BARING SOME ESSENTIALS: BOYS' ACHIEVEMENT, ERO AND LEADERSHIP

NOELINE WRIGHT
University of Waikato

ABSTRACT *This article identifies some popular concerns about boys' achievement, and concerns raised by researchers. The Education Review Office report on the achievement of boys is critiqued in relation to the role masculinities play in regulating boys' attitudes to learning. The paper concludes with some implications and obligations for educational leaders in addressing issues about boys' learning and achievement within a context of social justice.*

INTRODUCTION

Rumblings about what is seen as boys' relatively poor academic examination achievement compared with girls, surface in various guises at regular intervals (Cassie, 1999a, 1999b; Fyfe, 1998a, 1998b; Garner, 1999a; Rowe, 1999). Secondary school examinations results are often used as a yardstick, particularly in the "hard" subjects of chemistry, physics and some mathematics courses (Yates, 1997), leading to portrayals of a crisis in boys' academic achievement. The Internet for instance, has been a lively source of this debate where boys are seen as victims (*All About Gender Equity*, 2000; *Educational Equity for Boys*, 2000). Others take a more thoughtful stance, locating the issue not as one which establishes a right/wrong, but as one which attempts to show how vigorously notions of gender and power are contested (Foster, 1994; Vogel, 1999).

THE EDUCATION REVIEW OFFICE AND BOYS' ACHIEVEMENT

The Education Review Office (ERO) report *The Achievement of Boys* (1999) identified popular concerns about boys' achievement in New Zealand and generally located reasons for low male achievement as external ones; family circumstances, media exposure, relationships with caregivers, and a lack of male role models. It also suggested two main issues for schools, accommodating learning styles and behaviour, and developing appropriate programmes that manage them. The role masculinity plays in attitudes to learning is mentioned in a short reference to macho peer culture, but the report ignores the central place of masculinity in relation to boys' learning (Connell, 1989; 1994; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Martino, 1999; West, 1999). ERO's (1999) report also tends to speak in either-or terms; either girls are doing better than boys, or vice versa suggesting boys and girls are homogeneous groups. McGee, Bailey and Campbell (1999) identified this position as zero-sum.

The (1999) ERO report develops its assumptions about boys' learning by particularly relying on external examination results from The New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) and ERO reports on schools. ERO defines the gender gap as the percentage difference between girls' and boys' examination success at B grade or better. The report does not discuss the validity of using examination results as a measure of achievement in gender terms. The research

base of the report is interesting. A small number of references was cited, including references from Britain, New Zealand, Australia and the United States. It is a narrow and highly selective research base, with few texts from refereed journals, doing little to enhance the credibility of ERO's discussion of boys' achievement.

The report includes case studies from schools purported to be making a difference to boys' learning. The measures adopted by these schools appear worthwhile as support mechanisms for boys' learning, but they tend to overlook underlying problems associated with the role of masculinity. The report does not explain in any detail how schools monitor and measure the success of their programmes nor how long many of these programmes have been running. There is also little to indicate the basis upon which these schools gathered data to design these programmes.

The report finishes with a range of conclusions that appear to reflect popular myths about boys' learning. They include that women teachers may not understand boys' specific needs; that schools need good monitoring to detect patterns of achievement; that disruptive students affect boys' learning more than girls; that society's cohesion and economic well-being are at stake if boys do not do better at school; and, that the home and community are factors in poor achievement.

I argue that ERO's (1999) conclusions tend to locate the causes for boys' underachievement beyond boys and men themselves, as if they are essentially unproblematic, and they fail to identify which boys are at most risk. The report's conclusions also do not sufficiently address the roles of masculinity and power as factors in boys' achievement. Instead, the conclusions appear more likely to reinforce and reproduce beliefs, relationships and institutional practices that maintain barriers to learning rather than remove them (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Gilbert, 1998). In order to develop my argument, I turn to key researchers in the field.

THE ROLE OF MASCULINITY IN EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT: "BOYS WILL BE BOYS"

Connell (1989) investigated relationships between masculinity, power and education, by looking at the education of young men from a retrospective standpoint. Participants were two groups of three men from different backgrounds who reflected on their schooling experiences. In the study, Connell (1989) suggested that schools do not simply adapt to forms of natural masculinity or femininity, but that they construct, negotiate and support particular forms of each and that students steer a path within this framework which constantly shifts. Connell (1989) warned that conclusions reached about girls' academic achievements through feminist analyses do not equate with the educational situation of boys because men are the "privileged sex" (p. 293). This privilege, he noted, can be counterproductive to change because boys and men may not see any need to alter what they believe may already suit them. If males are to become the focus of change, he argued, then a new paradigm is needed to encompass it, requiring a deeper analysis of the construction of masculinity and the role schools play in it, a point missed in much of the ERO (1999) report. Other theorists, who consider the issue from different positions nonetheless echo aspects of Connell's conclusions (Francis, 1999; Kruse, 1992; Yates, 1997).

What arises in Connell's (1989), Mac an Ghaill's (1994) and Martino's (1999) studies, is a link between the notion of boys as "warriors" and some boys as part

of the "unrespectable end of the working class" (Mac an Ghaill, 1994, p. 93). Behaviours of boys who fit this description include truanting, smoking at school, and engaging in confrontational activities with peers and teachers. Such students pit themselves against the compulsory nature of school and its associated regulations. Their acts of defiance or resistance reinforced their alienation from learning. This getting into trouble, Connell noted, was "both sexualised and gendered" (1989, p. 294). Kenway and Willis (1998) describe how this is played out in harassment and bullying in schools. It was not just in the playground. They also identified disturbing instances in school staffrooms. Repressing sexuality in schools becomes one way of maintaining order which can occur through subordinating women while praising men via authoritative practices of schools and the ways students do their "sorting out . . . [of the] pecking order stuff" (Connell, 1989, p. 294). These two aspects closely link to what is valued in educational terms by both some students and some teachers.

Sexuality is closely intertwined with learning in schools. For instance, a boy in Mac an Ghaill's (1994) study went from being a "warrior" to a "wimp" (p. 93) by wanting to concentrate on schoolwork instead of creating mayhem. He clearly understood how necessary it was "to prove yourself all the time . . . it's still about beating other people" (p. 93). Not only did this boy negotiate a new position as a "swot" but he also hid his sexuality as a gay youth by initially teaming up with a group of boys who resisted school and learning. This boy, and men Connell (1989) interviewed, were aware that getting into trouble was a way of asserting their brand of masculinity, in stark contrast to those who were hardworking or compliant, often labelled as "sissie", or a "girl". West (1999) describes this positioning as "not-female" and "not-gay". In other words, the boy in Mac an Ghaill's (1994) study helped construct a view of himself as being in control, tough and on top by belonging to the "taken-for-granted male world . . . [of being] staunch" in order to survive (Rout, 1992, p. 171).

Boys who most overtly patrol the boundaries of acceptable masculinity in a school are variously described as "cool guys" (Connell, 1989), "warriors" (Mac an Ghaill, 1994) or "cool boys" (Martino, 1999). "Cool" is, along with its associated behaviours, therefore highly desirable. The labels "lads" and "laddishness" used in the United Kingdom evoke a similar feel. Somehow, boys labelled thus have "got what it takes" to be real men (Connolly, 1994; Dixon, 1996; Francis, 1999). Such terms do not carry the derisive and gendered baggage of words like "wimps", "poofters", "swots", "gays" and "girls", which label different boys as "other".

Dominant and powerful groups of boys appear to have an ability to intimidate others either through the perceived status of "cool" or through actual physical or verbal intimidation (Rout, 1992). Such boys can significantly influence the limits of acceptable masculinity and consequently, the limits of acceptable learning behaviours (Martino, 1999). Learning becomes the last priority (West, 1999). Connell (1989) identifies demarcations of masculinity in schools thus:

> . . . masculinity is organised–on the macro scale-around social power. Social power in terms of access to higher education, entry to professions, command of communication, is being delivered by the school system to boys who are academic "successes". The reaction of the "failed' is likely to be to claim other sources of power, even other definitions of masculinity. Sporting prowess, physical aggression, sexual conquest may do.

also in terms of what is acceptable in *practice* and how it affects learning. The ERO (1999) report on boys' achievement, however, is remarkably silent on the role of masculinity. And in what appears to be a contradiction with Aitken's views, the ERO report suggests that women's ways of working may be detrimental to boys' learning.

CONTESTING THE GROUND OF BOYS' ACHIEVEMENT: RHETORIC AND REALITY

There is clearly a contest between surface and substance in the boys' achievement debate and its causes. Media reports tend to focus on binaries like masculine-feminine and girls' achievement-boys' underachievement, as if there is constant conflict (Chapman, 2000; Morris, 2000; Parry, 1997; Rowe, 1999). Researchers have commented on how this zero-sum or competitive and adversarial mentality positions women and girls as a major cause of boys' achievement patterns. For instance, some see it as a warning sign that gains for girls may retrench and further increase the disparities that already exist beyond schooling into the workforce (Foster, 1994; Swann, 1998; Yates, 1997). Others see it as a rich country–poor country split (Gender Canyon, 1999; Save the Children, 1999). Still others vigorously assert that any gender action to improve the lot of women and girls has gone too far and it, along with the feminisation of education, has caused boys to fail (Zohrab, 1999).

Even teachers' own sexual politics are implicated (Connell, 1989). These sexual politics are seen as neither neutral nor absent and sometimes they are even hostile (Kenway & Willis, 1998; Skelton, 1993). Schools in effect reproduce, assist, negotiate, silence or repress what it means to be male or female learners (Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Martino, 1999). This policing is often within narrow margins that can affect assumptions about academic success (Cohen, 1998).

Bosker and Dekkers (1994), for instance, were concerned that by not choosing mathematics or science subjects like physics at its higher levels, students effectively cut off a variety of later career and study choices. Social factors affect students' choices. As students develop their sense of self, they become keenly aware of multiple messages about masculinity and femininity in both their school and private lives. This can have the effect of exerting pressure on how they perceive subjects and their likely abilities in them (Kenway & Willis, 1998). Some subjects take on a gendered nature. Mathematics and physics, ("hard" subjects) for instance, tend to be constructed as masculine, while music, languages and domestic sciences ("soft", or non-academic subjects) are characterised as feminine (Ball, 1982)[1]. Hegemonic views of masculinity and femininity are powerful social forces many young people are ill-equipped to resist. Making choices that position students as different from the norm is sometimes not safe, given the kinds of harassment that may accompany their choices.

A related point to consider is how schools' sorting mechanisms like subject choices, examinations, and streaming can exacerbate the differences they are supposed to help overcome by providing choices for the future. What is not acknowledged is that good jobs for everybody don't exist and girls and women, despite better academic success, tend to be overtaken in the career and salary stakes by men within a short time of being in the job market. This point is widely supported (Briar, 1994; Court, 1993; Epstein, Elwood, Hey & Maw, 1998; Francis, 1999; Jackson, 1998; Watt, 1999; Yates, 1997).

What is also potent in the boys' learning debate, is that privilege and unequal power relations are implicated (Arnot, 1992; Hoodfar, 1997). It is not too hard, for instance, to work out that schools generally cannot afford to have policies, procedures and plans that can be interpreted as undermining the chances of those students whose parents may wield some trappings of privilege and power. It doesn't seem to matter whether such trappings are based on socio-economic status, gender, race or combinations of all three[2], because those in positions of privilege can exert uncomfortable pressures on a school.

At issue, then, is a fundamental contest between social justice and privilege. An impetus for social justice may expose deeply embedded inequalities existing in schools (Blackmore, 1999; Strachan, 1998). ERO's (1999) contention that schools must remove barriers to learning is ignoring both the economic reality of inequalities in the workforce and the social reality of the unequal power relations likely to affect the ability of any school to make effective and radical social justice decisions.

CHALLENGES FOR LEADERS

The issue of raising boys' academic achievement or, for that matter, anyone's achievement, is complex. However, critics cannot continue to insist that it is the fault of women, a persistent theme especially in popular media (Morris, 2000; Roger, 2000; Zohrab, 1999). School leaders face difficulties in having to grapple with the effects of some underlying causes of poor achievement like socio-economic status, race, parental guidance, gender constructions, and school practices (Stoll & Fink, 1996). The ERO report (1999) also mentions the importance of some of these factors. At the same time, leadership is intimately linked with both professional and gender identity. This makes dealing with issues of gender doubly hard. Hall (1997), for instance, suggests that men have greater trouble than women in understanding themselves in relation to both gender and sexuality issues, which may confound the ability of leaders to make a difference in achievement, echoing Connell's (1989) assertion about privilege and gender. Those who are privileged do not readily give that position up.

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF) (Ministry of Education, 1993), makes it clear that schools are places which must provide students with equal educational opportunities, a consideration some principals appear to struggle with (Morris, 2000; Roger, 2000). Schools are supposed to accommodate the needs of all students, as well as have programmes that "will be gender-inclusive, non-racist, and non-discriminatory . . ." (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 7). This is an enormous expectation and is a minefield of tensions and contradictions. Leaders can approach these demands in a variety of ways with varying levels of success and compromise (Gerritson, 1998; Roger, 2000; Strachan, 1997, 1998). Others may even relegate the issue to the too-hard-basket because of possible conflicts that may relate to privilege and personal identity.

In terms of trying to meet boys' learning needs, calling for more male teachers as role models is insufficient (Cassie, 1998, 1999b; Gerritson, 1999; Middleton, 1999). Single sex boys' schools in particular, already have many male teachers. This doesn't necessarily mean that they are appropriate role models, nor that boys do well academically because of them. The ERO (1999) report also appears to want it both ways, by saying that boys seem to be risk-takers in their learning, but do better with traditional approaches that focus on unambiguous facts and rules. Creating single-sex classes in co-educational schools is not an

unproblematic answer either (Hinds, 1999; Purdy, 2000). And, as Kealey's (1984) work shows, streaming can aggravate and reproduce, rather than fix problems of socio-economic status, race, and views of acceptable masculinity.

Concerns can also arise when girls are admitted to boys' schools. The usual message, as mentioned earlier, is that girls help police boys' behaviour. Seldom is their entry into boys' preserves about the benefits to girls' education (Grunwell, 2000). Leaders are likely, therefore, to have a tough time negotiating the issue of successful academic achievement for all in terms of the NZCF requirements, particularly when moves to improve girls' chances in education essentially result in blaming women and girls for boys' lack of academic achievement (Lewis, 1999; Zohrab, 1999).

Leaders also need to consider what Jones and Jacka (1995) warn of; that there can be negative consequences to discussing disadvantage. Girls, they contend, have become grouped with "others" (like Māori and the disabled) and described as deficient in some way because they are unlike those who dominate positions of power: white, middle class, male. They suggest that such positioning masks how this grouping reinforces rather than overturns, not only the view of who is disadvantaged, but also what the disadvantage consists of. They assert that by continuing to see girls and Māori for instance, as "not good" (p. 170) at certain subjects or skills, it makes their success look like aberrations, things which, in the end, do not alter people's views of what they can be good at. An associated result is that any success by these "others" can be construed as too much, mobilising the zero-sum argument. If these people are succeeding, it must be at the expense of those who succeeded before. Landmines for leaders are everywhere.

People's hearts and minds are affected by attempts to create changes which can disrupt deeply held beliefs, which is why leaders may need an external change agent to facilitate the exploration of achievement and gender issues (Hargreaves, 1997). This is both a commitment of time and a recognition that conflict and disruption may occur in order to make effective changes. This is a commitment not everyone may be ready to make. Money is also needed, especially if change is to be long term. Apportioning funds in the first place may be highly contested, since ownership often only comes with engagement in a process, not before, and there will be those within a school and its Board of Trustees who do not see the need for such investment. Before they start, leaders have to deeply believe that embarking on such a course of action is worth the effort.

While assumptions about boys' achievement run deep, no one school has the power to completely resolve the issues because of competing external social pressures that put a squeeze on what happens in a school. What is possible however, is for school leaders to begin a process of developing understanding about what matters in both social justice and ethic of care terms so that students' learning chances may ultimately be enhanced (Beck, 1992; Stoll & Fink, 1996).

It requires a committed leader to withstand the enticements of those who suggest that there are easy answers like single-sex classes, or special programmes for boys, or that girls no longer need help. Change is never easy, and when it involves changing hearts and minds for the long term, it is even more difficult (Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 1997; Lambert, 1995). Changes which focus on gender and achievement assumptions will be complicated and conflicting. A Pandora's box of assumptions about masculinity, femininity and power will be opened (Fullan, 1993; Kenway, Willis, Blackmore & Rennie, 1994). Educational leaders will also face the concerns of groups who may not wish to share their current privilege. This could, for instance, result in damaging effects on school student numbers

because, as Connell (1989) and Kenway and Willis (1989) point out, some people believe that measures designed to promote social justice risk their own children's chances of educational success, the zero-sum-adversarial reasoning at work (Strachan, 1998).

Strategic developments need to accommodate the personal views of teachers and the school's community about the purposes of education. Culture and belief systems need to be understood since they are important factors in a school's ethos (Stoll & Fink, 1994, 1996; West, 1999). West-Burnham (1997) asserted that because one of the roles of schooling is "educative and transformational" (p. 234), there are "no value-free decisions where the learning of young people are concerned" (p. 240). A clear moral purpose of the school therefore, needs articulation. Fullan (1992), in suggesting guidelines for leaders working with teachers and communities, emphasised power to, rather than power over. This uses transformational practices which can help make a school a safe place to air differences, explore values and work towards overcoming problems in fulfilling social justice principles (Leithwood, 1992).

Leaders should be encouraging a vision based on social justice principles aimed at fulfilling the NZCF expectations of equity. Programmes and support networks focused on curbing bullying, sexual harassment and other violence are tangible places to start. It is important however, that such programmes are resourced properly so they become embedded in a school's values and culture and become part of wider strategies that focus on social justice principles. Galbraith (1998), for instance, clearly pointed out that "piecemeal" (p. 2) approaches seldom work. She echoes the view that school cultures are potent factors impacting on the ability of any programme to be effective in the long term.

A school leader can also provide spaces for staff to reflect on their own behaviour and attitudes through in-service opportunities, meetings, and developmental tasks. To keep social justice principles to the forefront, a leader has frequent opportunities to make references to these principles in discussions with both staff and Board of Trustees members. However, it will not be enough for a school to focus attention on one group without attempting to predict and manage how others may be affected. Examining actions, proposals and consequences becomes important. Hoodfar (1997), like Yates (1994), suggested that the basic challenge is to recognise differences and understand that our appreciation of those differences will always be incomplete. An emotional response to difference is often a feeling of threat, so it is important that this is understood. If it is not accommodated, it is possible that the status quo will go unchecked. This may mean that there is little that changes for many boys and girls at school.

CONCLUSION

In developed countries like New Zealand, when girls have access to education and appear to succeed better than some boys at the top of "boys'" subjects, the clamour about "poor boys" is deafening. There does not seem to be a complementary concern that boys do not do better than girls in "girls'" subjects. Also, it is not *all* boys who are in trouble. The same boys who did well before, still do, namely middle class, white boys. It is similar for girls; many do not equal the successes of their middle class and white sisters. Race, along with socio-economic status and gender, is also implicated in the scenario of who succeeds at school. School leaders have to do a much better job of grappling with issues of gender in their schools so that learning is a positive experience. This means some serious and sustained

examination of how sexuality, violence, and prevailing attitudes about gender can affect students' willingness to engage in the serious business of learning.

EPILOGUE

To end, I hope a short anecdote will illustrate the complexity of the issues. While in the gym changing rooms one day, I overheard two people discussing the misfortunes of a mutual acquaintance. As they left the changing rooms, one of them remarked that the person with the problem was spending too much time on trying to understand why it all happened. She believed that the acquaintance should focus on the results of the misfortune, because "it's the results you have to cope with". In terms of boys' achievement, too much focus on the results (i.e. apparently poorer success in examinations than girls) has created a series of myths that obscure the reasons for the situation in the first place. Indeed, without examining the causes there is no hope of making academic achievement accessible and possible for everyone, and school leaders, schools and students will be doomed to repeat the same mistakes over and over again.

REFERENCES

All about Gender Equity www.escape.com/~knechamk/back.htm; access date 21/1/2000.

Arnot, Madeline. (1992). Feminism, education and the new right. In, Madeline Arnot & Len Barton (Eds.), *Voicing concerns: Sociological perspectives on contemporary education reforms* (pp. 41-65). United Kingdom: Triangle Books.

Ball, Stephen. (1982). Competition and conflict in the teaching of English: A socio-historical analysis. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 14(1), 1-28.

Beck, Lynn. (1992). Meeting the challenge of the future: The place of a caring ethic in educational administration. *American Journal of Education*, 100, August, 454-496.

Bidois, Vanessa., & Walsh, Rebecca. (2000). Departure of mates saddens boarders. *New Zealand Herald* online.
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/storydisplay.cfm?storyID=126335&thesection=news&thesubsection=general

Blackmore, Jill. (1999). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership and educational change.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bosker, Roel J., & Dekkers, Hetty P.J.M. (1994). School differences in producing gender-related subject choices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5 (2), 178-195.

Bourdieu, Pierre., & Passeron, Jean-Claude. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture.* London: Sage.

Briar, Celia. (1994). Tracing the patterns: The development of EEO policies in New Zealand and overseas. In Janet Sayers and Marianne Tremaine (Eds.), *The vision and the reality* (pp.25-44). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Cassie, Fiona. (1998 October 14). Beyond the combat zone. *New Zealand Education Review*, p.5.

Cassie, Fiona. (1999a August 6). Poor boys on back foot from day one. *New Zealand Education Review*, p.5.

Cassie, Fiona. (1999b, September 3). You've got new male. *New Zealand Education Review*, p.9.

Chapman, Ruth. (2000, January 6). Boys held back by macho stereotypes. *New Zealand Herald*, A15.

Cohen, Michele. (1998). 'A habit of healthy idleness': Boys' underachievement in historical perspective. In Debbie Epstein, Jannette Elwood, Valerie Hey, & Janet Maw (Eds.), *Failing boys?: Issues in gender and achievement* (pp. 3-18) Buckingham: Open University Press.

Connell, Robert. (1989). Cool guys, swots and wimps: the interplay of masculinity and education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 15 (3), pp. 291-303.

Connell, Robert. (1994). Knowing about masculinity, teaching boys and men: Educational implications of the new sociology of masculinity and the old sociology of schools. In, Joan Lemaire (Ed.), *Girls, boys and equity: A practical resource for use in schools.* (pp. 7-27). Sydney: Centre for Teaching & Learning NSW Teachers' Federation.

Connolly, Paul. (1994). All lads together?: Racism, masculinity and multicultural/anti-racist strategies in a primary school. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 4 (2), 191-211.

Court, Marian. (1993). 1893-1993: How far have we come in women's employment in education? *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, (pp. 81-128). Wellington: School of Education, Victoria University.

Dixon, Carolyn. (1996). 'Having a laugh, having a fight': Masculinity and the conflicting needs of the self in design and technology. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 6 (2), 147-166.

Education Review Office. (1999). *The achievement of boys*. Wellington: Education Review Office, Winter.

Educational Equity for Boys www.escape.com/~knechamk/educ1.htm; access date 21/1/2000.

Epstein, Debbie., Elwood, Jannette., Hey, Valerie., & Maw, Janet. (1998). Schoolboy frictions: Feminism and 'failing' boys. In Debbie Epstein, Jannette Elwood, Valerie Hey, & Janet Maw (Eds.), *Failing boys?: Issues in gender and achievement* (pp. 3-18). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Foster, Victoria. (1994). *"What about the boys!": Presumptive equality, and the obfuscation of concerns about theory, research policy, resources and curriculum in the education of girls and boys.* FostV94.309@www.swin.edu.au/aare

Francis, Becky. (1999). Lads, lasses and (new) labour: 14-16 year-old students' responses to the 'laddish behaviour and boys' underachievement' debate. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20 (3), 355-371.

Fullan, Michael. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* London: The Falmer Press.

Fyfe, Anna. (1998a, August 12). Boys cause for concern. *New Zealand Education Review*, p.2.

Fyfe, Anna. (1998b, August 12). It's different for boys. *New Zealand Education Review*, p.7.

Galbraith, Ann. (1998). *Violence...not in our school.* Hamilton: Leaders Press, University of Waikato.

Garner, Theresa. (1999a, August 30). Boys facing grim cost of lax lessons. *New Zealand Herald online.*
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/storydisplay.cfm?storyID=10929

Garner, Theresa. (1999b, August 31). Men courted for primary schools. *New Zealand Herald online.*
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/storydisplay.cfm?storyID=11016

Gender Canyon. (1999). *New Internationalist.* Aug.

www.oneworld.org/ni/issue315/gender.htm

Gerritson, John. (1998, February 11). Stuck record payoff. *New Zealand Education Review*, p.20.

Gerritson, John. (1999, June 14). A matter of gender. *New Zealand Education Gazette*, p.1 & p.4.

Gilbert, Jane. (1998). Gender equity statements in the New Zealand national curriculum documents: Their genealogy and likely effects. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education.* (pp. 97-118). Wellington: School of Education, Victoria University.

Grunwell, Rachel. (2000, April 2). Girls out at boys' school. *Sunday Star Times*, A5.

Hall, Valerie. (1997). Dusting off the phoenix: Gender and educational leadership revisited. *Educational Management and Administration*, 25 (3), 309-324

Hargreaves, Andy. (1997). Rethinking educational change: Going deeper and wider in the quest for success. In, Andy Hargreaves (Ed.), *Rethinking educational change with heart and mind* (pp. 1-26). ASCD Yearbook. Virginia: ASCD.

Hinds, Diana. (1999, December 2). The trouble with Harry. *New Zealand Education Review*, p. 9.

Hoodfar, Homa. (1997). Feminist anthropology and critical pedagogy: the anthropology of classrooms' excluded voices. In, Suzanne de Castell & Mary Bryson (Eds.), *Radical interventions: Identity, politics, and differences in educational praxis* (pp. 211-232). New York: State University of New York Press.

Jackson, David. (1998). Breaking out of the binary trap: Boys' underachievement, schooling and gender relations. In, Debbie Epstein, Jannette Elwood, Valerie Hey, & Janet Maw (Eds.), *Failing boys?: Issues in gender and achievement* (pp. 77-95). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Jones, Alison., & Jacka, Susan. (1995). Discourse of disadvantage: Girls' school achievement. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 30 (2), 165-175

Kealey, Martin J. (1984). Meat and veges: An ethnographic study of two Grammar school classes. *set,* number 2, Item 10.

Kenway, Jane & Fitzclarence, Lindsay. (1997). Masculinity, violence and schooling: challenging 'poisonous pedagogies'. *Gender and Education*, 9 (1), 117-133.

Kenway, Jane., & Willis, Sue. (1998). *Answering back: Girls, boys and feminism in schools.* London & New York: Routledge.

Kenway, Jane., & Willis, Sue., Blackmore, Jill., & Rennie, Leonie. (1994). Making 'Hope Practical' rather than 'Despair Convincing': Feminist post-structuralism, gender reform and educational change. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15 (2), pp. 187-210.

Kruse, Anne-Mette. (1992). "…We have learnt not just to sit back, twiddle our thumbs and let them take over." Single sex settings and the development of a pedagogy for girls and a pedagogy for boys in Danish schools. *Gender and Education*, 4 (1/2), 81-103.

Lambert, Linda. (1995). Constructing school change. In L. Lambert, D. Walker, D. Zimmerman, J.E. Cooper, M. Lambert, M.E. Gardner, P.J. Slack (Eds.), *The constructivist leader* (pp. 52-82). New York: Teachers' College Press.

Leithwood, Kenneth A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49 (5), 8-12.

Lewis, Ken. (1999, September 1). Cars and girls: Why boys fail. *New Zealand Herald. Online* http:www.nzherald.co.nzstorydisplay.cfm?storyID=533

Mac an Ghaill, Mairtin. (1994). *The making of men: masculinities, sexualities and schooling.* Buckingham; Philadelphia: Open University Press.

McGee Bailey, Susan, & Campbell, Patricia. (1999). *The gender wars in education.* www.campbell-kibler.com/Gender_Wars.htm

Martino, Wayne. (1999). 'Cool Boys', 'Party Animals', 'Squids' and 'Poofters': Interrogating the dynamics and politics of adolescent masculinities in school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20 (2), 239-263.

Middleton, Stuart. (1999, September 10). Gender tragedies. *New Zealand Education Review*, p. 16.

Ministry of Education. (1993). *The New Zealand curriculum framework: Te anga marautanga o Aotearoa.* Wellington: Ministry of Education/Learning Media.

Morgan, Christopher. (2000, June 18). A royal battle of wills. *Sunday Star Times*, p. C2.

Morris, John. (2000, January 21). Why some boys lag behind girls in school. *New Zealand Herald*, A13.

Parry, Odette. (1997) 'Schooling is fooling': Why do Jamaican boys underachieve in school? *Gender and Education*, 9 (2), 223-231.

Purdy, Kim. (2000, February 6). Goodbye boy zone. *Sunday Star-Times.* p. A10.

Roger, Warwick. (2000, January). John Graham: The man who set the standards. *North and South*, Issue 166, 48-57.

Rout, Bill. (1992). Being 'Staunch': Boys hassling girls. In Sue Middleton & Alison Jones (Eds.), *Women and education in Aotearoa* (pp. 169-180). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Rowe, Rebecca. (1999, September 10). The trouble with cars, work, girls and mates. *New Zealand Education Review*, p. 9.

Save the Children. (1999). www.savethechildren.org/worldsmothers/page05.htm

Skelton, A. (1993). On becoming a male physical education teacher: The informal culture of students and the construction of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender and Education*, 5 (3), 289-303.

Strachan, Jane. (1997). *Feminist educational leadership in a new right context in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Waikato.

Strachan, Jane. (1998). Feminist leadership: Leading for social justice. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 4, 27-34.

St Stephen's and girls school look to merger. (2000, May 22). *Waikato Times*, p. 8.

Stoll, Louisel, & Fink, Dean. (1994). School effectiveness and school improvement: voices from the field. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5 (2), 149-177.

Stoll, Louise., & Fink, Dean. (1996). *Changing our schools.* Buckingham Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Swann, Joan. (1998) Language and gender: Who, if anyone, is disadvantaged by what? In Debbie Epstein, Jannette Elwood, Valerie Hey, & Janet Maw (Eds.), *Failing boys?: Issues in gender and achievement* (pp. 147-161). Buckingham Philadelphia Open University Press

Vogel, Peter. (1999). *Boys' Education: Is equity enough?* www.righthemisphere.com.au/cm/aut96/boysed.htm

Watt, Lawrence. (1999, July 23). It's different for girls. *New Zealand Education Review.*, p. 14.

West, Peter. (1999). Boys' underachievement in school: Some persistent problems and some current research. *Issues in Educational Research*, 9 (1), 33-54. http://cleo.murdoch.edu.au/gen/iier/iier9/west.html

West-Burnham, John. (1997). Leadership for learning – re-engineering 'mindsets'. *School Leadership and Management*, 17 (2), 231-244.
Yates, Lyn. (1997). Gender equity and the boys debate: What sort of challenge is it? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18 (3), 337-347.
Zohrab, Peter. (1999). *What about us? – Boys in schools and men in society*. http://www.zohrab.org/boysnws1.html

---

[1] A news report focusing on Prince William's imminent eighteenth birthday, described his schooling and his achievements at GCSE, then said this about the subjects he was to sit for A levels: "The A levels that William is sitting – geography, biology and history of art – illustrate his non-academic bent" (Morgan, 2000, p. C2).

[2] It is worthwhile to consider the Epilogue to Strachan's (1998) article which focused on the social justice agenda of a feminist principal. This principal felt she had to deliberately keep "a lower public profile on 'at risk' issues to protect [the] school's enrolment numbers"(p.33). This illustrates a clear relationship between contesting the status quo and managing responses to perceived loss of privilege.