team members to do the same. These were also included in a broader set of characteristics and task completion was never cited

as an overriding objective of great leaders. Indeed, integrity, valuing subordinates and leading by example were, I would say, the overriding characteristics of great leadership brought out by my participants.

Thus, in this set of answers, it would be difficult to find corroboration for many of the theories of leadership discussed in the literature reviews in chapters two, three and four. This implies, perhaps, that the literature has been searching for answers in all the wrong places, as it were. As discussed in chapter 2, decades of research have yielded very little in the way of new insights and here, perhaps, is one reason for that. The closest that existing studies come is the transformational leadership literature which suggests that charisma and empowerment are key characteristics of good leadership (see e.g. Burns, 1978; Bass,1985; Bass and Avoglio, 1994). Interestingly, women are most often identified as favouring a transformational leadership style (Rosener, 1990; Eagly et al., 2003) while at the same time charisma is often considered a masculine trait (Weber, 1947) – something which did not emerge from my data. Of course, these theories are quite specific in their prescriptions, while the participants gave a remarkably consistent account that included elements of many other leadership theories.

As mentioned above, I chose to begin this chapter with the answers to this question because of the surprising consistency in the participants' answers. In particular, what was interesting about the resulting answers was 1) the degree of overlap in participants' ideas about what made good leaders and 2) the lack, in general, of sex or gender stereotypical attributes present in these characterizations of great leadership, regardless of who was offering the description of great leaders and 3) no tying of specific characteristics or attributes to a specific sexed body.

As aforementioned the portrayal of great leadership discussed above then led me to ask the following question: "If gender is, in many ways, quite neutral in people's ideas of the way in which good leaders lead, why do people with varying sexed bodies, social roles and sexualities experience leadership and leading so differently, and markedly so in these hypergendered organizations?". In fact, this is the question that lies at the heart of this thesis. But in order to preface the analysis of the data that speak directly to this question I will now proceed to offer a short overview of the ways in which my respondents understood their own sexed body, social role and sexuality. Following that overview, I discuss what organizational life and leadership were like for the participants. I frame this discussion around the sexed body/social role/sexuality themes. This is not an attempt to force data into a preconceived grid, but rather a reflection of key themes around which the organizational lives of participants revolved: their sexed body often affected their career choices, their social role was an important aspect of the organizational prescription for leadership, and their sexuality was a specific interest of mine for this project. Following that discussion, I examine the way in which the participants' sexed bodies, social roles and sexualities intersected with their leadership. In chapter 7, I will, as suggested earlier, return to the research questions and discuss the answers that came out of this project.

Describing their sexed body as either female or male was straightforward for and led to predictable responses from all but two potential participants, one male to female transsexual and one female to male transsexual, who eventually pulled out of this study. However, participants identified in a wide range of ways in response to specific questions regarding their social role and their sexuality. It is interesting to note that, while I was very careful not to offer labels, many participants asked me to provide a set of labels from

which to choose how to describe their social role and sexuality. Generally, I would have to specify "with regards to varying degrees and shades of femininity and masculinity" when asking how participants saw their social role. As to sexuality, participants often wanted to know what label I wanted them to use, e.g. "Do you mean, am I a lesbian?"

Interestingly though, the men on balance seemed to describe themselves in less complex ways, generally sticking to terms like 'heterosexual', 'straight' or 'gay'. A notable exception was Henry who explained: "I'm not a gay man, I'm a man who happens to be gay – I'm just a bloke. At work I'm professional, detached, masculine. With friends I'm more relaxed – it can get quite outrageous". Equally, most heterosexual respondents were quite clear, very early on, that they were not queer. In fact, as mentioned in chapter 6, the straight male nurses all told me they were straight before I asked them. Given the stereotyping of male nurses as gay, I did not find this surprising. Interestingly, none seemed to have a particular problem with gay men: they just wanted to let me know. Sandra on the other hand was very concerned that no one mistake her for a lesbian – her heterosexuality is very important to her. Camille on the other hand is "a straight woman officer" while Charlotte explained that she is "a butch lesbian, comfortable; lesbian or dyke – but lesbian is more uptown; also queer, but only to academics".

Again unsurprisingly, the queer participants had all struggled at some point with parts of the heterosexual matrix. Certainly they had all worked out, to varying degrees, their sexual orientation and the ways in which they wished to present this orientation in different parts of their lives. Most of them found managing this aspect of their identity more difficult within their hypergendered organizations. Even the male nurses, who

worked within a stereotypically feminine occupation, found it problematic, at times, to be gay.

Generally, the older participants stuck to broad categories such as "gay man" or "lesbian" when describing themselves. One exception was Sally, in her early 50s, who explained that, although most people would deem her a lesbian, she was uncomfortable with labels. "I'm just me." she said. This was echoed by a number of younger queer respondents, mostly in their 20s or 30s.

The bisexual respondents were very careful to explain that they were neither gay nor straight, but bisexual. Interestingly, Karen, for example, had never had a relationship with a woman, but still considered herself bisexual. She found women attractive and wanted to be open to the possibility of having a relationship with a woman. Karen did mention that, in her experience, both gay and straight people were hostile to bisexuals. She had been concerned that I would be the same way and expressed relief at my non-judgmental attitude. The bisexual respondents were also different from the queer respondents who fell into what I call the "I'm just me" pool. The latter are very clear that they are gay or lesbian: they just do not want to have specific ways of behaving imposed on them because of their specific sexual orientation while the bisexuals are clear that they are open to both sexes as potential partners and do not want to be restricted to romantic or sexual attraction to one sex alone.

Queer women also tended to offer more nuanced identities overall. For example, Andrea described herself as "lesbian – soft butch – I wear trousers. I'm independent. I don't take on a masculine or feminine role". Jane expanded on being a lesbian as follows, saying she is "the world's oldest tomboy; my energy is very male. I think about things in

a very male-oriented way". Miranda was married to a man and fell in love with her best friend, also married to a man. She eventually came out as a lesbian although "I'm still trying to figure out what that is". Her social role identity includes: "partner in a six year relationship, quasi step mom, slowly on the way to being an educator and one short blonde."

Tanya had difficulties coming out, in part because she was already in the military. Her first girlfriend saw their relationship as belonging to a clear butch/femme paradigm: "She wanted to be the masculine one, the trouble was I was trying to do that at work". Tanya found the disjunction between the two roles problematic. I also asked Tanya "Can you be a lesbian in the military and be other than butch?" Like Charlotte, she stated she was not sure: "I needed to be strong and compassionate and decisive". Tanya presents as feminine, and she found that there was an incongruity between being a feminine woman and the attributes of success in the military. Other queer women also expressed a carefully nuanced identity. For example, Sally explained: "I'm a woman, a lesbian…I hate labels …what other people see is a very strong, independent, no-nonsense button-down collar woman…I guess you could say that I'm not frilly, but I don't wear leather. Sporty".

As mentioned earlier, there also seemed to be generational differences at play. Younger participants tended to describe more precise gender identities, often including attraction, body or circumstance in their self-description. Having provided a brief overview of the way in which participants saw their sexed bodies, social role and sexuality, I now turn to a discussion of the effects of the heterosexual matrix on participants' work lives and in terms of their leadership especially.

6.3 The effects of the heterosexual matrix

All of the participants, whether in nursing or the military, and whatever their sexed body, social role or sexuality, were affected by aspects of the heterosexual matrix within which their organizational lives played out. In other words, its material or power effects structured and regulated the ways in which they were able to perform their roles. For some, a certain aspect of the matrix was more pressing than for others. For example, their sexed body dictated so much of what women in the military were or were not allowed to do that it seemed at times to be the most overwhelming aspect of the matrix. However, it also became clear that the effects of different parts of the matrix were in many ways inextricably tied together. That is, even though it may have seemed that, for the military women, their female bodies played the largest role in defining their organizational experience, further exploration revealed that the military prescribes specific acceptable behaviours with regards to social role and sexuality that were just as restricting as the women's bodies themselves. These data are strongly suggestive of Butler's (1990) original argument: If I have a woman's body, I am expected to be feminine and heterosexual.

Thus, although this section is divided into three subsections that mirror Butler's heterosexual matrix, it is important to note that I have mainly done this for clarity and simplicity of organization. It is not my intention to suggest that these aspects are separate – the interconnectedness is always there. That is, while it may appear that much of what participants experienced was a result of their sexed body, there are various ways in which that body was displayed, deployed and (de)emphasized that are tied to both social role and sexuality. Certainly, that is the experience of both women and men participants in the militaries of all three countries. And, because feminine heterosexual women are not

supposed to be in combat, nor are homosexual men who exhibit a potentially non-masculine social role, it makes life very difficult for most of the women and some of the men in the military. The women and men in nursing were, of course, constrained in similar ways, albeit with quite different effects. In the following sections I discuss the ways in which participants' organizational lives were affected by each element of the heterosexual matrix. In the final section of this chapter, I will then discuss how the participants worked out their leadership, given their ideas regarding effective leadership and the constraints and possibilities presented by their organizational environments.

6.3.1 The effects of the sexed body: If only you were a (wo)man

Predictably, and as already established, their sexed body was an issue for the female participants in the study who had served in the military. In general, their body channelled or regulated their posting options, service options and promotion options. While many had joined the military to escape from small towns or an uncertain professional future ('push' factors), there were many others who joined because they were looking for particular opportunities that they believed were available in the armed forces ('pull' factors). For example, Sandra joined the Canadian Forces because she wanted to be an astronaut. This was not a pipe dream but a serious objective that she held. However, at the time that Sandra joined, i.e., the early 1970s, women were not allowed to be test pilots in the CF, a key prerequisite for astronaut training: indeed they could not even attend Officer Candidate School. Ironically, she was told she could be a nurse instead. Sandra wrote to the Canadian Prime Minister every month for a number of years as part of a campaign to change the rules. When the military colleges were opened to women in 1979, Sandra attended the Royal Military College in Canada and continued to

serve for many years. However, she was never able to attain her dream of test piloting or becoming an astronaut. Similarly, Tanya, a retired lesbian member of the US military, joined the US Navy because she wanted adventure but, after twenty years as an officer, was only able to serve in educational positions. She had been directed repeatedly towards teaching as a suitable occupation for a woman in the military.

Even getting a special or new posting or breaking through some regulation that had prevented female military respondents from accessing a particular forces job usually proved to be just the beginning. For example, there were issues that should have been mundane but were ignored and therefore became embarrassing for these women. Tanya was one of the first women in the US Navy posted to a remote part of the globe. She was very happy at this posting, in part because it was a stepping stone to achieving some of her career objectives. However, when she arrived at her barracks, she realized that there were no places for female members to sleep: in fact, there were no facilities at all for women. Women had never been posted there and no one had thought that, once the posting was open to women, they would have to provide facilities for them. Tanya ended up having to live away from where the rest of the unit was billeted and felt that, as a result, she missed out on important interactions with her fellow team members during the time she was serving. The difficulty in living arrangements led to Tanya's eventual return to a stateside posting in large part because of the Navy's reluctance to spend military dollars on quarters for one woman and their insistence that she couldn't stay in the men's quarters. In the end she was not able to pursue a career track she'd started on because of a supposedly minor matter. Another example is Marcy who, at one point in her career, was promoted to a command post that had again never been occupied by a female officer before. Part of her

duties as CO involved participating in regular outdoors ceremonies or parades where she was required to wear a ceremonial sword. The sword and accompanying accoutrements were designed to fit very neatly over and within the standard male dress uniform. However, the female jacket and skirt uniform did not work with the ceremonial sword outfit. As a result, Marcy had to jury rig a contraption that allowed her to wear the appropriate uniform on parade and she was always concerned that the temporary arrangement would let her down during a public ceremony. It took a long time before the female uniform was redesigned so that it could be worn just as easily as the male uniform with ceremonial swords. These incidents could be seen as the modern-day equivalents of women having to masquerade as men in order to serve in the military. In the early years of the military women had to pretend to be men in order to serve (Chapman Catt, 1897; Adie, 2003). Today, even though they are not excluded per se, they still face body-based barriers, whether through rules such as the combat exclusion or because of these kinds of logistical, material barriers.

Nevertheless, circumstances for women in the military were often different according to service and according to country. Certainly, as pointed out in chapter 3, section 3.3, these women were excluded from particular postings and services at various times in the armed forces of all three countries. Indeed, the reactions to their desire to enter closed occupations often reflected puzzlement and stereotypical understandings of women's behaviour: "People – men – would ask 'Why are you here? What do you want?' They'd say, 'If women want to be on a ship, put them all on one ship. They would never do any work.' " (Tanya) Of course, this plays into stereotypical understandings of women

and the Navy perpetuated in films such as *Operation Petticoat* discussed in section 4.5 of chapter 4.

Likewise, Martha told the story of what happened when she applied to become an infantry officer once that occupation became open to women. Her experiences reflect the findings of Burnat et al. (1998) who found that groups with token women, i.e., a very small proportion of female members, preferred men as leaders and gave women who behaved like men a particularly hard time. She was interviewed many times by both deskbound and field infantry officers who were surprised at her desire to enter this male occupation. They would say things to her like "You don't really want to be an artillery officer – it's dirty... you'll be stuck in mud... you have to pee in the bushes... it's really dirty... mud gets everywhere". It took repeated interviews for Martha to be allowed to try to make it into the artillery corps, something that she did eventually achieve.

Camille, an officer in the Canadian Air Force, explains that "For example, if you listen to a male warrant officer speak about women in the combat arms, they say 'women shouldn't be here. They get their period, they can't just pee anywhere'. But, when it's all Air Force, there's no need to prove anything. There was pressure when I was new, but not because I'm a woman, just because I was new". Thus, according to Camille, some areas of the CF are more hostile to women's bodies than others.

It is also interesting to note that, as pointed out in chapter 3, a number of the women interviewed served in what were called support positions but were actually front-line positions. For example, Jane served in Eastern Europe during the Cold War, and told me there were many missions during which she and fellow soldiers went behind the lines in order to complete their orders. Although she was not technically serving on the front

line, Jane in reality was in very real danger of being shot at, captured, or killed. She explained that in these situations she was much more readily accepted than when she was posted in her home country: "In the US I had to prove myself to the new guys every single time. I have to prove myself to this new rookie that I know my job rather than him or her having to prove to me that they know theirs." Indeed Jane's sexed body appears to intersect with her sexuality here as she continued, "overseas and in the war theatre in Europe, it was 'we don't care who you are, what you do in your spare time, as long as you do the job'." This fits in with the findings of Estes (2005) whose respondents explained that in wartime people overlooked their sexual orientation but stopped doing so once they returned to home bases. As an MP Jane felt that it did not matter what her sexed body or sexuality were as long as she could do the job and as long as she was relatively discreet with regards to her sexuality. However, as I discuss in 6.3.3, there were consequences to hiding this queer sexuality that led Jane and others to leave the military.

Even within the services, occupations and postings where women were allowed to serve, there were differences in the way they were accepted or treated. For example, Camille pointed out that "Within air traffic control, I never felt that [I had to prove myself]. When I changed to a [regular] base to a certain extent my abilities were automatically in question and I have to prove it". She continued to explain that age intersected with her sexed body to sometimes affect the way others reacted to her leadership: "With younger people, it's easier: I do the morning runs with them. I'm the first to rappel down the walls. But a 40-year-old man who'd been in longer than you? Automatically they're questioning your abilities, waiting for you to mess up". This might be explained on two levels: younger people might find it easier to accept a female leader

because they may have been socialized differently from older people or people in general might find it more difficult to accept the leadership of someone younger than them and this is exacerbated if this leader is a woman and the team member is a man.

Andrea also pointed out that being admitted into an occupation did not necessarily mean acceptance. When she served as a driver and in Military Police units, she found that "If you didn't prove yourself as a female they would be laughing behind your back". Interestingly, she also found that the more traditionally female environments like the Pay Corps were much more sexist than environments like the MPs.

The other major issue faced by some of the women in the military, especially after many nontraditionally female occupations were opened up, was tokenism (Kanter, 1977, Burnat et al. 1998). Sometimes, it was simply the difficulty of getting proper equipment like Marcy and her ceremonial sword, sometimes proper accommodation like Tanya when she was posted to the remote base. However, sometimes it was about the difficulty of proving oneself when you are the only woman in an all-male environment. As Martha put it, "If you're the fish in the fishbowl it's hard to be part of the team". And sometimes, according to Martha, organizational attempts to force integration or to artificially encourage the admission of large numbers of women into non-traditionally female occupations made women's lives even more difficult: "Positive stereotypes are just as damaging as negative ones. Having different physical standards for men and women is the one most divisive thing regarding gender [sex] integration in the forces today". Martha continued to say that she felt the solution was to develop standards that are sex-neutral. In her experience, both women and men who had the 'right stuff 'would be able to pass them without creating divisive and acrimonious feelings about so-called

preferential treatment. Marcy, on the other hand, was frustrated at the military's attempts to get her to enter a non-traditionally female occupation when those opened up. She had always wanted to pursue administrative work, not because it was 'women's work', but because she felt it was a good fit for her, and had to argue for choosing that career path. She did not want to be the victim of what she termed "reverse discrimination". To conclude this discussion it is worthwhile reiterating that these examples have all been of <u>women</u> in the military because that is a reflection of the data. The male participants from the military did not see their sexed bodies as relevant or worthy of discussion in the context of this study which in and of itself says something significant about this occupation's hypermasculine character.

Similar, but different, issues existed for participants in nursing.   Here too, it was their sexed body that often determined the career opportunities available to both women and men. For example, George was told that he could not work as a midwife, which was his original intention when he started nursing training. He was instead encouraged to go into psychiatric nursing as a suitable profession for a young man. Henry and Leon were also told that they couldn't work as midwives or in a maternity setting and yet both of them had started out in nursing wanting to do just that. However, in keeping with Muldoon and Reilly's work (2003) discussing the way in which specialisms are sex-typed by nursing students and how this affects their choice of specialism as well as with the work of Evans (1997) and MacDougall (1997) on the sex-typing of nursing specialisms, other male nurses were attracted to A and E or surgical nursing for example because of their perceived enhanced technical nature.

Indeed all the nurses interviewed suggested that there was also a "boys and their toys" attitude that prevailed in the nursing profession. Women are not explicitly shut out of certain nursing specialisms like in the military. Rather, they are strongly encouraged, or rather expected, to work on wards and similar sex-appropriate settings while men are expected to want to work with their toys or in psychiatric nursing and then, as suggested in Williams (1995) and Evans (2004), quickly move on to administrative and managerial roles. It is interesting to note that these nurses seem to buy into much of this sex stereotyping themselves. For example, Martin, a straight male nurse in the UK, believed, like the participants in Cross and Bagilhole's (2002) study, that for men nursing is a career a while for women "it's a job that comes and goes as it fits into their lives". He pointed out that many of his female colleagues over the years would leave to start families and return in a part-time capacity or on a part-time basis in order to accommodate their family lives.

Certainly, both female and male nurses express a degree of frustration at stereotypical understandings of their role and how they are treated as inhabitants of sexed bodies within the nursing profession. For example, male nurses expressed frustration at being shut out of certain wards or certain tasks because they involve procedures that are prohibited to them. Often, these involve female patients or children. Female nurses felt that less respect was paid to them because they were female and that this was exacerbated by the location of nursing within a patriarchal healthcare system regardless of the country in which they were working. This lack of respect, according to them, was exhibited in the way they were treated on a daily basis but also in the way that they were almost ghettoized into particular lower status kinds of work.

Certainly, lack of access to resources, including training, was reflected in many participants' lives. Tanya illustrates this quite nicely when she points out that: "As long as I had the skills and knowledge my gender didn't make a difference but I couldn't always access the skills and knowledge I needed <u>because</u> of my gender".[35] It wasn't that she wasn't capable of doing things, but rather her inability to access required training that prevented her from moving forward in her chosen career path.

How did the participants feel about the above circumstances? First, as is implicit in a lot of the previous discussion, they felt extremely frustrated at the restrictions imposed by the way in which their sexed body was perceived by the profession or organization they were in. In the military, this meant the women were frustrated at not being able to access resources, postings and promotions, simply because they were women. There was an accompanying determination to break out of the rigid limitations placed upon them, although many female soldiers left the military in order to pursue opportunities outside these restrictions. Some, like Sandra and Tanya, were never able to attempt to prove they were capable of doing the jobs they wanted. Others, like Martha, discovered that gaining admission was only a first step and that the battle for acceptance by their peers, subordinates and superiors was continual.

In nursing, several male participants pointed out with a degree of sadness that they had initially wanted to work as midwives but were very actively discouraged from that specialism. Further, once they had chosen another, presumably more acceptable, specialism they were encouraged to move towards administration even though they really wanted to "practise nursing". In other words, both military women and male nurses were

---

[35] In this instance Tanya was using the word 'gender' to signify 'sex' which is different from the way I use it in this thesis. However, I felt it was important to quote her verbatim.

concerned about reverse stereotyping. They did not want to enter non-traditional specialisms just for the sake of being different. In summary, participants were annoyed at the extent to which their sexed body, rather than their qualifications, talents or abilities was the key determinant of opportunities they were given.

Another interesting finding was the way in which participants modified the presentation of their sexed body as an important way of signaling other aspects of the matrix – i.e., their social role and their sexuality. The link between the body and the heterosexual matrix was particularly strong for the straight women in the military. Some, like Carla and Sandra, felt it was important not to be mistaken for a queer woman. Others like Camille were not so much concerned with being perceived (wrongly) as gay as they were with being 'correctly' perceived as a 'regular' heterosexual woman, their masculine occupation notwithstanding.   As we might expect, for the nurses this aspect of the sexed body seemed more important for male nurses than for their female counterparts. All of the male nurses, when asked to describe themselves to me if I could not see them, included physical descriptors that presented them in line with the male/masculine/straight matrix: in my opinion, they offered a picture of a quite generic Western twenty-first century male style of dress, haircut, many with beards and generally quite a robust build.

Further, how did these respondents' sexed body intersect with their leadership? Women like Marcy were reminded of the 'unsuitability' of their bodies for military leadership by incidents such as the aforementioned lack of fit between the female uniform and the ceremonial sword. The sword was an integral part of an important weekly ceremony, deeply rooted in the military's history and symbolizing the leader of the base. Yet the necessity to improvise a carrier for this sword that might at any moment give way

and embarrass Marcy and her fellow soldiers reinforced a certain sense of illegitimacy in her wearing of the sword - and therefore of her leadership. The female body of women like Martha was used to identify them as unsuitable for the kind of leadership required in the artillery: even when she and others like her gained the right to enter this military occupation their bodies, and especially their bodily functions, were used as an example of their continued unsuitability. And, even though Tanya was unable to realize her initial ambitions in the US military, she was a leader in the sense that, as a woman, she blazed a trail by accepting the postings that she did. However, eventually her body could apparently not be accommodated in living quarters. Finally, Camille's leadership and her female sexed body intersect every day when she goes on the morning runs as part of the way she leads her staff team. For the nurses, it is again not surprising that sexed bodies intersect with leadership. All my male nurse participants discussed the way in which they were expected to want to accede to management positions <u>because</u> they were male. However, these sorts of experiences and relationships are simply not discussed in the leadership literature, where the sexed body is seen solely as a cipher or proxy for one's leadership <u>abilities</u>.

Having discussed the ways in which their sexed body informed participants' organizational experiences, I will, in the last section of this chapter, discuss the ways in which participants negotiated their leadership against the feelings and frustrations engendered by how their sexed body is perceived at work.

6.3.2 The effects of social role: Slugs and snails and puppy dog tails, or sugar and spice and everything nice?

In this section, I discuss the ways in which participants understood the intersection of their social role with their lives in the military or nursing and with their leadership. Certainly, many of the male military participants were aware of needing to present as masculine in order to be considered an effective leader. For example Caleb stated "Leadership is part of being in the military. You knew a personal style was expected and, if you could do it, you would do it. Masculine, authoritarian, military, effective. These were valued and these were what I did." Similarly Tim, when discussing ways in which leaders earned respect in the military, described how "you end up knocking a few heads together" in order to earn subordinates' respect if you're a man. Clearly, these men felt that a strong masculine demeanour was an important part of successful leadership in the military, in keeping with arguments presented by writers like Schein (1973), Powell and Butterfield (1989), Boldry et al. (2001) and Powell et al. (2002) who found that successful leadership was associated with masculine characteristics in a variety of different professions.

For women, as in previous work like Mitchell's (1994) study of cadets at West Point, Boldry et al.'s (2001) study of cadets at Texas A and M and Browne's (2006) study of cadets at RMC in Canada, negotiating between masculinity and femininity was trickier. For example, when Tanya was asked about the degree to which she presented as feminine or masculine in her everyday interactions in the military, she explained "There was an incongruity between being a feminine woman and the attributes needed for success. So, I presented as an officer. I could have presented as more feminine, but I presented as an officer". When pressed about the differences between presenting as 'more feminine' and

'presenting as an officer', Tanya struggled to articulate specifics, even though she knew in her own mind what she meant. She suggested, for example, that she wore her hair in a softer, feminine style, but not too long and she wore very light makeup on those occasions when she did wear makeup. In other words Tanya here is seemingly speaking of a 'balance' between feminine enough <u>and</u> masculine enough at the same time in her military leadership capacity.

Tanya also expressed frustration with certain aspects of femininity dictated by the Navy, such as having to wear skirts in particular circumstances and having to carry a handbag. In fact, the handbag, a strong symbol of femininity, so disconcerted her that she had to find some way of coming to terms with it for herself. She ended up calling it her "toolbox" – a term she and her partner still use in jest today, years after she retired from the Navy. When asked, most of the other women echoed Tanya's feelings that 'tamping down' their femininity would serve them well. As suggested above, the literature offers similar conclusions: Browne (2006) suggests that women learn to walk a tightrope early in their careers, while Mitchell (1994) states that they find a third way between femininity and masculinity, behaving as "women loosely disguised as men" (p. 142).

As a female leader, Camille faces some of the same issues. In camouflage uniform, Camille presents a sporty appearance that seems a fine example of the balanced position that has 'enough' femininity but 'enough' masculinity too. She is tall, slim in an athletic way, attractive and well spoken. She treats people with an easy confidence that speaks of comfort with her role as a female officer in the military. Indeed, Camille has spent time working out her self-presentation in quite thoughtful ways. Of course, while in uniform her presentation is fairly generic. She has to wear whatever uniform is mandated

for the task that she is accomplishing. However, certain aspects of her appearance are

open to varying degrees of choice. For example, her hair is short but not too short and it is

worn in a soft, curly style. Her manner is forthright but not overly aggressive or assertive.

Camille says "I make a point of not swearing. We have these things called civilian

Fridays – on those days I'll often wear dresses and skirts. I'm not the most feminine

person regarding nails or makeup but I do care how I dress. I was a real tomboy when I

was a kid". It is interesting that, even as a child, Camille understood that there was such a

thing as 'appropriate femininity' and that she belonged to a specific category, 'tomboy',

because she was somehow different from a 'regular' girl. Camille also agreed that there is

pressure to behave in a particular, stereotypically quite feminine, way in the military, but

explained that it is not different from societal pressure in general: "You can't be too loud

or too boisterous – not too expressive". She also explained that: "I'm very athletic and

that's more noticed if you're a woman than if you're a man", pointing out that for her the

double standard that exists in civilian life with regards to women and men is amplified in

the Canadian Forces, although more so in the Army than in the Air Force. Here again

Camille seems to be saying that different areas of the CF exhibit different degrees of

hostility to women. She is able to contrast these two services because she is primarily an

Air Force officer but currently works at a base with colleagues and recruits from the

Army.

Moving on, many of the male nurses provided positive examples of the way in

which their social role influenced interactions with patients or colleagues. Leon and

George both commented that, in their experience, and in keeping with the respondents in

studies by Williams (1995) and Evans (2004), certain physicians preferred to deal with

male nurses because they perceive them to be more professional. Interestingly, they also suggested that some nurses prefer to work with or for male nurses because they perceive them to be less emotional than female nurses. The discussions of emotion hinted at a discomfort with this subject in the area of nursing care. Certainly, participants acknowledged the link between emotion and the caring aspect of nursing. However, many male participants seem to indicate a difficulty in coming to terms with the emotional aspects of their profession while at the same time maintaining an appropriate gender role identity, something also discussed by Simpson (2004) and Cross and Bagilhole (2004).

While the above presents the way in which the <u>participants</u> perceived their own social role, <u>my</u> experience of the femininity or masculinity of the participants that I had a chance to meet in person was that each had developed their own way of presenting their social role even though the soldiers were working within an environment that regulated outward appearance and manner to a greater extent than in civilian life and many of the nurses wore uniforms at work. I found that the straight women in general presented in a way that I would describe as muted femininity. In other words, just like the participants in Browne's (2006) study and Mitchell's (1994) study who 'walked a fine line' between masculinity and femininity, for the most part they emphasized certain aspects of femininity such as feminine hair style, make-up and clothing whether they were in or out of uniform, but at the same time they had all developed a very forthright way of interacting with people that tamped down this femininity.

Interestingly, and just as with discussion of their self-identification, there was more variation amongst the queer women. Some had no interest in presenting a relatively feminine appearance, while others looked as feminine as many of the straight women I

interviewed. For example, Charlotte, who identifies as a butch lesbian, wears her hair

short, does not wear any makeup and consciously adopts what she calls a "comfortable"

persona because: "I don't like being looked at by the heterosexual world... that has nothing

to do with work, because the way I dress is circumscribed by work." In other words, she

integrates her own sense of social role within the confines of the military, choosing, for

example, not to wear makeup even though it is allowed within guidelines. She also feels

that she needs to be more assertive when at work than in her personal life: "I need to be

more assertive and aggressive in the military". Charlotte doesn't confuse being assertive

with a butch social role, however: "I didn't need to be forceful to be a female leader. I

didn't have to be a super butch to be effective". Clearly, for Charlotte being butch is part

of her social role and social identity whereas being assertive and aggressive is a way that

she can behave at work when required. It is interesting to note that Charlotte's self-

identification as butch is not related to or derived from her leadership – rather, for her, the

need to be more assertive comes from the social role expectations of leadership in the

military. This goes against a lot of stereotypes of butch women, in whom masculinity and

aggressiveness are often conflated to present a particularly aggressive persona – clearly,

for Charlotte, the aggressive parts of her leadership are necessitated by the military part of

her life, not by her personal life.

I also asked whether there was a particular desire on the part of these women to

signal their sexual orientation through their social role and I received mixed answers. As

we have seen in earlier discussion, for some straight women like Sandra it was important

not to be mistaken for a lesbian: "I'm an attractive woman. I dress up very feminine. I'm

androgynous in my abilities, very physically fit -- but I never want to be mistaken for

someone who's gay". When I tried to press her for a reason why, she was not comfortable answering me. I can only surmise that this was yet another instance of the power of the matrix at work. For other women like Tanya, her presentation was part of trying to hide her lesbianism for fear of disciplinary action. Yet, as she tried to negotiate military life and develop her leadership persona, she struggled with balancing the masculine ideals of military leadership and her own more feminine persona, aware all the while of the possibility of being imprisoned within another stereotype, that of the masculine or butch lesbian. For yet other women, it was more important to appear as 'themselves' regardless of any messages that might send about their orientation.

Of course, appearances can also be deceiving. When I first met Martha, for example, I was struck by her relatively butch persona, even though she was wearing her hair in a chin-length pageboy and her skirt dress uniform. Later in the day, I saw and spoke to her when she had changed into combat fatigues, where her strength and forthright manner were highlighted to an even greater extent. Fortunately, I did not make the stereotypical assumption that Martha is queer – it turned out she was happily married to a man with whom she has several children. Other women I spoke with when I attended a military conference, but who were not all interviewed for this project, presented as almost hyperfeminine, yet turned out to be lesbians, so it was difficult to draw any conclusions with regards to sexual orientation based on the degree of femininity or masculinity presented. That is, of course, a reflection of real life. However it does run counter to the stereotypical understandings of gender and sexual orientation that prevail both in greater society and in the military to a certain extent and so is discussed in the next section in greater detail.

Nevertheless, and as we have seen already, there seem to be stereotypical understandings of gender at play both in the military and in nursing. These were sometimes expressed by participants, but sometimes identified as part of 'occupational' culture or 'sector' culture. For example, Sandra's quote reveals a presupposition that feminine women cannot be lesbians, while Caleb felt that masculine presentation would help hide his queer sexual orientation. For both of these participants, this was also tied to their role as leaders and the credibility of their leadership. In nursing, women's social role is generally prescribed as what Henry called "pink and fluffy". As a number of my respondents pointed out, for example, it has not been very many years since nurses have been allowed to wear trousers as opposed to skirts or dresses for non-operating theatre jobs. However, Henry also pointed out that, as nursing becomes more technically challenging, regardless of specialism, the 'pink and fluffy' persona is receding. This seems to confirm the work by Cummings (1995) who addressed the gender effects of the increasingly technical nature of nursing and its further differentiation and specialization. As well, Harry pointed out that the performance of both female and male nurses in war zones like Afghanistan and Iraq have gone a long way towards what he called "legitimizing" nursing and removing the feminine social role attached to it. This is an example of the discussion in section 4.2 of chapter 4 in which I pointed out the important role that wars have played in the historical development of nursing as a profession.

Indeed, the female nurses I interviewed seemed comfortable exhibiting whatever degree of femininity suited them, without consideration of how this might affect their work lives. Certainly, the ones I met in person exhibited a variety of personae in this

regard. Rose's description serves as an accurate summary: "I'm more feminine than masculine, but not overly girly".

The men in nursing were, as expected, and in keeping with Simpson (2004), more conscious of their presentation in this regard, just as were the female members of the military. However, this does not mean that they consciously adopted a more or less masculine persona at work. Rather, while they were aware that presentation mattered they were also comfortable with being genuine in their professional lives in this regard. For example, Henry, a gay man, described himself as offering a professional, detached and masculine appearance. Leon, another gay man, stated that on a scale of zero to 10 where zero is extreme femininity and 10 extreme masculinity he would score himself as 7 or 8. Interestingly, George, a straight man, explained that at work he presented as quite masculine. However, he said that in his personal life: "I'm quite approachable... sensitive... willing to talk about emotional things". Equally, both Billy, a gay male nurse in Canada, and Alex, a straight male nurse in Canada, present as clean-cut soft-spoken young men. Again here we see that stereotypical understandings of social role are not applicable.

But in terms of 'occupational' culture, George went on to explain that the women he was referring to "weren't even lesbian". I found it interesting that George felt compelled to explain how the masculinity of the social roles displayed by female PICU nurses was unrelated to any stereotypical expectations that they might be lesbians, a clarification I found actually to indicate a stereotypical understanding of sexual orientation on his part. George, who is straight, explained that "When people know that I work in mental health, they assume I'm straight". And yet he also explained that "there's a whole

stream of girlfriends who've assumed I'm gay as a result of being a man who can talk about my feelings". During our interview it was clear that George was very comfortable with his sexual orientation, his social role and his role within nursing but also that he obviously felt that he had to negotiate and explain these aspects of his identity to people who made stereotypical assumptions about him. However, he seemed in no way threatened by having people assume that he was gay. On the contrary, George seemed to feel that he was able to show people that we are more complex as humans than the stereotypes people so often use to understand us.

So, how did participants in general feel about the way in which their social role interacted with their leadership role? The most important issue here is related to the ideas in role congruity theory (Eagly et al., 1995). Even though the participants themselves held largely gender-neutral ideas of good leadership, they were subjected to others' ideas, which were, for the most part, stereotypically gendered to a greater or lesser degree. For example, as discussed above, the female soldiers reiterated what many others have said earlier regarding "walking a fine line" between femininity and masculinity.

I also refer back here to comments made by Leon, for example, who suggested that some nurses and some physicians prefer to work with male nurses because they perceive them to be less emotional than female nurses. Such expectations result in participants having to continually think about the degree of masculinity/femininity they express, its appropriateness and its effect on their peers, followers and superiors. As leaders, this effect is critical for them because it influences their ability to lead successfully.

Having discussed the impact of their social role in their organizational lives, I now turn to an examination of the way in which their sexuality affected the participants at work.

6.3.3 The effects of sexuality: Those we love

Sexuality, i.e. sexual orientation, was inevitably a matter for much discussion and thought for those members of the military who were queer. As established, I interviewed women and men who had served in different periods of time in the military of all three countries. For the Americans, working under DADT in particular created predictable issues and problems that are still affecting the lives of many members of the US military (see, for example, Frank, 2004; Estes, 2005). But in many ways, the lives of most of the participants were still affected by the need to 'manage' their sexual orientation, whether or not the military in which they served discriminated on the basis of that orientation at the time.

The first issue that came up was of course the fear of discovery that almost all the queer participants lived with who had served during periods when there was a ban on homosexuals. As Tanya, who served in the US military for twenty years – latterly as an officer – and only discovered after two years in that she was a lesbian, explains: "Once I figured out I was a lesbian I was scared and paranoid for the next eighteen years". Her experience is similar to the experience of all the queer participants who served in the military of all the countries while a ban existed. Both Andrea and Susan told stories of bed checks and surprise inspections that were conducted in the British military in order to discover women in sexual situations with other women. Indeed, Andrea explained that

often in all-female barracks it was difficult to pursue a relationship unless one of the parties was billeted in a single room. However, even when that was the case, surprise inspections still made it very difficult to spend intimate time together. Interestingly, she explained that the surprise inspections and bed checks were quite often unsuccessful in discovering illicit relationships anyway because there would usually be a tipoff ahead of time that an inspection was going to happen. Susan told a story about one occasion when a tipoff didn't come early enough and two women were almost caught. One of them quickly jumped under the bed and grabbed on to the bedsprings, lifting herself up off the floor as she tried to wait out the inspection. Unfortunately, she was not able to hang on long enough – she fell to the floor with a rather large thump, was discovered and eventually cashiered out of the Army. Another story that Andrea tells about a woman who jumped out of a window in order to escape an inspection and broke her leg brings home the extreme effects of policies that exclude lesbians and gay men from serving in the military.

Eventually, as outlined in chapter three, section 3.5, in 1999 the British military lifted the ban on lesbians and gay men, as had the Canadian Forces before them in 1992; but the latter had had their own share of what Sally called "witch hunts" in the years preceding the repeal. She explained that the military could bug and tape record conversations in off-base apartments if they wanted to, in order to ensure that lesbians and gay men were caught and dishonourably discharged. I asked Sally, who was out as a lesbian before she joined the CF, why she had joined up when she knew that her sexual orientation was problematic in that context. She responded: "I knew I was gay, knew if I got caught I get booted out with a dishonourable discharge and that would follow me

around... but it was easy to blend in - what was scary was the witch hunts". Similarly, many other queer soldiers explained that, while they knew that their sexual orientation could be grounds for dishonourable discharge, they had joined the military out of a desire to serve their country, because the lifestyle appealed to them or because they felt that this was a place where they could make an important contribution. To them, their sexual orientation was irrelevant to their potential performance in the military. This mirrors the discussion in section 6.3.1 of female participants' comments regarding the way in which they had been limited in the military because of their sexed bodies. In the case of sexual orientation, queer respondents expected that they would be able to keep this aspect of their identity separate from their day to day working lives and thus be successful in achieving their objectives.

In the end, however, much like the participants in Frank's (2004) study, having to hide their sexual orientation led to anger, resentment and eventual exit from the military for many of the participants, both women and men, that I interviewed. For example, Jane, who reenlisted in the middle of transitioning out of the military when the first Gulf War started, explained in a data extract that has been partly used previously:

"DADT really bothered me, living a double life got to be really old. It was depressing.... Every day that I put on a uniform I was publicly stating 'This is my job and I'm putting my life on the line for you and your rights. I'm on the front line of defence for the Constitution of the United States. I have sworn to defend it from enemies, foreign and domestic'. Yet I'm a gay soldier – my domestic enemies are here in the US ... Overseas, it was 'we don't care who you are, what you do in

your spare time, as long as you can do your job'. I wasn't good enough to be in the peacetime army but I was good enough to bleed for them - potentially get killed".

Jane eventually decided to leave the Army, in part because of the way that hiding her sexual orientation made her feel:

"Keeping quiet, after a while it killed my naturally boisterous personality. I didn't like who I was becoming because I couldn't be me".

She also resented what was, to her, the two-faced way in which many soldiers behaved towards her:

"When I was leaving one of my officers said 'You're one of the best officers this unit has ever seen. We all knew you were gay, why did you have to say anything?'. And I answered 'Because I'm one of the best officers this unit has ever seen.' I got tired of hearing 'good job' to my face and 'dyke' behind my back".

Jane's experience was not uncommon; many queer soldiers, like the respondents in Estes' (2005) research, were out to peers and to their immediate superiors as well. Their superior officers generally did not care as long as they did a good job and would refrain from instituting discharge proceeedings. Typically, most peers did not care either, in the sense that they would not out gay or lesbian colleagues to the military. However, that did not mean that these same coworkers did not feel uncomfortable with queers in their midst and that they did not make disparaging remarks when they thought their queer colleagues were out of earshot.

As a result, other queer soldiers never told anyone they worked with that they were not heterosexual for fear of the consequences. They generally accomplished this by either hiding or dividing up their lives: "I compartmentalized that part of my life. It was a matter

of prioritizing: job/position/discharge ranking versus my personal life. And later I chose never to disclose that I was gay when I went to VA[36] doctors". (Caleb). These men and women often refrained from getting too close to peers in order to hide their sexuality. They also, for example, avoided official social functions in order to avoid either bringing false 'dates' or showing up alone and having to explain why. Jane volunteered to take duty shifts in order to avoid this dilemma at official functions but feels that her non-appearance contributed to an already difficult situation.

As predicted by Frank (2004), this had the effect of isolating some of these respondents in their daily working lives:

"You can only reveal so much of yourself to your friends. Never party too hard 'cause you never know what'll happen. But because you're not as emotionally bonded with the people it's easier to do the more difficult things. It was easier for me, not having the strong emotional attachments to people." (Sally)

For Sally the isolation was somewhat beneficial. Others echoed these sentiments but without the positive inflection: "I was fed up with having to hide my sexuality. It was wrong – it was part of me. I began to resent that" (Andrea) and "I left because I didn't want to give away the next 20 years of my social life. My roommate and I would have been life partners if we'd been in civilian life" (Caleb).

In fact, in a post-interview exchange, Tanya explained the fundamental way in which her sexuality affected her military career:

---

[36] VA in this case stands for Veteran's Administration. This government department offers a number of services, including physician and hospital services, at reduced or no cost to retired members of the US military. In a country without universal health care the potential loss of these benefits is a serious threat.

"I realized that because I was in hiding my whole [service] career, the last 18 years out of 20, I didn't take risks that would expose me to close scrutiny. Yes, I tried to be somewhat adventurous, but I truly didn't want to stand out. Yes, I wanted to do the best damn job I could, but I didn't want to be out front... I didn't want my actions put under a microscope. So, yes, being a lesbian did affect my behaviours, but from my perspective of interactions, not from the perspective of whomever military I interacted with" (emphasis hers).

Given the difficulties that queer members face when bans exist on gay men and lesbians joining up, what has been the effect of lifting such bans? In Canada and the UK it is difficult to say what life is like for queer soldiers based on my data. Very few of the participants in this project were out and still serving in those forces after the ban – most had left because they were tired of hiding their sexual orientation or they got dishonourably discharged. Charlotte is one of the few queer participants who was in the CF before the repeal of the ban and continues to serve today. She explained that, when she originally joined, "I lied to get in and it pissed me off". She was not worried about a dishonourable discharge because at the time she did not know anyone else in the Canadian Forces and she felt that as long as she kept to herself she would have no problems. After the repeal of the ban on lesbians Charlotte became very open about her sexual orientation: "I decided I was going to be a poster child. I was senior enough for there to be no repercussions - in this way I could make it easier for others coming behind me". When I asked her why she would take on such a task, she replied "Because I'm that much of a feminist".

Therefore, Charlotte is now open about her sexual orientation to her peers and to her superiors. As well, it often comes up when dealing with junior personnel. When I mentioned to her that I thought it was very brave of her to be out in such an unapologetic and complete way in her working life she replied: "Brave? Not really. It would only be if there was a real risk they would attack me". She made the point that one of the things that allowed her to be out to this degree was her chosen occupation, music. She was very clear that there were many places in the military where it would be much more difficult to be out. She also indicated that it would be far more difficult for a gay man than for a lesbian: "If you're an infantier, if you're on a ship, especially if you're a man, it's like pinning a target on your head – slashed tyres, painted car, broken windows. I would be afraid of it if I were a man".

Clearly, we need more information on the way in which the repeal of the ban on lesbians and gays has actually translated into everyday life for queer soldiers in the Canadian and British militaries. Charlotte certainly suggests that a change in policy is not enough to make a difference:

"There's a policy here that we don't discriminate, but attitudes haven't changed. Now they're recognizing the need to address belief and that's more difficult since they get hung up on freedom of religion. In any case, I don't have to wait long to hear a homophobic joke or comment".

We also need more information on how queer sexuality affects military leadership. For my participants, sexuality was intimately tied to social role and they were keenly aware of the relationship between the two. They were also aware of stereotypical expectations regarding their social role and sexuality. Once they had managed those, i.e., once they

had worked out their presentation in these regards, their biggest concern seemed to be escaping stereotypical expectations of their leadership behaviour as tied to their sexuality.

Overall though I should make it clear that women in the military especially, whether gay or straight, were quite concerned with sexuality. They were aware of the "dykes, whores or bitches" story told at the beginning of chapter 3 (quoted in Herbert, 1998, p. 55), and resisted being placed into any of these categories. Camille for example related an incident when she had been told by her CO that she was exhibiting inappropriate behaviour when socializing with team members during Friday evening gatherings at the mess. When pressed for an explanation of 'inappropriate', her CO was vague and suggested that it was unseemly for a married woman to have a beer with her male colleagues and subordinates. Camille was furious at this accusation of impropriety. She explained that male officers in her position were encouraged to join the Friday evening gatherings as a way of bonding with team members on base. Yet, although she had done nothing besides share a drink in the same way, her status as a married woman rendered this problematic. In other words, here Camille seemingly was able to occupy the category of whore. This fits with Eagly et al.'s (1992) observation that, when women and men behave in identical ways, women are devalued when the behaviour is stereotypically masculine, especially when the evaluators are men.

Equally, women soldiers were often aware of the need to appear feminine to a certain degree in order to 'confirm' their heterosexuality (whether they were straight or not). There were also within-sexuality stereotypes that operated for these women. For example, Andrea found that she had to maintain one presentation for the general population, but felt constrained to also maintain a 'sporty lesbian' presentation for fellow

lesbian soldiers: "When I was on courses, it was very stereotypical. You was [sic] gay – it was always comfy shoes and a tracksuit. There was very little individuality, really".

As discussed previously I also asked Charlotte, one of my last interviewees, whether it was possible to be a lesbian in the military and not be butch. She replied that she was not sure it was possible. Here I was reminded of Tanya's tale regarding the first woman with whom she had a relationship, and who wanted her to be more feminine. For Tanya, it was difficult to be more feminine in her social life while working in an environment that was so masculine and that valued the masculine so dearly.

So the strong masculine hypergendering of the military includes heteronormativity (Harrington, 1999) that affects these women (and men) to varying degrees. The effect of DADT, as documented by Estes (2005) and Frank (2004) for example, was experienced by all the queer American participants. All of them eventually left the military rather than continue to live with the constraints and fear imposed by this policy. For many of those in the Canadian and British military who served before a ban on lesbian and gay members of those forces was lifted the circumstances and outcomes were similar. Interestingly, two lesbian participants, Andrea and Susan, left the British forces when the women's army was integrated into the regular army. They missed the camaraderie of an all-women's force and felt that many of the younger male soldiers exhibited a degree of immaturity that was detrimental to their everyday work life.

For the nurses, the issue of sexual orientation played out quite differently. For the women, it seemed to be a non-issue, perhaps because all of the female nurses that I interviewed were straight and thus had a normative sexual orientation. For the male nurses, however, several talked about the assumption that people often held that because

they were male nurses they were also automatically gay. As implied in previous

discussions, this did not seem to bother either gay or straight male nurses I spoke with.

But several male nurses, both gay and straight, and as again we have seen already,

explained that there was also a fear of allowing them to be midwives, that is, to work

closely with women giving birth. This brought to mind Evans (2002) who discusses the

way in which men's touch can be sexualized in the context of care-giving and how this

leads to either a fear of placing men in touching contexts or to the male nurses themselves

having to work out what is considered 'safe' touch. I wondered why, if they were

supposedly not sexually attracted to women, gay men were seemingly perceived as

threatening in this situation. Is heteronormativity so powerful that 'even' gay men would

be sexualized in any 'intimate' treatment of women? No one seemed to have an answer to

this question.

To some extent, the straight male nurses also seem to fall into the aforementioned

traditional expectation of working either in mental health or high velocity, highly

technical areas such as intensive care and emergency rooms. Many of the gay men tended

to work in areas where being gay was a plus, for example, HIV/AIDS prevention and

community outreach. They also often found that being gay allowed them to understand

some of the issues faced by their patients: "I've always been an outsider. I'm always

thinking outside the box anyway, so it makes it easier to get out of the box and makes it

possible for me to empathize with people and marginalized populations. It's not hard for

me to get into a headspace of someone who is a non-majority person." (Leon)

On the other hand, and as expected, many of the male nurses felt that it was

important to negotiate their sexuality as it was presented at work. For example, George,

who works as a mental health nurse, was quite comfortable being perceived as more 'sensitive', even though it left him open to more bullying. He believed it was an asset from the point of view of caring for patients. George was likewise conscious of certain aspects of his persona signalling his heterosexuality, e.g. his appearance, going along with male banter and his specialism but was also aware that his choice of occupation (i.e., nursing per se) in particular had led previous girlfriends to think that he might be gay as discussed earlier.

For Leon "being gay has been more of a challenge – the [career and promotion] ceiling was quite low for me". Leon was out in the mid 1980s, before the anti-discrimination legislation in Canada was amended in 1995 to include sexual orientation. Recently, he feels this has become a non-issue. However, he commented that he feels that nursing is a conservative profession and that is why he found it difficult for many years. Leon works in public health nursing where "the work is risky for men: people can misconstrue why you're asking them to do certain things. It's awkward, unless you work in special areas like me" – HIV prevention. However, because Leon works in sexual health, he is very aware of the 'no touching' requirement (Evans, 2002). Leon also mentioned, like Andrea, that other queer people were quite often guilty of stereotyping him. "Some of the women [lesbians] I have worked with imposed stereotypes on me, and I've had to squeeze out of that".

Another interesting issue was the point at which male nurses' sexuality was discussed in the data gathering. For example, as established earlier, all the heterosexual male nurses told me their sexuality early in the interview, either by way of using the term 'straight' or 'heterosexual' or by telling me an anecdote or story that revealed their

sexuality in some way. This fits in with the literature on the stigmatization of male nurses as mentioned above, especially the experiences of Williams and Herkes (1993) and Whittock and Leonard (2003) whose straight male nurse respondents likewise made sure to reveal their sexual orientation early in an interview.

Having discussed the ways in which their sexual orientation affected participants' organizational lives, and leadership in particular, I now turn to a discussion of the ways in which their sexed body, their social role, their sexuality and their leadership intersected.

6.4 Sex, gender, sexuality and leadership

In the previous sections of this chapter, I first discussed the way that participants defined great leadership. I found remarkable similarities between respondents. There was general agreement that great leaders act with integrity towards all, build credibility through their actions and expertise and also have a strong physical presence. I then examined the impact of the three aspects of Butler's (1990) heterosexual matrix on participants' organizational experience. In this section, I examine the ways in which they developed and enacted their leadership, given their ideas about great leadership and their organizational experiences.

For all the participants, leadership was intimately connected to the rest of their identity. Sandra stated that: "You can't separate who you are from your leadership". Miranda concurs: "It doesn't turn off, even in your tent at 2 a.m.". Military respondents in particular believed that the development of leadership was an ongoing process that was tied to other aspects of their identity. Because leadership is such an important part of military life, it is continually being developed and honed, regardless of whether other aspects of identity, such as sexuality, are uncertain or changing. However, participants

felt that, regardless of whether these aspects of identity developed at the same time or in different cycles, they were all fundamental aspects of who they were. They also believed, like Jane, that "Once you learn how to lead it's hard not to lead." Further, retired participants took that leadership identity with them when they left their military positions. To quote Jane again: "If I hadn't been in the military and had that leadership training I wouldn't be the person I am today. I'd be more complacent. I wouldn't get things done in the same way".

The impact of the sexed body was as expected: leadership opportunities, resources, respect and promotion were all affected by whether one was a woman or a man in the military and in nursing. Even when women in the military were allowed into formally closed occupations they faced difficult situations, especially due to stereotyping and tokenism. They were expected to lead in particular ways, ways that are presented as "natural" by much of the leadership literature. In particular, these expectations fit with the women's ways approach (Loden; 1985); Grant, 1988; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990; and Eagly and Carli, 2003). Tanya's comment "[Because I was a woman] there was an expectation of care or nurturing and overlooking things that men wouldn't" reveals her frustration at being perceived as a softer (which translates into weaker) leader, simply because she's a woman. The other difficulty for her was that she didn't see herself as particularly 'nurturing' or 'caring' in this professional context and therefore resisted attempts to force her into what she considered to be stereotypical behaviour. Further, Tanya took pride in her adherence to military expectations of herself and expected no less of those under her command. However, when she refused to overlook infractions or substandard performance with regards to these expectations, she faced criticism from both

her peers and her subordinates who expected her to be less exacting about military (read masculine) standards because she was a woman (read feminine). Her experiences are echoed by Miranda: "I'm a woman -- people expect me to lead a certain way... if I don't, it's 'she's a woman, she's aggressive, opinionated. If it's a guy, he's a great all-around guy." On the other hand, some women who saw themselves having uniquely female leadership styles faced difficulties as well: "As a female leader, my leadership ability wasn't as recognized as some of my male colleagues because it was different. You're either seen as Madonna [i.e., a sexualized female] or a subordinate" (Sandra).

Similar issues existed for the nurses. For the men, leadership opportunities were enhanced because they were men. Many had been encouraged to pursue management posts early in their career because it was assumed that they would both want and excel at being managers.   They also had to find ways to reconcile the expectation that they would lead 'like men' – i.e., in a task-oriented way – with their own understanding of good leadership which was, as we have seen in section 6.2 above, more nuanced and not stereotypically sex-typed.

The effect of social role was more nuanced. People were deeply aware of the expectations placed on them in this regard and tried to work within them. This could sometimes be confusing for women in the military who constantly worked at managing their social role. It was particularly problematic at times for straight women, who sometimes felt extra pressure to behave in a feminine way in order to confirm their heterosexuality. It was difficult to feminize their leadership while struggling to maintain that balance between femininity and masculinity referred to above. For men in the military, social role requirements are much clearer – they are expected to be masculine.

Most of the straight male soldiers that I interviewed felt some impetus to be 'masculine' without necessarily being 'macho'. Indeed, it was interesting that many of the male examples of great leaders exhibited a certain understated masculinity (e.g. General Lou Mackenzie and Charlotte's CO, who I met) in keeping with the gender-neutral character of great leadership offered by participants, rather than the overly masculine personae that are sometimes stereotypically associated with great soldiers, at least in popular culture.

On the other hand, women in nursing did not generally seem to feel the need to counteract the feminine ethos of their profession. While they felt frustrated at the way in which the femininity of nursing was often perceived by others to be subservient to the masculine curing role of physicians, they were also very proud of their profession. None of my respondents expressed a need or desire to modify their leadership in order to conform to a particular social role. Male nurses, in contrast, worked more at managing their social role and this sometimes spilled over into their leadership. George's comments earlier about the masculine ethos of the PICU highlight the expectations that they sometimes faced regarding their presentation. However, George explained that, even though he encountered expectations of masculinity related both to the ethos of the PICU and the fact that he was a male nurse, he worked out his leadership based on his own ideas of good leadership and not in response to those expectations. In a similar statement, Leon expressed his desire to be the best leader that he could, regardless of social role expectations that stemmed from his being a man or his being a nurse. Like most of the nurses, both male and female, these men seemed aware of the gender typing of their profession but were also determined to work out their leadership without conforming to a gender-stereotypical way of leading.

The impact of sexuality in the military was very much along the lines of previous research such as Estes (2005) and Frank (2004). Queer participants in the US military and in the pre-liberalized Canadian and British forces felt afraid, alienated and devalued. Soldiers in today's Canadian and British forces seemed less concerned. However, there was not enough opportunity to explore this in depth. The female nurses were the least of aware of sexual orientation as an issue in their work lives and in their leadership. This could perhaps be a reflection of the fact that, as mentioned earlier, all my female nursing participants were heterosexual and thus conformed both to the heteronormativity of their profession and of the matrix. The male nurses managed their sexual orientation as discussed in section 6.3.3 above. All of the gay male nurses that I interviewed worked outside hospital settings in community nursing. They generally worked with a patient population that was diverse with regards to sexual orientation, if not almost exclusively gay. As discussed earlier, some nurses like Leon felt that their orientation allowed them to be more empathetic with their patients and offered them greater insights into their patients' health care issues. In terms of their leadership, their choice of workplace also seems to have allowed them to circumvent stereotypical expectations placed on them because they were gay. Thus, like the heterosexual male nurses, they were able to work at leading the way they wanted to rather than in conformity or opposition to a stereotype.

It seems that often the sexed body, as the most visible, least malleable element of the matrix, 'trumps' the others. People have stereotypical expectations of women and men in these hypergendered environments. Women like Miranda are expected to lead more 'softly' and overlook infractions while male nurses like George are expected to lead in a more 'masculine' (read direct) manner. While expressions of social role and sexuality

can be modulated to quite a degree, the sexed body, especially when in a military or nursing uniform, is much more 'obvious'. It thus tends to drive much of the way in which participants' sex/gender/sexuality is perceived as a whole. In the words of Camille: "it's really about the fact that I'm a woman".

If we reconsider the characteristics of great leaders elucidated in section 6.1, we can also see how, according to these data at least, some may be easier to accomplish than others in the contexts discussed above. Others are more open to differential interpretation according to sex especially. For example, getting on with the job, do as I do and take care of your people all seem to be rules that can be followed with a greater degree of latitude within the confines of stereotyping. However, several female soldiers pointed out that it is much more difficult for women to leave out politics because that is often interpreted as refusing to be part of the team; but, when they do engage in even benign political behaviour, it is seen as manipulative. On the other hand, it seems more acceptable for male soldiers and nurses to exhibit listening/empathetic behaviour, even though it is stereotypically feminine. Expertise can be affected by access to opportunity and training but can also affect credibility. Thus, it is more difficult for female soldiers to display expertise in non-traditional occupations and in elements of combat, regardless of their experience. Interestingly, presence was one characteristic of great leaders that crossed sex lines. All agreed that appearance, bearing and other aspects of physical presence were not contingent on sex and were an important part of being a great leader.

Summing up, it seems as if the military is still caught up in the 'knock heads together' idea of leadership to some extent. This makes it very difficult for the women I interviewed to develop their own style of leadership. They have to cope with stereotypes

regarding their sexed bodies that spill out into social role, sexuality <u>and</u> leadership. They

work in an environment that sees them as "dykes, whores or bitches" and this heaps layers

of prejudice upon them. Thus, in terms of the matrix, if she is a woman (sex), she is also a

bitch (social role) and a dyke or a whore (sexuality). As these women developed as

leaders, they worked at undoing this stereotypical matrix. As one person with whom I

discussed my project put it, and in keeping with Camille's comment above, "it's not so

much about managing their leadership as managing their gender". It seems to have

perhaps been easier for straight women like Marcy and Diane, a straight woman in the

Canadian Forces, who worked in administrative capacities and presented as heterosexual

and non-threateningly feminine but who could also be quite forceful if needed. I believe it

was also easier for them because they were mothers and therefore their sexuality was

acceptable and as non-threatening as their femininity.

In a sense, then, there is a hierarchy at work here: the body first, then the social

role, then sexuality. Thus, for Martha, say, being a woman with a masculine presentation

was potentially problematic. However, like Diane, she was also straight and a mother, and

this blunted the impact of her masculine social role. On the other hand, for many lesbians,

it was difficult to similarly mitigate their difference. For example, most would have to

deal with not fitting into <u>two</u> of the prescribed aspects of the matrix because they had no

husband or children to counteract their non-conforming sexuality. Thus, a self-described

"soft butch" lesbian such as Andrea would be 'different' because of her body, her

masculine social role and her sexual orientation. The difference between her and Martha

or Diane, both of whom I also met in person and who also present as women with a

masculine social role, is that Andrea could not present a husband and / or children as a

way of fitting into the third aspect of the matrix and thus blunting the impact of her

difference.

However, the hierarchy and the heteronormativity of the matrix were not always

invoked. In exigent circumstances such as war, for example, queer soldiers were far freer

to be themselves. For example, Jane pointed out that, during the Gulf War and on

deployment during the Cold War, she was easily accepted by the military brass, who did

not question her sexuality. It was during her postings to US bases that she had the

aforementioned problems with attendance at military functions. However, Jane faced the

same stereotypical expectations regarding her leadership no matter where she was posted.

Miranda recounted similar stories, explaining her frustration when male subordinates, in a

variety of settings, expected her to overlook sub-par performance because she was female

and therefore "softer", even though her social role is quite middle of the road and her

sexual orientation was generally overlooked in exigent circumstances. Many queer

soldiers were able to hide their sexuality effectively, and thus concentrate on subverting

leadership stereotypes tied to their sexed body alone.

For male nurses, on the other hand, there seemed to be less impact of stereotypes

on their leadership. They found that the femininity of the profession allowed them to

incorporate the stereotypically feminine aspects of leadership more easily. As Leon

suggested "Because I work in a feminine profession I find that I can lead in a more

balanced way". However, nurses like George, who worked in a masculine area like

mental health, felt pressure to lead in a masculine way. Still, it seems as though George is

very comfortable in his social role, which he says includes an ability to be emotional and

perform a more balanced masculinity. He is therefore able to withstand pressure to be

macho, and also lead in a more balanced way consistent with his own inner vision of good leadership.

But a number of female nurses expressed great frustration at the stereotypes that extended to their leadership. For example, Lily, a straight nurse in Canada, expressed frustration at being expected to be subservient, agreeable, relational and self-effacing as a female nursing leader. She struggles to find a place from which to lead that is removed from her sexed body, social role and sexuality. Still, what was in many ways one of the most interesting cases was Henry, the gay male nurse in the British military. Unlike gay male soldiers, he felt far less pressure to be masculine, because he is a nurse. Yet, as a surgical (read 'masculine') nurse, he is perceived as more masculine than 'regular' nurses. He feels that this combination allows him to lead according to his own ideas regarding good leadership because he doesn't fall tidily into any particular box.

These are some of the ways in which the leadership behaviour of the participants affected or was affected by their sexed body, social role and/or sexuality. In the next chapter, I turn to the research questions and draw together ways in which these participants provided answers to those overarching questions.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter I focus on the answers to the four overarching research questions and one sub-question. I begin giving a brief overview of the first six chapters. I then continue to address each research question and sub-question by discussing the answers that the participants' interview data provided to those questions. In the final section of this chapter, I outline what I believe to be my main contributions, reflect on the thesis project overall and point to some directions for future research.

7.1.1 What has come before

Chapter 2 provided the first of three literature reviews. In the first part of that chapter, I focused on the intersection of feminist theory and leadership studies and in particular how these intersections originate from two main philosophical approaches, the 'women-in-management' literature and its ties to liberal feminism and the 'women's ways' literature and its ties to psychoanalytic feminism. In the second part of chapter two, I discussed the ways in which theorists have sought to address some of the problematic aspects of these two approaches. In particular, I looked at the way in which the essentialism and dualism inherent in both of these approaches have been highlighted (for example by Calás and Smircich, 1991) and the alternatives that have been proposed. In the final part of the chapter, I proposed that Butler's (1987, 1988, 1990, 1993) ideas regarding the performativity of gender and the heterosexual matrix, following from some of Foucault's (1978, 1980) ideas

regarding the subject and power, can be used to break leadership literature free of the essentialism and attendant stereotypes and heteronormativity that characterize it. I concluded this chapter by introducing the research questions that guided the thesis project.

The next chapter (3) provided a review of the literature on gender and the military. In the first section I provided a historical background for my project by describing, in brief, the development of the military of Canada, the UK and the US. In order to examine the masculine hypergendering of the military, and in keeping with Butler's heterosexual matrix as discussed in the conceptual review, I examined three aspects of this gendering, sexed body, social role, and sexuality, and, in particular, how these three aspects of the matrix are hypermasculinized and/or heteronormative in the military of all three countries.

In the second section of that chapter, I reviewed some of the key literature that has attempted to understand how and why particular attitudes towards gender, sex and sexuality developed in the military of Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, and how and why they continue to drive, to a greater or lesser extent, much of the way in which personnel are recruited, selected, trained, allowed to serve and promoted in those armed forces.

Chapter 4, like the previous one on the military, begins with a historical overview of the nursing profession in the three countries. Then, in order to examine the feminine hypergendering of nursing, and, in keeping with Butler's framework discussed in Chapter 2 and also used in the previous chapter, I examine the same three aspects: sexed body, social role, and sexuality. I looked at how these are hyperfeminized and/or

heteronormative in the places where nurses work in the three countries. In the last part of

this chapter I examined some of the literature in nursing that attempts to understand how

members of this profession, both women and men, can come to terms with these issues,

and how a profession that is facing serious leadership challenges due to looming

retirements tries to move beyond narrowly constituted expectations all the while being still

stuck within a mostly patriarchal medical field.

In chapter 5 I explained and discussed the methodological approach that I used in

order to search for answers to the research questions and reflected on my experience of

'doing' this project. I began by exploring the fundamental ontological and

epistemological positions that I brought to this project. I then continued by discussing the

research strategies that I employed. In the next section, on research methods, I included a

discussion of the issues that Lee and Renzetti (1993) suggest are important to consider

when researching sensitive topics: methods, technical issues, ethics, politics, legalities and

the effects of doing the research on the life of the researcher. I then described the

sampling and data collection process as well as the processes of analysis and

interpretation. I ended this chapter by reflecting on the methodological issues that were

raised for me through this project, the difficulties that I had, the opportunities that were

presented, and the lessons that I will take into future research projects.

Chapter 6 provided an analysis of the data that I collected through the thirty-four

interviews that I conducted. I began the chapter with a section that examined the ways in

which participants described great leaders. I continued by discussing the ways in which

the participants' sexed body, social role and sexuality affected their organizational lives

and leadership. Finally, I looked at the way in which participants, in the

hypergendered/heteronormative contexts within which they worked and given their ideas

of great leadership, developed and enacted their own leadership. That has allowed me to

proceed to the next section where I examine the ways in which the project provided

answers for each of the research questions.

7.2 Answers to Research Questions

How then, do the above discussions and my data provide insights into the

research questions? In this section I will deal with each of the research questions in

turn.

7.2.1 Question One

How do/can people construct identities that transcend the heterosexual matrix?

What might a queer identity/one at the border entail?

As discussed in chapter 6, participants offered a range of descriptions of their

gender (understood in its tripartite sense) identity. All participants who completed

the interviews found their sexed body pretty straightforward to describe as either

male or female. Moreover, descriptions of sexual orientation or social role,

interestingly, often included physical descriptions, typically of hairstyle, dress or, for

the men, facial hair.

Social role was a little more difficult to tease out, mainly because participants

were often uncertain as to the exact nature of 'social role' in this context. After

explaining it as varying degrees and shades of femininity or masculinity, I found

participants were more comfortable and were able to place themselves along what

seemed to be an invisible continuum. Indeed, some, like Leon, actually used that

metaphor: as we have seen, he stated that on a scale of zero to 10 where zero is

extreme femininity and 10 extreme masculinity he would score himself as 7 or 8.

In terms of sexual orientation, queer participants had all spent a certain

amount of time working out their sexuality and its consequences in their lives. The

men seemed to describe themselves in less complex ways, most often saying

'heterosexual', 'straight' or 'gay'. Henry, who told me that "I'm not a gay man, I'm a

man who happens to be gay – I'm just a bloke. At work I'm professional, detached,

masculine. With friends I'm more relaxed – it can get quite outrageous", was one of

the few men who gave more nuanced descriptions. But despite their often highly

considered and variegated responses to this issue, very few of the lesbians used the

terms 'butch' or 'femme' to describe themselves, even though those terms are often

used, particularly within the lesbian community. A notable exception was Charlotte,

who as discussed in chapter 6.0 who used the term to underscore a point she was

making regarding her butchness versus the masculinity of the military environment.

I wondered whether the more nuanced understandings of sexuality the lesbian

participants shared with me were perhaps due to the fact that, as women, they

occupied the position of Other and so, as lesbians, they were compelled to explore

their sexuality in a deeper way than the gay men.

Thus the construction of queer identities/identities at the border varied by

respondent. Certainly, it is not possible, nor is it desirable, to offer some sort of

classification system. Based on these data we can say, however, that an identity at

the border is made up of the sexed body interacting with a variety of social roles and

sexualities, with little relationship to stereotypes that exist regarding queer people.

A similar variety existed among the heterosexual participants in terms of social role – i.e., a range of masculinities and femininities. Interestingly, some of the straight women found it particularly difficult to escape stereotypes, <u>because</u> they were straight. For example, in these data the expectation seems to be that either a lesbian will be butch or not – and if she is not, it is chalked up to her being queer, and an expectation that she is already different because of that. However, <u>all</u> straight women seem to be expected to fulfil a stereotype that is formulated by the heterosexual matrix and it seems more difficult for them to develop an identity that is at the border. This of course runs seemingly counter to Butler's arguments about the "abjection" conferred on queer individuals, who regularly and routinely subvert the matrix simply by virtue of being queer. Perhaps the conclusion should be that the matrix only 'protects' to the extent that we exist 'unproblematically' within its confines.

7.2.2 Question Two

As people construct their identities as leaders, do they seek to reconcile all their other identities into a coherent whole with their identity as a leader? Do they view their leader identities as in any way shaped, influenced or informed by their sex, gender and/ or sexual identities? Or do their leader identities instead come to affect how they see themselves as male, female, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera)?

Did people lead a certain way because of their sexed body? Their social role? Their sexuality? Or did being a leader influence these aspects of identity? It is actually hard to say. For some, being a leader influenced the way in which they

<u>displayed</u> their body, social role and sexuality. For many, their sexed body and their attributed social role influenced the way in which <u>others</u> thought they should lead. And, for some, their sexuality influenced the way in which they approached their organizational lives, including leadership, especially when they sought to hide it. However, almost all participants professed to lead in ways that fit into their <u>own</u> ideas about how to be a good leader. These ideas were mostly not tied to any stereotypes around body, social role or sexual orientation. I considered the possibility that perhaps these people were unaware of stereotypical thinking that might have underpinned their leadership. However, this was absolutely not the case in the interviews – indeed the reverse was the case, in the sense that many expressed very eloquently their experiences of how others perceived them as leaders, based on their 'occupancy' of the matrix. The one thing that was clear is the interconnectedness between the participants' leadership identities, their sexed body, their social role and their sexuality. Given the discussions in Chapter 6 on the way leadership intersects with elements of the heterosexual matrix, in fact, it is very explicit that participants developed as leaders while trying to negotiate the matrix and its prescribed identities.

7.2.3 Question Three

To what extent are leadership, sex, gender and sexual identities `fixed' or `static'? Do we play out our sense of ourselves as leaders, men, women, masculine, feminine, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (etcetera) in the same way across time and place?

Generally, queer participants had taken longer to develop aspects of their identity, especially their sexuality and their social role. However, they also had to

consider how they were going to live their social role and sexuality within an organizational context that was fraught with stereotypes, prescriptions and prohibitions. Most felt that their identity as described here, i.e., sexed body – social role – sexuality, once established tended to remain constant over time. Nonetheless, they also indicated, in line with Henry's observation, that, in general, the presentation of social role and sexuality was different within a work context than with friends.

Most participants believed that their identity as leaders also remained consistent over time and place. At the same time, they explained that their leadership style tended to remain fairly consistent although they might apply it differently, depending on context. Interestingly, most of the military participants were like Tanya, who as we have seen explained that even in a social situation like a potluck dinner she will move things along in order to ensure that everyone fill their plate instead of simply milling around while the food gets cold. In other words there was a certain 'spillover' between 'public' and 'private' spheres in this sense. For the soldiers who have left the military, their leadership attributes and skills are an important part of success in new positions. Jane, for example, stated that "in civvy street you can't just order someone to do something". Thus, she explained that the part of her that is a leader and helps her to actually lead people comes from her time in the military. Overall then, according to these data, once people develop a leadership identity, it does not tend to change over time, much like their gender identity. Again, this is interesting because it contradicts most contemporary theory about identity and its fluctuating, dynamic, 'becoming' character. It is difficult to explain this seeming

disjuncture, except to say that conventional Western ideas of identity as 'essence' are seemingly still pervasive amongst my respondents.

7.2.4 Question Four

How do queer or borderline identities intersect with leadership? Can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? In particular, in a profession in which gender roles are still fairly rigidly prescribed, and in which only certain forms of gendered leadership are `acceptable', can people escape the heterosexual matrix in their leadership behaviours? If so, what are the effects of such subversion for the leader involved?

People can, and do, escape the heterosexual matrix in their behaviours in these data. As discussed in Chapter 6, most of the participants felt strong pressure to conform to the matrix and to attendant stereotypes, especially as regards leadership. They also struggled to enact their ideas of leadership within the confines of the matrix. However, participants did not offer any evidence that subverting the <u>leadership</u> behaviour per se expected within the confines of the matrix had negative consequences, while deviating from the heteronormativity of the matrix as regards social role and sexual orientation certainly did. Team members seemed generally to respond to their leadership behaviour on its own as opposed to in reaction to any deviation from the stereotypes. To be sure, there were people who expected them *a priori* to lead in stereotypical ways. An example was offered by Miranda who explained, as noted earlier, that subordinates would expect her to overlook infractions because she was a woman and therefore 'softer'. But those subordinates seemed to learn to cope with this unexpected leadership behaviour more quickly than, say, Camille's CO who took a dim view of the occasions when she spent

time with her team members at the base mess as a way to develop team interaction – an activity that was encouraged in male leaders.

Further, many of the examples of great leaders that participants offered were themselves non-stereotypical leaders in that they did not display the expected aspects of the matrix – e.g., soldiers who were not hypermasculine or nursing leaders who were both women and men and who exhibited 'middle of the road' social roles. Queer participants like Charlotte, who separated her butch persona from the necessarily more aggressive persona she embodied as a military leader and Henry, who explained that occupying a place at the intersections of a 'feminine' profession, nursing, and a 'masculine' profession, the military, allowed him to lead in a more balanced way because he did not fit neatly into a box are further examples of leaders who escape the matrix. The fact that these women and men were also successful as soldiers and nurses demonstrates that it is possible to subvert the matrix and be a successful member of a hypergendered organization.

7.2.4.1 Subquestion to question four

To what extent do the differently hypergendered contexts of the military and nursing in the three countries seem to lead to varying outcomes in this regard?

In order to answer this question, I have highlighted what I believe to be key points of difference in the hypergendered contexts of the military and nursing in the three countries. For example, Canada is, in general, a queer-friendly country that was an early adopter of anti-discrimination policies that included LGBT people (Hunt and Eaton, 2007). It is therefore not surprising that queer Canadian respondents felt less threatened in the military than, for example, American soldiers. However, it is also interesting to note that before the changes in human rights legislation the 'witch hunts' that Sally refers to

were just as problematic for queer members as they remain for members of the US

military. Even today, there still seems to be uncertainty as to how the disclosure of queer

identity will be received in certain areas of the Canadian Forces.

Canada has also lifted the combat exclusion, resulting in the participation of a

number of women in units such as artillery and infantry among others. But the

women in my data in the Canadian Forces have found efforts to integrate them

sometimes <u>hinder</u> their acceptance by male colleagues. Their sexed body is the

strongest flashpoint in the discussions of their suitability for the combat arms.

However, these women, like most of the participants, work at enacting leadership

that is in line with their own ideas regarding good leadership in opposition to

stereotypical role expectations.

Another point of difference is, of course, the existence of DADT in the US

military. As discussed in Chapter 6, this policy has led to anger, alienation and

loneliness for many soldiers causing them to leave the military for civilian jobs.

Interestingly, not one queer retired soldier expressed regret at serving in the

military, even though they had to leave in the end. DADT also resulted in queer

participants occasionally behaving and/or leading in stereotypical ways to varying

degrees in order not to be found out.

But another point of difference in the military, one that is common to all three

countries, is the degree of hypergenderedness according to branch of service. As

discussed in chapter 6, Camille, an officer in the Canadian Air Force, explains "For

example, if you listen to a male warrant officer speak about women in the combat

arms, they say 'women shouldn't be here. They get their period, they can't just pee

anywhere'. But, when it's all Air Force, there's no need to prove anything. There was

pressure when I was new, but not because I'm a woman, just because I was new".

She continues: "Within air traffic control, I never felt that [I have to prove myself] --

but when I was transferred to a base [which had personnel from other service

branches], to a certain extent my abilities were automatically in question and I had to

prove them over and over again". Indeed, in many ways, women in the combat arms

suffer the most from the effects of role congruity theory (Eagly et al., 1995). They are

not just women occupying a masculine role (soldier) – they belong to some of the

most masculine occupations in the military.

In nursing, male nurses have been well organized in the UK longer than in

Canada and the US. Further, they seem to be less concerned about stereotypes and

they feel freer to lead in ways that are consistent with their own ideas rather than to

dispel or fulfil stereotypical attributions. It therefore seems unsurprising that my

British male nurses tend to occupy a larger variety of nursing specialisms than their

counterparts in the other two countries.

In comparing the two professions, each as a whole, nursing and the military

seem to impact differently on individuals according to their sexed body, social role

and sexuality. The military is male, masculine and straight. For soldiers who fit that

bill, there are more opportunities and more resources. There is also more credibility,

more safety and an easier path to senior ranks. For female soldiers, life is

considerably more difficult. They are excluded from combat in two countries, a fact

that hampers their ability to reach top ranks. At the same time, they are often

deployed in combat support positions where they are still injured, captured and

killed. Female officers are often subjected to gender harassment (Miller, 1997) and spend a lot of time earning the respect of followers over and over again as Camille noted above.

In contrast, men in nursing who are in a parallel gender situation fare much better – even though they do not fit into nursing's gender prescription, they find more opportunity for advancement, fast tracking to the top and easier respect from physicians and even many female nurses. It is true that they are still kept out of certain occupations, but they are disproportionately present in top nursing ranks, in contrast to the female officers of the military. Thus, the biggest point of difference seems to be the professions themselves. Regardless of the way each profession is hypergendered, being male seems to be far more advantageous than being female. In other words, the 'predictions' offered by the literature reviews in chapters 3.0 and 4.0 are borne out here with regard to hypergendering.

In all 3 countries and both professions, however, people seem to lead in a way that fits with their own ideas regarding great leadership, regardless of their own sexed body, social role or sexuality. This does not mean that their sex, gender and sexuality are separate from their leadership. It is more the case that their leadership, their sexed body, their social role and their sexuality are parts of their identity that function simultaneously although not always smoothly or coherently.

7.3 Contribution, Reflections and Future Directions
I believe that this project makes both an empirical and a methodological contribution. First the methodological contributions include overcoming the difficulties in accessing this type of participant group, people of varying sexes, social

roles and sexualities who work in two types of organizations in three different countries. In particular, the sensitive nature of the topic made it that much more difficult to find participants willing to discuss such personal issues frankly. As well I was able to interview a number of queer members of the US military, even though DADT could have resulted in potentially serious consequences for them if they disclosed their sexuality and that fact came to the attention of the military. In chapter 5, I outlined the steps I took in order to reach this many participants.

My empirical contributions relate primarily to the way in which this project addresses a combination of issues that have not been addressed together before. Certainly, some of the data confirm previous studies on the lives of queer people in organizations, women in the military and female and male nurses. However, few studies examine the lives of openly queer members of the military and little has been written about the organizational experience of gay male nurses – not the stereotype, but <u>actual</u> gay men. As well, little has been written about sexuality and leadership and there has been no work comparing leadership in military and nursing contexts. Findings also include the differential consequences for those who do not fit the prescribed gender in nursing versus the military. And section 7.2.4.1 highlights some other ways in which differently hypergendered contexts and different national terrains lead to varying outcomes for leaders.

With regards to the leadership literature and my claim that Butler's ideas regarding the heterosexual matrix can be used to break the leadership literature free of the essentialism and attendant stereotypes and heteronormativity that characterize it, I would suggest that the thesis offers two key insights. First, the

narratives of their sexed bodies, social roles and sexual orientations offered by my

participants certainly suggest that the essentialism and heternormativity in the

leadership literature simply cannot encompass or account for these leaders' identity

projects. The variety of gender positions (understood in the broadest sense)

occupied by these participants speaks to the multiplicity of possible intersections of

sexed body, social role, sexuality and leadership that this literature has not so far

addressed. Second, by using Butler's framework this study highlighted the way in

which all three aspects are part of gender as it is understood and (re)produced in

contemporary western society, as regulated in particular by the heterosexual matrix.

As such, sexed body, social role and sexuality must all be addressed in work that

purports to examine the intersection of gender and leadership. It is not enough to

examine differences, or similarities, between women and men as if these were

unproblematic, *a priori* categories of personhood without understanding the more

complex ways in which people's sexed bodies, social roles and/or sexual orientations

both intersect with each other and impact on their leadership.

    In terms of leadership in general, this project provides a couple of key

insights. First, when stereotypical leadership characteristics are removed from

interview questions, we find that participants hold remarkably similar views on the

characteristics of great leaders. These characteristics are mostly free of sex or

gender stereotypes, certainly as they are exhibited in exemplars of great leadership

cited by participants. Further, although participants agreed on these characteristics

and attempted to incorporate them into their own leadership, they also struggled

against stereotypical elements of the heterosexual matrix that permeated their

organizations. Finally, it seems that these people are required to expend energy and effort to manage aspects of their gender such as their social role, the way their sexed body is displayed and their sexual orientation and this can sometimes get in the way of their leadership.

As I reflect on this project, I am struck by a number of other issues. First is the length of time it took to find participants. It was at once easy and difficult: one participant generally yielded a small cluster of potential participants. Once that cluster was exhausted, it took some time to find another cluster. Trust was, of course, a key ingredient in getting people to agree to participate, as was academic affiliation. My own sexuality was an important part of building trust with queer participants.

Another insight is the understanding that these interviews affected the participants to varying degrees. For some, they seemed to be self-contained conversations from which they quickly moved on. However for others, for example Tanya, the revisiting of a career marked by fear of discovery as a lesbian led to the painful realization that she had spent eighteen years being afraid and that fear had directed her career choices much more than she would have liked. We spent some time talking on the telephone and e-mail in order for her to work through these feelings. This experience was surprising for me. It drove home the sensitivity of the topic and led me to build in debriefing time and questions at the end of all subsequent interviews that allowed participants to think about what we had discussed and move out of that mindset into their everyday lives.

Looking forward, this project has really only scratched the surface of the intersection between leadership, the sexed body, social role and sexuality. Future projects that build on this one could ask a number of potential questions. For example, how do team members perceive their leaders' sexed body, social role and sexuality and how do these intersect with their leadership? In the military, how do these related issues play out in combat situations versus home base / non-combat postings? What will happen in the US military when DADT is repealed, something that seems likely during President Obama's term in office? How integrated are queer soldiers now in the Canadian and British militaries? In nursing, how does the increasing proportion of women physicians affect the way in which nursing leaders operate? How do queer female nurses deal with the stereotypical expectations placed on them as non-heterosexual women? What about nurses in the military (I only had one military nurse participant) – how do they manage their sexed bodies, social roles and sexuality and leadership within their double-hypergendered context? Finally, are the characteristics of great leaders identified by participants shared by a wider number and range of people? This project was an attempt to understand the ways in which leadership, the sexed body, social role and sexuality intersect. It has provided some initial answers. There is, however, much more to be learned.

Appendix 1 – Invitation to participate

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled <u>Leading at the border: gender, sex and leadership in gendered organizations</u>. You are being asked to participate if you have at any time served in any branch of the armed forces of any country for more than one year, and have occupied a leadership position as part of that service. I stress that this does not mean that I am looking for commissioned officers only – people at all levels in the military serve in leadership capacities, and I welcome participants of all ranks and occupations within the military. I am looking especially for women who self-identify as lesbian, bisexual or transgender. I am searching for a greater understanding of how you integrate your identity as a leader with the other identities that are part of you.

If you give your permission to participate, you will be asked to do so in one of two ways. If it is possible for us to meet face to face, you will be asked to spend 30 to 60 minutes responding to a series of questions in a face-to face interview with me. The interview will take place in a location that is acceptable to you, for example your home or my office, or another place of your choosing. You will be asked a series of questions, which I will send you in advance. The interview will be tape-recorded in order that I may concentrate on the interaction rather than on taking word-for-word notes, and so that there is an accurate record of the whole interview. You may request that I turn off the tape recorder at any time, for however long you wish. A research assistant, who will not have any access to your identity, will transcribe the tapes. At no time will you be required to provide your name or other identifying information on tape. All tapes, transcripts, and notes will maintain this anonymity. The only place where your name appears is as your signature on a consent form, which will be kept in a locked cabinet, separate from the data, and destroyed after the study is over. You will not even be asked to print your name, just to sign it. If you are concerned about signing this form, a copy of which will be sent to you ahead of time, I can read it out to you and ask for your verbal consent as part of the interview. The consent is a requirement of my university to ensure that I have explained the above to you, answered any questions that you may have, and that you are a voluntary and informed participant. All tapes will be destroyed after the study is over, while anonymous transcripts and notes will be kept in my locked files for archival purposes for three years.

If it is not possible for us to meet face to face, you will be asked to participate in a telephone interview as described above. I'll send you the consent from ahead of time, and then I'll read it out to you at the start of the interview, discuss any questions that you may have, and ask you to confirm your consent verbally.

You are free, at any time during, or after, the process, to withdraw from this study. You are also free, at any time, to refuse to answer any question that you are asked. I hope to publish the results of this study at an academic conference, and perhaps later in an academic journal. I may quote you in the article. However, all quotes will be anonymous, and there will never be any reference to your identity in the article. I will make a copy of the article available to you. I know of no risks that can occur by participating in this study. I would be happy to address any concerns that you may have about participating in this study by email at bowringm@cc.umanitoba.ca

Consent Form

<u>Leading at the Border: Gender, Sex and Leadership in Gendered Organizations</u>

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information. In the case of a telephone interview, I will send you a consent form by email ahead of time, and I will then read it out to you at the start of the interview, discuss any potential concerns or questions that you may have, and ask you to confirm your consent verbally. This will then form a part of the transcript.

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled <u>Leading at the Border: Gender, Sex and Leadership in Gendered Organizations</u>. The purpose of this study is to understand the way in which leaders in organizations integrate their gender identity with their identity as a leader. It specifically focuses on leaders in organizations in which the gender and sex of the ideal leader is typically prescribed. You have been asked to participate because you served in the armed forces or worked as a nurse for at least one year, in a leadership role, and do not, in some way, fit into the prescription for your organization.

If you give your permission to participate, you will be asked to spend 30 to 60 minutes responding to a series of questions in an interview with me. If possible, this interview will be face-to-face. If not, the interview will be by telephone. If face-to-face, the interview will take place in a location that is acceptable to you, for example your home, your office, or my office. The same applies to a telephone interview. You will be asked a series of questions, as set out in the attached protocol. The interview will be tape-recorded in order that I may concentrate on the interaction rather than on taking word-for-word notes, and so that there is an accurate record of the whole interview. You may request that I turn off the tape recorder at any time, for however long you wish. A research assistant, who will not have access to your identity, will transcribe the tapes. At no time will you be required to provide your name on tape. All tapes, transcripts, and notes will maintain this anonymity. The only place where your name appears is on this consent form, which will be kept in a locked cabinet, separate from the data, and destroyed three years after the study is over. All tapes will be destroyed after the study is over, while anonymous transcripts and notes will be kept in my locked files for archival purposes for three years.

You are free, at any time during, or after, the process, to withdraw from this study. You are also free, at any time, to refuse to answer any question that you are asked. I hope to publish the results of this study at an academic conference, and perhaps later in an academic journal. I may quote you in the article. However, all quotes will be anonymous, and there will never be any reference to your identity in the article. I will make a copy of the article available to you. I know of no risks that can occur by participating in this study.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation. All inquiries of this nature should be directed to Professor Michele Bowring, University of Manitoba telephone: 001-204-474-8349 or bowringm@ms.umanitoba.ca

This research has been approved by the Joint Faculty Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact the above-named person or the Human Ethics Secretariat at 001- 204-474-7122. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Participant's Signature: _____Date:_____

Email address if you wish to receive a copy of the results. You may provide any email address that you wish, including third-party or anonymous hotmail-type address:

 _____

Researcher's Signature:_____Date:_____

Bibliography

Acker, J. 1990, "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations", *Gender & Society,* vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 139-158.

Acker, J. 1992, "From sex roles to gendered institutions", *Contemporary Sociology,* vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 565-569.

Adams, J., Rice, R.W. & Instone, D. 1984, "Attitudes Toward Women And Judgments Concerning Performance By Female And Male Leaders", *Academy of Management Journal,* vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 636-643.

Adie, K. 2003, *Corsets to Camouflage: Women and War,* Hodder & Stoughton, London.

Alcoff, L. 1988, "Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: the identity crisis in feminist theory", *Signs,* vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 405-436.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Alban-Metcalfe, J. 2002, "Leadership" in *Psychology at work*, ed. P. Warr, Penguin Books, London, pp. 300-325.

Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. 2000, *Doing Critical Management Research,* Sage, London.

Ashley, J.A. 1977, *Paternalism and the Role of the Nurse,* Teacher's College Press, New York, NY.

Astell, M. 1694, *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, part 1,* 2002 edn, Broadview Press, Peterborough ON.

Astell, M. 1694, *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, part 2,* 2002 edn, Broadview Press, Peterborough ON.

Astell, M. 1700, *Some Reflections Upon Marriage,* John Nutt, London. Available: http://www.pinn.net/~sunshine/book-sum/astl_mrg.hml [22 October, 2008].

Bartol, K.M. 1978, "The sex structuring of organizations: A search for possible causes", *The Academy of Management Review (pre-1986),* vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 805.

Bartol, K.M. & Butterfield, A.D. 1976, "Sex Effects in Evaluating Leaders", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 446-454.

Bass, J.M. 1985, *Leadership and performance,* Free Press, New York, NY.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. 1994, "Shatter the Glass Ceiling: Women May Make Better Managers", *Human Resource Management,* vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 549-560.

BBC staff writers 29 March 2007-last update*, Women on the military frontline.* Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/6502847.5.htm [2008, October 22].

Belkin, A. & Embser-Hebert, M. 2002, "A Modest Proposal: Privacy as a flawed rationale for the exclusion of gays and lesbians from the US military", *International Security,* vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 178-197.

Belkin, A. & Evans, R. 2000, *The effects of including gay and lesbian soldiers in the British Armed Forces: Appraising the evidence*, The Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities, Santa Barbara, CA.

Belkin, A. & McNichol, J. 2000, *Effects of the 1992 lifting of restrictions on gay and lesbian service in the Canadian Forces: appraising the evidence*, Palm Center of the University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA.

Belkin, A. & McNichol, J. 2000a, "Homosexual Personnel Policy in the Canadian Forces: Did Lifting the Gay Ban Undermine Military Performance?", *International Journal,* vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 73-88.

Bellafaire, J.A. , *The Women's Army Corps: A commemoration of World War II service (CMH publication 72-15)*. Available: http://www.history.army.mil/brochures/wac/wac.htm [2008, October 22] .

Bem, S.L. 1974, "The measurement of psychological androgyny", *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* vol. 42, pp. 155-162.

Benhabib, S. 1992, *Situating the Self: Gender, community and postmodernism in contemporary ethics*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Benhabib, S. 1994, "In defense of universalism, yet again! A response to critiques of situating the self", *New German Critique,* vol. 62, pp. 173-189.

Bennus, W. & B. Nanus 1985, *Leaders: Strategies ofr taking charge*, Harper and Row, New York, NY.

Boldry, J., Wood, W. & Kashy, D.A. 2001, "Gender stereotypes and the evaluation of men and women in military training", *Journal of Social Issues,* vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 689-705.

Bostridge, M. *, Florence Nightingale: The Lady with the Lamp* [Homepage of BBC], [Online]. Available: www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/victorians/nightingale_01.shtml [2008, 11/02] .

Bowring, M.A. 2004, "Resistance Is *Not* Futile: Liberating Captain Janeway from the Masculine-Feminine Dualism of Leadership", *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 381-405.

Bowring, M.A. & Brewis, J. 2009, "Truth and consequences: Managing lesbian and gay identity in the Canadian workplace", *Equal Opportunities International,* vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 361-377.

Boyce, L.A. & Herd, A.M. 2003, "The relationship between gender role stereotypes and requisite military leadership characteristics", *Sex Roles,* vol. 49, no. 7/8, pp. 365-378.

Bradley, H. 1989, "Medicine" in *Men's work, women's work: a sociological history of the sexual division of labour in employment*, ed. H. Bradley, University of Minnesota Press, Minnealopolis, MN, pp. 188-202.

Brewis, J., Hampton, M.P. & Linstead, S. 1997, "Unpacking *Priscilla*: subjectivity and identity in the organization of gendered appearance", *Human Relations,* vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 1275-1304.

Brown, D. & Kennedy, S.*, 'I love her now and always' - husband's tribute to Sarah Bryant, first female soldier to be killed in Afghanistan* [The Times Online], Available: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article4171432.ece [2008, 10/10].

Browne, P.P. 2006, *The socialization of cadets at the Royal Military College of Canada: Focus Group Results*, Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, Ottawa, Canada.

Bryman, A. 2004, *Social Research Methods,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Burns, J.M. 1978, *Leadership,* Harper & Row, New York, NY.

Butler, J. 1985, "Variations on sex and gender: Beauvoir, Wittig and Foucault", *Praxis International,* vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 505-516.

Butler, J. 1988, "Performative acts and gender constitution; an essay in phenomenology and feminist theories", *Theatre Journal,* vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 519-531.

Butler, J. 1990, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity,* 1999 edn, Routledge, New York, NY.

Butler, J. 1993, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex",* Routledge, New York, NY.

Butler, J, 1995, "Contingent foundations; feminism and the question of "postmodernism"" in *Feminist contentions; A philosophical exchange,* eds. S. Benhabib, J. Butler, D. Cornell and N. Fraser, Routledge, New York, NY.

Butterfield, D.A. & Grinnell, J.P. 1999, "Re-viewing" gender, leadership and managerial behavior: do three decades of research tell us anything?" in *Handbook of Gender and Work*, ed. G.M. Powell, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 223-238.

Butterfield, D.A. & Powell, G.N. 1981, "Effect of group performance, leader sex and rater sex on ratings of leader performance", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* vol. 28, pp. 129-141.

Calás, M. 2003, "Dangerous Liaisons: The "feminine-in-management" meets "globalization"", *Business Horizons,* vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 71-81.

Calás, M. & Smircich, L. 1991, "Voicing seduction to silence leadership", *Organization Studies,* vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 567-601.

Calás, M. & Smircich, L. 1992, "Rewriting gender into organizational theorizing: directions from a feminist perspective" in *Re-Thinking Organization*, eds. M. Reed & R. Hughes, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Calás, M. & Smircich, L. 1992a, "Using the F word: feminist theories and the social construction of research" in *Gendering Organizational Analysis*, eds. A.J. Mills & P. Tancred, Sage, Newbury Park, pp. 222-234.

Calás, M. & Smircich, L. 1996, "From the 'woman's point of view': Feminist Approaches to Organization Studies" in *Handbook of Organizational Studies*, eds. S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T.B. Lawrence & W.R. Nord, Sage, London, pp. 218-258.

Calás, M. & Smircich, L. 2006, "From the 'woman's point of view' Ten Years Later: Towards a Feminist Organization Studies" in *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Studies*, eds. S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T.B. Lawrence & W.R. Nord, Sage, London, pp. 284-346.

Calás, M., Jacobsen, S., Jacques, R. & Smircich, L. 1991, "Is a women-centered theory of management dangerous? " presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Conference*, Miami.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation staff writers 2006, May 17-last update*, Canadian woman 16th soldier killed in Afghanistan*. Available: http://www.cbc.ca/world/story/2006/05/17/afghanistan-cda.html [2006, May 17].

Canadian Forces 2005, *Women Throughout Canadian Military History*.

Canadian Nurses Association 2009, *History*. Available: http://www.cna-nurses.ca/CNA/about/history/default_e.aspx [2009, June 20].

Carless, S.A. 1998, "Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives", *Sex Roles,* vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 887-902.

Center for Military Readiness (CMR) 2002, "new Infromation undermines lawsuit intended to silence CMR", May 7, 2007, Available: http://www.cmrlink/cmrlawsuit.asp?.docID=52 [20 October, 2008].

Chapman Catt, C. 1897, *The Ballot and the Bullet,* National American Woman Suffrage Association, New York.

Chapman, D.S. & Rowe, P.M. 2001, "The impact of videoconference technology, interview structure, and interviewer gender on interviewer evaluations in the employment interview: A field experiment", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 279-298.

Charmaz, K. 1995, "Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods" in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, eds. N. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Charmaz, K. 2000, "Grounded theory: Objectivist and subjectivist methods" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, London.

Charmaz, K. 2003a, "Grounded Theory" in *Qualitative Psychology : A Practical Guide to Research Methods*, ed. J.A. Smith, Sage, London, pp. 507-535.

Charmaz, K. 2003b, "Grounded Theory" in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, eds. N. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Charmaz, K. 2006, *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis,* Sage, London.

Chodorow, L. 1978, *The Reproduction of Mothering,* University of California, Berkeley.

Cooper, E.A. & Barrett, G.V. 1984, "Equal Pay and Gender: Implications of Court Cases for Personnel Practices", *The Academy of Management Review,* vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 84.

Corbett, S. 2007, *Battle of the Sexes*, Sunday Times Magazine, London.

Corbett, S. 2007, *The Women's War*, The New York Times Magazine, New York, NY.

Creswell, J.W. 2003, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches,* Sage, London.

Cross, S. & Bagilhole, B. 2002, "Girls' jobs for the boys?", *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 204-206.

Cummings, S.H. 1995, "Attila the Hun vs. Attila the Hen: Gender socialization of the American nurse", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 19-29.

Cyr, J.P. 1992, "Males in nursing", *Nursing Management,* vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 54-55.

de Beauvoir, S. 1952, *The Second Sex,* 1989th edn, Vintage, New York, NY.

Denzin, N.K. 1970, *The Research Act in Sociology,* Aldine, Chicago.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. 1994, "Entering the field of qualitative research" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. 2000, "Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Descartes, R. 1637, *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One's Reason and of Seeking Truth in the Sciences,* Available: http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/59 [28 October, 2008].

Diekman, A.B. & Eagly, A.H. 2008, *Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: women and men of the past, present and future,* vol. 26, pp. 1171-1188.

Dinnerstein, D. 1975, *The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual arrangements and human malaise,* Hogarth, London.

Drentea, P. 1998, "Consequences of Women's Formal and Informal Job Search Methods for Employment in Female-Dominated Jobs", *Gender & Society,* vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 321-338.

Due Billing, Y. & Alvesson, M. 2000, "Questioning the Notion of Feminine Leadership: A Critical Perspective on the Gender Labelling of Leadership", *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 144-157.

Dunivin, K.O. 1994, "Military culture: change continuity", *Armed Forces and Society,* vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 531-547.

Dyer, G. 1991, *War: A Commentary*, Public Broadcasting Service, Boston.

Eagly, A.H. 2007, "Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: resolving the contradictions", *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1-12.

Eagly, A.H. & Carli, L.L. 2003, "The female leadership advantage: an evaluation of the evidence", *The Leadership Quarterly,* vol. 14, pp. 807-834.

Eagly, A.H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. & van Engen, M.L. 2003, "Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men", *Psychological bulletin,* vol. 129, no. 4, pp. 569-591.

Eagly, A.H., Karau, S.J. & Makhijani, M.G. 1995, "Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: a meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin,* vol. 117, no. 1, pp. 125-145.

Eagly, A.H., Makhijani, M.G. & Klonsky, B.G. 1992, "Gender and the evaluation of leaders: a meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin,* vol. 111, no. 1, pp. 3-22.

Esterberg, K.G. 2002, *Qualitative Methods in Social Research,* McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Estes, S. 2005, "Ask and tell: gay veterans, identity and oral history on a civil rights frontier", *Oral History Review,* vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 21-47.

Evans, J.A. 1997, "Men in nursing: issues of gender segregation and hidden advantages", *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 226-231.

Evans, J.A. 2002, "Cautious caregivers' gender stereotypes and the sexualization of men nurses' touch", *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 441-448.

Evans, J.A. 2004, "Men nurses: a historical and feminist perspective", *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 321-328.

Fayol, H. 1916[1949], *General and Administative Management,* Pitman: London.

Fletcher, J. 1994, "Castrating the female advantage: feminist standpoint research and management science", *Journal of Management Inquiry,* vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 74-82.

Fletcher, J. 1998, "Relational Practice: a feminist reconstruction of work", *Journal of Management Inquiry,* vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 163-175.

Foucault, M. 1978, "Technologies of the Self" in *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, eds. L.H. Martin, H. Guttman & P.H. Hutton, University of Massachusetts, Boston, pp. 16-29.

Foucault, M. 1980, *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1,* Random House, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. 1988, "The Technologies of the Self" in *Technologies of the self; a seminar with Michel Foucault*, eds. L.H. Martin, H. Gutman & P.H. Hutton, University of Massachusetts, Boston.

Frank, N. 2004, *Gays and lesbians at war: military service in Iraq and Afghanistan under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"*, The Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities, Santa Barbara, CA.

Freeman, C. 2003, "Recruiting for diversity", *Women in Management Review,* vol. 18, no. 1/2, pp. 68-76.

Freire, P. 1968, *Pedagogy of the oppressed,* 2000 edn, Continuum, New York, NY.

Freud, S. 1930, *Civilization and its discontents,* Norton, New York, NY.

Freud, S. 1935, *The Interpretation of Dreams,* Macmillan, New York, NY.

Friedan, B. 1963, *The Feminist Mystique,* Norton, New York, NY.

Gamson, J. "Sexualities, queer theory and qualitative research" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, London.

Gilligan, C. 1977, "In a different voice: women's conceptions of self and of morality", *Harvard Educational Press,* vol. 47, pp. 481-517.

Gilligan, C. 1982, *In a Different Voice,* Harvard, Cambridge.

Gilligan, C. & Antonucci, J. 1988, "Two moral orientations: Gender differences and similarities", *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* vol. 34, pp. 223-237.

Glaser, B.G. 1992, *Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis: Emergence vs. Forcing,* Sociology Press, Mill Valley CA.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. 1967, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory,* Aldine, New York, NY.

Grant, J. 1988, "Women as Managers: What They Can Offer to Organizations", *Organizational Dynamics,* vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 56.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. 1994, "Competing paradigms in qualitative research" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 105-117.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. 2005, "Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences" in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 191-216.

Gutek, B.A. & Morasch, B. 1982, "Sex-ratio, sex-role spill over and sexual harassment at work", *Journal of Social Issues,* vol. 38, pp. 58-74.

Gunden, E. & Cressman, S. 1992, "Leadership skills for empowerment", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 6-10.

Hampf, M.M. 2004, ""Dykes" or "Whores": Sexuality and the Women's Army Corps in the United States during World War II", *Women's Studies International Forum,* vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 13-30.

Haraway, D.J. 1988, "Situated Knowledges: The Science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective", *Feminist Studies,* vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 575-599.

Haraway, D.J. 1991, "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology and Socialist-feminism in the late 20th century" in *Simians, Cyborgs and Women*, ed. D.J. Haraway, Routledge, New York, NY.

Harding, T. 2007, "The construction of men who are nurses as gay", *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 636-644.

Harrington, K. 1999, *Leadership by design: the gendered construction of the military (Air Force) officers*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Havens, D.S. & Laschinger, H.K.S. 1997, "Creating the environment to support shared governance: Kanter's theory of power in organizations", *Journal of Shared Governance,* vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 15-23.

Heckathorn, D.D. 1997, "Respondent-driven sampling: a new approach to the study of hidden populations", *Social Problems,* vol. 44, pp. 174-199.

Heden, B.A. 1986, "A case study of oppressed group behaviour in nurses", *Journal of Nursing Scholarship,* vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 53-57.

Heffernan, M. 2002, "The female CEO circa 2000", *Fast Company,* vol. 61, pp. 9, 51-60, 62, 64, 66.

Heilman, M.E., Block, C.J., Martell, R.F. & Simon, M.C. 1989, "Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women and managers", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 74, no. 6, pp. 935-942.

Heilman, M.E. & Martell, R.F. 1986, "Exposure to successful women: Antidote to sex discrimination in applicant screening decisions?", *Organizational behavior and human decision processes,* vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 376-390.

Helgesen, S. 1990, *The Female advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership,* Doubleday, New York, NY.

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. 1977, *The Managerial Woman,* Doubleday, Garden City, NJ

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. 1997, *The Managerial Woman,* Doubleday, New York, NY.

Herbert, M. 1998, *Camouflage Isn't Only for Combat: Gender, Sexuality and Women in the Military,* University Press, New York, NY.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. 1977, *The Management of Organizational Behavior,* Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Holyoake, D.D. 2001, *The male nurse: addressing the myth of maleness in musing*, APS Publishing, Salisbury UK.

Hunter, D. 1974, "Men in nursing", *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatric Nursing,* vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 12-14.

Jagger, A. 1983, *Feminist Politics and Human Nature,* Rowman and Allanheld, Totowa, NJ.

Jardine, C. 2008, 20 June 2008-last update*, Mourn Sarah Bryant as a soldier, not a woman* [The Telegraph], [Online]. Available: www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3559665/Mourn-Sarah-Bryant-as-a-soldier-not-a-woman.html [2008, 10 October].

Kalisch, P.A. & Kalish, B.J. 1982, "Nurses on prime time television", *The American Journal of Nursing,* vol. 2, no. 264-270.

Kalisch, P.A. & Kalish, B.J. 1982b, "The image of nurses in motion pictures", *The American Journal of Nursing,* vol. 82, no. 8, pp. 605-611.

Kalisch, P.A. & Kalish, B.J. 1982c, "The image of nurses in novels", *The American Journal of Nursing,* vol. 82, no. 8, pp. 1220-1224.

Kampfner, J. May 15, 2003-last update*, Saving Private Lynch story 'flawed'* [BBC], [Online]. Available: http://bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/correspondent/3028585.stm [2008, October 22] .

Kampfner, J. May 15, 2003-last update*, The truth about Jessica* [The Guardian], [Online]. Available: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/may/15/iraq.usa2 [2008, October 22] .

Kanter, R.M. 1976, "The impact of hierarchical structures on the work behavior of women and men", *Social Problems,* vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 415-430.

Kanter, R.M. 1977, *Men and Women of the Corporation,* Basic Books, New York, NY.

Kapczynski, A. 2003, "Same-sex privacy limits and the limits of anti-discrimination law", *Yale University Law Journal,* vol. 112, no. 1, pp. 1257-1293.

Kare, J.L. & Horn, W.G. 2001, *The Medical Implications of Women on Submarines*, Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory.

Kier, E. 1998, "Homosexuals in the US military: open integration and combat effectiveness", *International Security,* vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 5-39.

Kmec, J.A. 2008, "The process of segregation in a gender typed field: the case of male nurses", *Sociological Perspectives,* vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 259-279.

Konrad, A. & Gutek, B. 1986, "Impact of work experiences on attitudes towards sexual harassment", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 422-438.

Kunz, M. 2008, . Available: http://www.michelekunz.com/nursingtimeline.html [2008, October 8].

Kvale, S. 1996, *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing,* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Laschinger, H.K.S. 20, "A theoretical approach to studying work empowerment in nursing: a review of studies testing Kanter's theory of structural power in organizations", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 2, no. 25-41.

Laschinger, H.K.S. & Havens, D.S. 1996, "Work empowerment and perceived control over nursing practice: conditions for work effectiveness", *Journal of Nursing Administration*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 27-35.

Laschinger, H.K.S., Havens, D.S. & Heather, K. 1997, "The effect of workplace empowerment on staff nurses' occupational mental health", *Journal of Nursing Administration,* vol. 27, pp. 42-50.

Lee, R.M. & Renzetti, C.M. 1993, "The problems of researching sensitive topics" in *Researching Sensitive Topics*, eds. C.M. Renzetti & R.M. Lee, Sage, London.

LeGates, M. 2001, *In Their Time: A History of Feminism in Western Society,* 2nd edn, Routledge, New York, NY.

Lewis, M.C. 1997, "Men in nursing : time for a re-evaluation", *InterAction, Newsletter of the American Association for Men in Nursing,* vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 9-11.

Locke, J. 1690, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* 1997 edn, Penguin Books, London.

Locke, J. 1693, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education,* 1880 edn. National Society, London. Available at http://www.books.google.ca

Loden, M. 1985, *Feminine leadership, or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys,* Times Books, New York, NY.

MacKintosh, C. 1997, "A historical study of men in Nursing", *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 26, pp. 232-236.

Mahoney, J. 2001, "Leadership Skills for the 21st Century", *Journal of Nursing Management,* vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 269-271.

Mannino, S.F. 1963, "The professional man nurse: why he chose nursing and other characteristics of men in nursing", *Nursing Research,* vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 185-187.

Martin, J.E. & Petersen, M.M. 1987, "Two-tier wage structures; implications for equity theory", *The Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 297-315.

Matheson, L.K. & Bobay, K. 2007, "Validation of oppressed group behaviors in nursing", *Journal of Professional Nursing,* vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 226-234.

McDaniel, C. & Wolf, G.A. 1992, "Transformational leadership in nursing service", *Journal of Nursing Administration,* vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 60-65.

McDonald, L. 1998, *Women theorists on society and politics,* WLU Press, Waterloo ON.

McDougall, G. 1997, "Caring - a masculine perspective", *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 809-813.

McNay, L. 1992, *Foucault and feminism,* Polity Press, Cam.

Mericle, B. 1983, "The male as psychiatric nurse", *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing,* vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 28-34.

Merton, R.K. 1968, *Social Theory and Social Structure,* Free Press, New York, NY.

Mill, J.S. 1869, *The Subjection of Women,* D. Appleton and Company, New York, NY.

Miller, L.L. 1997, "Not just weapons of the weak: gender harassment as a form of protest for army men", *Sociological Quarterly,* vol. 60, pp. 32-51.

Ministry of Defence (MOD) 2000, *The Armed Forces Overarching Personnel Strategy*, London, The Stationery Office.

Ministry of Defence (MOD) 2002, *Women in the Armed Forces - Defence Factsheet.* Available: http://www.mod.uk/defenceInternet/FactSheets/WomenInTheArmedForces.htm [2009, January 18].

Morris, M. 1996, "By Force of Arms: Rape, war and military culture", *Duke Law Journal,* vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 651.

Muff, J. 1982, "Handmaiden, battle-ax, whore: an exploration into the fantasies, myths and stereotypes about nurses" in *Socialization, Sexism and Stereotyping: Women's Issues in Nursing*, ed. J. Muff, Waveland, Prospect Heights, IL.

Muldoon, O.T. & Reilly, J. 2003, "Career choice in nursing students: gendered constructs as psychological barriers", *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 93-100.

Mullen, B. & Cooper, C. 1994, "The relationship between group cohesiveness and performance: an integration", *Psychological Bulletin*, vo;. 115, pp. 210-227.

Murphy, F. & Nightingale, A. 2002, "Accident and emergency nurses as researchers: exploring some of the ethical issues when researching sensitive topics", *Accident and Emergency Nursing,* vol. 10, pp. 72-77.

Nantais, C. & Lee, M.F. 1999, "Women in the United States Military: protectors or protected? The case of prisoner of war Melissa Rathbun-Nealy", *Journal of Gender Studies,* vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 181-191.

Nieva, V.G. & Gutek, B.A. 1981, *Women and Work: A Psychological Perspective,* Praeger, New York, NY.

Nightingale, F. 1860, *Notes on Nursing: What it is and what it is not,* New York: Appleton. Available; http://books.google.ca

NATO 2006, "Country Report: USA", Available:

http://www.nato.int/ims/2006/win/national_reports/USA.pdf [2 November, 2008].

No Angels 2004-2006, television series, Channel 4.

Oakley, A. 1981, "Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms" in *Doing Feminist Research*, ed. H. Roberts, Routledge, London, pp. 30-61.

Paetzold, R.L. & O'Leary-Kelly, A. 1994, "Hostile environment sexual harassment in the United States", *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 1, pp. 50-57.

Page, J., Evans, M. & Elliott, F. June 19, 2008-last update*, New rules of war put women on frontline in Iraq and Afghanistan*. Available: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article4168044.ece [2009, January 17].

Palmer, A. 1983, "Nightingale revisited", *Nursing Outlook,* vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 229-233.

Parker, M. 2002, "Queering Management and Organization", *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 9, pp. 146-166.

Peach, L.J. 1994, "Women at War: The ethics of women in combat", *Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military,* vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 1-64.

Peach, L.J. 1996, "Gender Ideology in the Ethics of Women in Combat" in *It's Our Military Too: Women in the US military*, ed. J.H. Stiehm, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, pp. 157-194.

Poliafico, J. 1998, "Nursing's gender gap", *Registered Nurse,* vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 39-42.

Porter, S. 1992, "Women in a women's job : the gendered experience of nurses", *Sociology of Health and Illness,* vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 510-527.

Porter-O'Grady, T. 1995, "Reverse discrimination in nursing leadership: hitting the concrete ceiling", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 56-62.

Powell, G.M. 1993, *Women in Management,* 2nd edn, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.

Powell, G.M. & Butterfield, D.A. 1979, The "good manager": Masculine or androgynous? *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 22, pp. 395-403.

Powell, G.M. & Butterfield, D.A. 1984, "The Female Leader and the 'High-High' Effective Leader Stereotype", *Journal of Psychology,* vol. 117, no. 1, pp. 71.

Powell, G.N. & Butterfield, D.A. 1989, "The 'Good Manager': Did Androgyny Fare Better in the 1980s?", *Group & Organization Studies,* vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 216.

Powell, G.M., Butterfield, D.A. & Parent, J.D. 2002, "Gender and managerial stereotypes: have the times changed?", *Journal of Management,* vol. 28, pp. 177-193.

Prasad, A. & Prasad, P. 2002, "The coming of age of interpretive organizational research", *Organizational Research Methods,* vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 4-11.

Ramazanoglu, C. (ed) 1993, *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism*, Routledge, London.

Renzetti, C.M. & Lee, R.M. (eds) 1993, *Researching Sensitive Topics*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.

Rich, A. 1980, *On Lies, Secrets and Silence,* Virago, New York, NY.

Roberts, S.J. 1997, "Nursing executives in the 1990's: Empowered or Oppressed?", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 64-71.

Roberts, S.J. 1983, "Oppressed group behaviour: implications for nursing", *Advances in Nursing Sciences,* vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 21-30.

Rode, M. 1989, "The nursing pin : symbol of 1000 years of service", *Nursing Forum,* vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 15-17.

Rodgers, L. 2009*, Sisters in arms celebrate 60 years* [Homepage of BBC], [Online]. Available: news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/7845175.stm [2009, 12 March 2009].

Rosener, J.B. 1997, *America's Competitive Secret: Women Managers,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ryan, S. & Porter, S. 1993, "Man in nursing: a cautionary comparative critique", *Nursing Outlook,* vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 262-267.

Salmon Report 1967, *Report of the Committee on Senior Nursing Staff Structure*, HMSO, London.

Schein, V.E. 1973, "The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 57, pp. 95-100.

Schein, V. E. 1975, "Relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 340-344.

Schmitt, E. 1994, "Generals Oppose Combat by Women", [New York Times] Available: http://www.nytimes.com/1994/06/17/us/generals-oppose-combat-by-women.html?scp=7&sq=schmitt%20women%20combat%201994&st=cse [18 October, 2008].

Schneier, C. & Bartol, K.M. 1980, "Sex effects in emergent leadership", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 65, no. 341-345.

Schnier, M., *Feminism: The Essential Historical Writings,* 1992, Vintage, New York, NY.

Schwab, D.P. & Grams, R. 1985, "Sex-related errors in job evaluation: A 'real-world' test", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 533-539.

Scott, K.A. & Brown, D.J. 2006, "Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* vol. 101, no. 2, pp. 230.

Sharpe, R. 2000*, As leaders, women rule: new students find that female managers outshine their male counterparts in almost every measure* [Business Week], [Online]. Available: http://www.businessweek.com/common_frames/ca.htm?2000/00_47/be708145.html [12 October 2008].

Sherman, R.O. 2005, "Growing our future nursing leaders", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 125-132.

Simpson, R. 2004, "Masculinity at work: the experiences of men in female-dominated occupations", *Work Employment and Society,* vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 349-368.

Squires, T. 1995, "Men in nursing", *Registered Nurse,* vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 26-28.

Stiehm, J.H. 1982, "The Protected, the protector and the defender", *Women's Studies International Forum,* vol. 5, no. 3/4, pp. 367-376.

Stiehm, J.H. (ed) 1989, *It's Our Military Too: Women and the US Military*, Temple University, Philadelphia.

Strauss, A.L. & Corbin, J.M. 1998, *Basics of Qualitative Research,* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Sun Staff Reporters 2008, *Sarah dies while Qatada is freed*, The Sun, London. 19 June, 2008. Available from:

http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/campaigns/our_boys/1311149/Sarah-Bryant-is-the-first-British-woman-to-die-on-service-in-Afghanistan-Taliban.html

Taylor, A. 2008, *Cpl Sarah Bryant Remembered*, The Sun, London. 20 June 2008. Available from:

http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/campaigns/our_boys/article1316887.ece

Tewksbury, R. & Gagné, P. 1997, "Assumed and presumed identities: problems of self-presentation in field research", *Sociological Spectrum,* vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 127-155.

Thyer, G.L. 2003, "Dare to be different: transformational leadership may hold the key to reducing the nursing shortage", *Journal of Nursing Management,* vol. 11, pp. 73-79.

Tong, R.P. 1989, "Postmodern feminism" in *Feminist Thought*, ed. R.P. Tong, 2nd edn, Westview Press, USA, pp. 193-211.

Terborg, J.R. 1977, "Women in management: a research review", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 62, pp. 647-664.

Upenieks, V. 2003, " The Interrelationship of Organizational Characteristics of Magnet Hospitals, Nursing Leadership and Nursing Job Satisfaction", *The Health Care Manager,* vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 83-98.

Upenieks, V. 2003a, "A nurse leader's perceptions of what compromises successful leadership in today's acute patient environment", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 140-152.

Upenieks, V. 2003b, "What constitutes effective leadership: perceptions of magnet and not magnet nurse leaders9", *Journal of Nursing Administration,* vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 456-467.

US Department of Health and Human Services 2004, *National Survey Sample of Registered Nurses (NSSRN)*, Health Resources and Service Administration, Washington D.C.

Varma, A. & Stroh, L.K. 2001, "The impact of same-sex LMX dyads on performance evaluations", *Human resource management,* vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 309-320.

Walker, K. 2001, "Moving Gaily Forward? Lesbian, gay and transgender human rights in Europe", *Melbourne Journal of International Law,* [Online], vol. 4, [October 22, 2008]. Available from: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/MelbJIL/2001/4.html.

Waller, K. 2001, "Moving gaily forward? Lesbian, gay and transgendered human rights in Eurpoe", *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, vol. 4 [online] Available: http://www.austrlii.edu.ac/au/journals/MelbJIL/2001/4.html [27 October, 2008].

Widgery, A. 1966, "The will to match our opportunity", *The Canadian Nurse,* vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 35-39.

Williams, C.L. 1992, "The glass elevator: hidden advantages for men in the "female" professions", *Social Problems,* vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 253-267.

Williams, C.L. 1995, "Hidden advantages for men in nursing", *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 63-70.

Wilson, B. & Laschinger, H.K.S. 1994, "Staff Nurse perceptions of job empowerment and organizational commitment: a test of Kanter's theory of structural power in organizations", *Journal of Nursing Administration,* vol. 24, no. 45, pp. 39-49.

Wollstonecraft, M. 1792, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman,* J. Johnson, London. Available from http://books.google.ca

Women in Military Service for America Memorial Foundation (WMSAMF) 2008, "Early Years: Civil War" Available:

http://www.womensmemorial.org/H&C/History/earlyyears%28civil%29.html [2 November, 2008]

Woodward, R. & Winter, P. 2006, "Gender and the limits to diversity in the contemporary British Army", *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 45-67.

Zaleznik, A. 1977, "Managers and Leaders: Are they different?", *Harvard Business Review,* vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 67-78.