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ABSTRACT

Most, if not all, universities across Canada emphasize diversity, inclusivity, and equity in their missions, value statements, and institutional priorities. However, institutions of higher learning across Canada have yet to sufficiently challenge institutional discourse and culture in ways that truly move it and its members beyond *passively articulating* value for diversity to *actively demonstrating* commitments to inclusivity and equity. Universities struggle to achieve a range of educational equity goals across four domains: (a) improving access for historically underrepresented students, (b) fostering inclusive campus climates, (c) developing globally inclusive curricula, and (d) recruiting and retaining equity-seeking\(^1\) faculty and staff. Persistent challenges in implementing educational equity policy in Canadian academe suggest an imperative to critically examine whether and how the social, political, and economic forces of neoliberalism, as the prevailing ideology in Canada, complicate the educational equity policy process. In particular, I am interested in exploring whether and how the discourses of neoliberalism manifest in discursive practices of senior administrators and the implications for enacting change to achieve educational equity. The purpose of my research is fivefold: (1) to investigate the social, political, and cultural ideologies and discourses that dominate in the academy and influence the educational equity policymaking process; (2) to learn about the perspectives and practices of individual senior administrators in relation to educational equity; (3) to identify the thematic barriers and enablers to advancing educational equity, as perceived by senior administrators; (4) to identify discursive practices among senior administrators, in relation to educational equity; and (5) to consider the ways that senior administrators believe their social identities and positionalities influence their success advancing educational equity.

\(^1\) Equity-seeking groups in Canada: women, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal peoples and persons who are visible minorities.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background and Research Focus

In Canadian institutions of higher learning, there is a keen interest in equity and equity-related issues, such as diversity, accessibility, inclusivity and internationalization. This interest has been influenced by several factors, among which are three key drivers. One major driver is the dramatic demographic shift with both the influx and changing mix of immigrants coming to Canada (Policy Horizons Canada, 2013). As a result, Canadian universities are seeing an increasingly diversified body of students in post-secondary institutions and, consequently, an increasingly diverse pool of scholars and academics seeking to enter the professoriate and eventually be considered among institutional administrative ranks. Another factor is the globalization of markets and a global economy increasingly reliant on knowledge and innovation. Universities recognize the potential for knowledge and revenue generation, research innovation, competitive advantages, and reputational gains to be made with greater numbers of international students and scholars from select countries. Consequently, Canadian universities, urged by government incentives, are looking to attract record high numbers of undergraduate and graduate international students as well as to host exchange students and visiting scholars (Advisory Panel on Canada’s International Education Strategy, 2012). A third factor is the renewed emphasis on Aboriginal rights, equity, and opportunity in Canada. With growing employment and income disparity as well as dire poverty, preventable ill health and death among and within various Aboriginal communities reaching a critical point, the government has
committed to helping to reduce the education gap among Aboriginal peoples as a means to tackle the social, health, and economic plights of the nation’s first peoples (Kroes, 2009; Fong & Gulati, 2013; Friesen, 2013; Drummond, Giroux, Pigott, & Stephenson, 2012). These realities facing universities have resulted in widespread articulation of commitments to various aspects of equity across Canadian institutions of higher learning. However, despite interest in and commitment to equity, there continue to be considerable variations in whether and how institutions of higher learning define, understand and respond to equity and equity-related issues.

One of the greatest barriers to achieving educational equity, I contend, has been the lack of coherence and consistent usage of distinct but complementary terms and concepts related to equity. Often, equity and equity-related concepts are conflated and simplistically dubbed “diversity” issues. To more effectively commit to and implement educational equity programs and policies requires an understanding of the definition and scope of educational equity and the distinctiveness and complementarities of related concepts. Thus, it is important to define educational equity and related concepts early in this thesis to contextualize the use of the term “diversity” in the review of literature as well as to clarify the terminology that I use in my study. Definitions will be provided at the end of this introductory chapter after elaborating my research focus and problem as well as the purpose and importance of my study.

Statement of the Research Problem

In a Conference Board of Canada article on building diverse and inclusive organizations, Creary (2008) argues that “diversity” initiatives are doomed to fail if not seriously and systematically undertaken by senior administrators, as would be expected for any other change
management effort. She suggests that senior leaders within organizations must embrace three essential pillars – leadership, governance and accountability – and take several intentional actions in order to make progress on their diversity and inclusivity efforts.

Successfully integrating change into any organization takes leadership, governance, accountability, and an iterative process of continuous improvement. The change required to build diverse and inclusive organizations is no different. Without incorporating these core principles, a diversity initiative will likely fall short. (Creary, 2008, p. 8)

This focus on intentional leadership, governance and accountability to achieve organizational success in advancing equity and equity-related goals can be applied to institutions of higher learning. Senior administrators in academic environments have a pivotal role to play in managing the development and implementation of programs and policies to support the achievement of identified equity-related institution goals. Studies in the U.S. higher learning context suggest that, along with a strong institutional articulation of diversity priorities, core support from senior administrative leadership was among the most important factors in predicting institutional action in relation to achieving equity-related goals and priorities (Rowley, Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2002; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar & Arellano, 2012).

In a nationwide U.S. study, Rowley et al. (2002) examined the responses of Chief Academic Officers in four-year U.S. colleges and universities to a survey about institutional commitments to diversity initiatives. Specifically, they studied the extent to which higher educational institutions closely follow their mission statements, administrative rhetoric, and formal policies when it comes to diversity. They found that, as diversity within institutions has become almost universally accepted as an important goal, the majority of institutions do indeed articulate their commitment to diversity in their official mission statements and planning
documents. However, they also found that few institutions implement policies and programs to inform a diverse learning environment:

For more than four decades, institutions have engaged in efforts to increase the presence of racially and ethnically diverse student populations, enlarge the availability pools of trained graduate students who can assume the faculty ranks in academia, and implement curricular and co-curricular diversity initiatives...The essential question, however, is the extent to which institutional rhetoric on diversity is so common as to be rendered meaningless when weighed against the context of actual practice. (Rowley et al., 2002, p. 2)

Reflecting on the gap between institutional rhetoric on diversity and actual institutional practices supporting a variety of diversity and equity goals in the context of U.S. institutions of higher learning, Rowley et al. (2002) describe inconsistencies between what institutions say about diversity commitments on the one hand and what they do on the other:

Commitment to diversity in higher education is evident at rhetorical, policy, and programmatic levels within higher educational institutions. Most institutions articulate their support for the importance of diversity through a variety of formal means. These include organizational behaviours and characteristics such as rhetorical articulation of the commitment to diversity by university leaders, formal institutional mission statements, and institutional policies such as strategic planning documents or programmatic guidelines...However, periodic reviews of institutional data indicate uneven progress towards diversity goals, and sometimes stagnation in actual efforts to increase the presence of underrepresented minorities on campus. Efforts to desegregate higher education continue as institutions define more varied aspects of their commitments including, but not exclusively, the presence of a more diverse faculty and student body, transformation of the curriculum, and formal recognition of diversity achievements on campus. (p. 3)

There is no doubt that universities, through their administrators and administrative bodies, are signalling recognition of increasingly diverse learners and response to demands for inclusivity and equity in access to higher education, in the representation of teachers and educators, in the climate within the educational environment, and in the content of educational programs. At the same time, and perhaps as a response to increasing diversity and calls for
inclusivity and equity, neoliberalism has emerged and played an increasingly dominant role in influencing institutions of higher learning (Tudiver, 1999; Canaan & Shumar, 2008). The neoliberal ideology, its underpinnings and emergence will be discussed at length in Chapter Four. For now, I offer a quote from Abu-Laban and Gabriel (2002), which provides a succinct description of what they refer to as neoliberal ideals:

[R]ecent policy changes and debates in the interrelated policy domains of immigration, multiculturalism, and employment equity have been underpinned by a particular reading of globalization that stresses measures informed by neo-liberal ideals. Together, each of these policy areas was (and is) implicated in the funding, framing, and managing of Canadian ethnocultural and racial relations, as well as other forms of diversity – including those relating to class and gender. In the contemporary moment, the policies of immigration, employment equity, and multiculturalism are all being rewritten in new directions. Each new policy script epitomizes how “diversity” has been constructed – albeit in a number of shifting ways – in a manner that is often congruent with various neo-liberal ideals.

These neo-liberal ideals include the valuing of a smaller welfare state, whereby governments do less, and individuals, families, and volunteers undertake to do more in the area of social services. Neo-liberal ideals also stress the commodification of social goods (e.g., health care, education, and welfare services). In this process, Canadians are treated less as “citizens” and more as “individuals”, “clients”, or “customers”. Not least, neo-liberal ideals emphasize and privilege the “free” market, economic efficiency, and unfettered competition. Thus, neo-liberal ideals carry a new understanding of what is “public” and what is “private”. (p. 166)

The relationship between educational equity policy implementation and the intensification of neoliberalism is at the heart of my research. In this neoliberal environment, market-oriented principles and managerialism, focused on productivity and efficiency, are paramount (Tudiver, 1999; Turk, 2000; Davies, 2005; Ong, 2006; Lewis, 2008). It is posited that the ideological foundations of neoliberalism and its manifestation in the discourses and practices of administrators and administrative bodies in higher education are counterproductive to the goals of achieving educational equity (Blackmore, 2006, 2011; Canaan & Shumar, 2008). This argument raises the question of whether the ongoing challenges universities have faced in
actually achieving substantive and comprehensive change across all domains of educational equity may in fact be hindered by attitudes and behaviours increasingly influenced by ideologies and discourses of neoliberalism in the academy.

Turning to one example of a Canadian university where I have some experience working on diversity, inclusivity and equity initiatives, the Senate at Queen’s University approved a new academic plan in 2011, including the latest articulation of institutional value for and commitment to diversity, inclusivity and equity. The planning document expressed the following principles, among a list of several, to help guide academic program development as well as policy planning and implementation processes:

6. In admissions, hiring, education, research, and service, Queen’s must promote diversity, inclusivity, and equity.
9. Students are a heterogeneous group, and come to Queen’s with various aspirations, values, abilities, learning styles, different cultural and racial backgrounds, and needs. Planning for academic programs and the community environment must seek to understand and respect this diversity. (Queen’s Senate Task Force, 2011, p. 6)

In addition to recommending the academic planning process be guided by diversity, inclusivity and equity values and principles, the Queen’s Academic Plan (2011) identifies four foundational pillars to support the re-visioning of the academic mission. One of the core pillars is entitled “Reaching Beyond: Globalism, Diversity, and Inclusion at Queen’s” (p. 7). Coinciding with the launch of the new academic plan, 2011 was the year that Queen’s finalized revisions to its educational equity policy. In that new Senate-approved policy, educational equity was defined as encompassing a range of institutional goals across four domains referred in the policy as educational access, educational context and climate, educational content and practice, and educational capacity:
Educational Access: recruitment, retention and graduation of students who have historically been under-represented, underserved and/or disadvantaged in University programs

Educational Context and Climate: provision and maintenance of a supportive and welcoming educational and learning environment for all students, faculty and staff of all social identities.

Educational Content and Practice: promotion of education and training for students, faculty and staff on educational equity issues as they relate to curriculum, pedagogy and the broader learning environment.

Educational Capacity: increasing the institution's capacity for educational equity through recruitment, hiring and retention of faculty, staff and administrators. (Queen’s SEEC, 2011)

The new policy document represented the first substantive revision of the educational equity policy drafted and approved in 1996, following recommendations from a 1991 Principal’s Advisory Committee Report on Race Relations. The 1991 Report on Race Relations was commissioned after the discovery that several racialized\(^2\) and Aboriginal faculty members had exited the university citing experiences of both overt and systemic racism. After 15 years of what diversity and equity proponents at Queen’s believed was inadequate attention to educational equity at the institution, the renewed document was presented as a means to enhance the implementation of university-wide and department-specific educational equity policy objectives. Singh (2010) analyzed the process of implementation, monitoring and dissemination of the policy recommendations in the 1991 Principal’s Advisory Committee Report on Race Relations referenced above. Tracing practices in the more than twenty years since the adoption of the original educational equity policy, Singh uncovered barriers and inconsistencies in implementing policy objectives and presented findings that suggest an expectation that change in the areas of

\(^2\) Recognizing that race is a social construct, the Ontario Human Rights Commission describes people as “racialized” instead of more outdated and inaccurate terms such as “racial minorities”, “visible minorities”, “persons of colour” or “non-Whites”.
educational equity must be driven by the upper most levels of administration and governance.

She reported the following findings:

In creating a true anti-racist campus, all of the participants stressed that equity should be valued and considered of the utmost importance in the institution and should be embedding and respected in all facets of academia; and creating that tone should begin with the Principal and the administrative bodies over which he or she has control. (p. 105)

Queen’s continues to struggle to develop, implement and enforce both short and long-term educational equity policy objectives, and the university is not alone in facing this dilemma. Most, if not all, universities across Canada and the U.S. emphasize diversity, inclusivity and, sometimes, equity in their missions, value statements and institutional priorities. They are, nonetheless, challenged with developing and implementing comprehensive strategies, programs and policies to specifically identify and meet institutional educational equity goals. Despite lofty assertions to foster diversity, inclusivity, and equity, Canadian universities have yet to sufficiently challenge their institutional discourse and culture in such a way as to truly move it and its members beyond passively articulating value for diversity to actively demonstrating commitments to inclusivity and equity. Persisting challenges in implementing educational equity policy in the Canadian higher educational context suggest to me an imperative to critically examine the social, political and cultural factors complicating the educational equity policy process. In particular, I am interested in exploring the roles of senior administrators in perpetuating barriers to policy implementation or enabling change to achieve educational equity.

For the purpose of this study, educational equity is viewed as encompassing a range of institutional goals across following four policy domain: (a) improving access for historically underrepresented students, (b) fostering inclusive campus climates, (c) developing globally
inclusive curricula, and (d) recruiting and retaining equity-seeking\textsuperscript{3} faculty and staff. These four domains of educational equity raise the following questions. Who has access to higher education, learning and research programs? How are the learning, research and broader educational environments experienced by members of the campus community? Which professionals, academics and administrators are employed to serve, teach, educate, research, and lead in the community and how they are treated in their employment? What, where, and how does teaching and learning takes place? These questions are intrinsically related to the institutional conditions created by administrative policies.

There may be several indicators of ineffectual educational equity policy in higher education across each of the four domains. Now, I will briefly discuss four of many possible indicators of ineffectual educational equity policy across each of the domains referenced for the purpose of establishing the research problematic. The first indicator of potentially ineffectual educational equity policy is connected to the question of who has access to higher education, learning, and research programs. In this regard, the persistent and growing educational gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal learners in Canada is a case in point. The second indicator of possible ineffectual policy is linked to the question of how the learning, research, and broader educational environments are experienced by members of the campus community. An instructive example is the fact there are recurring reports of race-related incidents and experiences of overt and systemic racial discrimination on Canadian campuses. The third indicator is related to questions of which professionals, academics, and administrators are employed to serve, teach, educate, research, and lead in the community and how they are treated in their employment. The disproportionate number of female and particularly racialized female

\textsuperscript{3} In Canada there are four designated equity-seeking groups: women, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal peoples and persons who are visible minorities.
professionals, scholars, and senior administrators illustrates evidence of ineffectual policy in this area. The fourth indicator is associated with the question of what, where, and how teaching and learning take place. An example on policy ineffectiveness in this regard is inadequate attention to building intercultural competence on campus and developing globally inclusive curricula, which is also referred to as “internationalization at home” (Knight, 2004). Despite growing numbers of international students on most campuses, most institutional internationalization efforts tend to be outwardly focused on increasing study abroad opportunities for domestic students, as opposed to internationalization at home (Bond & Scott, 1999). While each of these indicators represents an individual instance of policy non-implementation, together they point to a larger problem: higher education institutions have generally been ineffectual in implementing wide-ranging educational equity policies to achieve broad and strategic institutional educational equity goals.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of my research is fivefold: (1) to investigate the social, political, and cultural ideologies and discourses that dominate in the academy and influence the educational equity policymaking process; (2) to learn about the perspectives and practices of individual senior administrators in relation to educational equity; (3) to identify the thematic barriers and enablers to advancing educational equity, as perceived by senior administrators; (4) to identify discursive practices among senior administrators, in relation to educational equity; and (5) to consider the ways that senior administrators believe their social identities and positionalities influence their ability to successfully advance educational equity. In other words, my study will seek to uncover the dominant ideologies and discourses driving Canadian university agendas and examine the
extent to which these affect the academic organizational culture, and specifically the political will and skill of senior leadership, to lead change in the area of educational equity. Thus, my research attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the ideological underpinnings of dominant discourses in academe and how do these discourses relate to educational equity policy implementation?
2. How might senior leader discourses and ideologies affect educational equity policy implementation?
3. What barriers and enablers are thought to influence educational equity policy implementation according to senior administrators?
4. How do senior administrators perceive and practice educational equity?
5. How do senior leaders think their own social identities and positionalities influence their perspectives and practices in relation to educational equity?

**Importance of the Research**

My research will address the seldom-studied subject of educational equity policy implementation from the perspective of a sample of senior administrators in Canadian academe. My work will contribute to a limited body of literature that examines how educational equity is conceptualized and understood by senior administrators in Canadian universities. Further, it will add to a relatively new line of inquiry attempting to understand how senior administrator imaginations of educational equity relate to their mobilization of educational equity policy. This link between imagination and mobilization is explored by examining discourses surrounding equity, processes of governmentality, and prevailing socio-political ideologies, which mediate
senior administrative attitudes and behaviours. Moreover, paying particular attention to the challenges universities may face recognizing and resolving raced and gendered implications of educational equity policy non-implementation, my research will contribute to a greater knowledge base from which to problem-solve and address educational equity issues that may have differentially negative impacts on campus community members who identify as racialized individuals and/or as women. Combining qualitative methods of critical discourse analysis as well as narrative inquiry, my research findings and analysis will culminate in a discussion of implications and recommendations for more effective educational equity policy-making and implementation in the 21st century Canadian university. The benefit to participants is the opportunity to consider educational equity policy issues as they relate to different institutional contexts and the opportunity to reflect on study findings to inform future perspectives and practices to better achieve desired educational equity goals.

**Definition of Terms**

Language use and interpretation is socially, culturally, politically and ideologically mediated. Carson, Pearson, Johnson, Mangat, Tupper and Warbutorn (2005) assert that denotations and connotations, the literal and socio-cultural meanings, of terms are contextual and ever evolving due to the “complex interplay of differences which are constructed in human meaning systems” (p. 166). That having been said, one can ask how language can be used strategically and ethically to frame and define issues, problems, and goals as well as how stakeholders understand and attribute meaning to terms and words associated with particular ideological or political perspectives. As there is difficulty understanding the meaning of and
distinctions between equity-related terms, definitions of key terms will now be provided, albeit in a brief and cursory manner. The terms described below are social identity, diversity, inclusivity, equity, educational equity, multiculturalism, multicultural education, anti-racism, anti-racist education, internationalization, and intercultural education. Although these terms have distinctly different meanings, they are often interchanged, misunderstood and misused. While these concepts can strengthen one another and together effect positive change towards educational equity, their confused usage can be mutually undermining and detrimental to achieving broader social, institutional, and educational equity goals. When the term equity-related is used in this paper, it is to mean one or more of the concepts described below.

**Social Identity, Diversity and Inclusivity**

Social identity theory differentiates between personal identity and *social identity*. Social identity relates to membership in social and cultural groupings based on such things as race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender and faith for example (Jones & McEwen, 2000). Social identity theory also proposes that social group identities that are “negatively valued by society are the most powerful, psychologically accessible, and are more salient, acting as social scripts” (Hurtado et al., 2012, p. 72; Hurtado, Gurin, & Peng, 1994).

*Diversity* is defined as “the condition of having or being composed of…different types of people (as people of different races or cultures) in a group or organization” (Merriam Webster Online, n.d.). In other words, cultural diversity is composed of differences among people along varied dimensions of social group identities. In addition to understanding the term in relation to social and cultural categories to which people belong or with which they self-identify, the
concept of diversity commonly connotes differential value, recognition, acceptance, and respect of individual differences. Sometimes, but not always, the term extends to imply the principles of inclusion and participation. Despite the fact that the definition of diversity includes a broad range of social and cultural dimensions, the term is most commonly used in Canada to refer to racial and ethnic identities and differences contrasted with a “White” identity, which is assumed to be the norm. Furthermore, the term diversity often conjures, for members of mainstream dominant social and cultural groups, notions of multi-, cross-, inter-, and intra-cultural peace and harmony. The way the term diversity is used to connote and conjure interpretations that are not technically defined by the term, is one instance of how language can take on new meaning with habitual social and cultural misconceptions and misinformation leading to the establishment of certain discourses. According to Chan (2005), “discourses are ‘patterns of interpretation’ (Fraser, 1989, p. 156) and meanings constituted through social and institutional relationships [and these] meanings occur through speech, thought, and other forms of communication” (p. 130). Chan goes on to say that “subjectivity and power relations are therefore implicated in discourses” (p. 130).

Institutions use the term inclusivity to describe a condition that is the outcome of policies or practices aimed at engaging the full diversity of members in their community. The use and placement of the terms diversity and inclusivity in university mission statements and various planning documents is strategic. Frequently, senior administrators deliberately choose these somewhat vague and broad terms to convey their institutional commitments to equity-related goals. Among the reasons for using these terms instead of specific and pointed equity language, may be related to a lack of differentiation between the terms, a preference for language that is perceived not to be confrontational, or a realization that diversity and inclusivity can be more
passively discussed as values whereas equity suggests an outcome that requires more active and interventionist commitments.

**Equity and Educational Equity**

The term *equity* means fairness and justice according to laws that stipulate groups should be free from violence, harassment, discrimination, exclusion, stigmatization, prejudice and bias based on protected human rights grounds for example. It is distinct from the notion of equality, which refers to equal treatment with respect to access to resources and opportunity for social and civic engagement regardless of social identity. A consortium of European countries involved in a study on equity in education agreed on the following definition of *educational equity*:

Educational equity refers to an educational and learning environment in which individuals can consider options and make choices *throughout their lives* based on their abilities and talents, not on the basis of stereotypes, biased expectations or discrimination. The achievement of educational equity enables females and males of all races and ethnic backgrounds to develop skills needed to be productive, empowered citizens. It opens economic and social opportunities regardless of gender, ethnicity, race or social status. (OECD, 2004, p. 8)

This definition is intended to be broad and to emphasize both equity in educational opportunities and equity in educational outcomes, thereby serving to “acknowledge existing inequities in access, participation, achievement and educational outcomes and creation of fair learning environment for all regardless of socio-economic background, place of residence, ethnic background, and gender” (p. 8). Thus, according to the study consortium, the term educational equity refers to an aspirational condition, which institutions of higher learning should continually
aim for, in order to redress the effects of historically unequal access to higher learning. The
promise of educational equity, they say, is to grant equal opportunity for learners to exercise
their right to pursue higher educational and to maximize their potential to develop knowledge
and skills necessary to benefit and contribute as citizens in society (OECD, 2004).

The definition is broad enough to include goals relating to student access of higher
education, which may be summarized as the recruitment, retention, and success of representative
proportions of historically underrepresented populations. It is also broad enough to include three
additional goals that equity proponents would argue are necessary for learners to fully realize the
benefits of higher education. These three additional goals are: the establishment of inclusive
campus environments, responsive to an increasingly diverse university community; the
incorporation of globally inclusive curricular content, relevant to an increasingly global
marketplace; and the attraction, engagement, and promotion of faculty and staff from designated
equity-seeking groups, representative of the diverse and international talent pool.

Post-secondary institutions are expected to effect educational equity through their
systems, structures and policies. Some of the hallmarks of educational equity policy in Canada
include employment equity policies targeting designated equity-seeking groups\(^4\), selective
recruitment of students from social groups that have suffered systemic discrimination,
pedagogical and curricular integration of equity-related issues, and, anti-discrimination policies
(Richer & Weir, 1995). An effective educational equity policy is one that not only addresses
explicit discrimination but also, more importantly, redresses implicit everyday discrimination
that becomes imbedded in the structures, systems, and social processes of the institution.

\(^4\) The Employment Equity Act and the Human Resources and Skills Development Canada Federal Contractors Program promote
working conditions that achieve equality in the workplace for the following four designated groups in Canada: women;
Aboriginal peoples; persons with disabilities; and members of visible (visibly racialized) minorities.
Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education

Multiculturalism as a state ideology and policy was launched in Canada in 1971. Mallea and Young (1984) recall that, at its inception, the legislation “won overwhelming support from the three major political parties” (p. 9). Mallea and Young, describing the goals set out by multiculturalism within a bilingual national framework, said, “It seeks to preserve basic human rights, increase citizen participation, develop Canadian identity, reinforce Canadian unity, encourage cultural diversity, and eliminate discrimination” (p. 9). Gupta (1999) rearticulated the four central tenets advanced by Mallea and Young, suggesting multiculturalism intended:

1. to assist all Canadians to develop culturally,
2. to assist all Canadians to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society,
3. to arrange cultural encounters to promote unity,
4. to assist immigrants to learn one of the two official languages. (Gupta, 1999, p. 191)

According to Mallea and Young, within a decade of the federal government adopting the new legislation, several provinces adopted provincial multiculturalism policies, interpreting and translating their “normative principles into educational practice” (p. 9). At the same time, and very soon after its emergence as an official Canadian government policy in 1971, multiculturalism was met with serious criticism, particularly with respect to its manifestation in the educational domain. Mansfield and Kehoe (1994), describe the approach to multicultural education:

Multicultural education has traditionally emphasized intergroup harmony (Lynch, 1992), educational underachievement (Banks & McGee-Banks, 1989), individual prejudice (Lynch, 1992), equality of opportunity (Banks & McGee-Banks, 1989), enrichment through celebration of diversity, and improving self-image through pride in cultural heritage (Fleras & Elliott, 1992). (p. 419)
Multiculturalism has been criticized for focusing on the cultural and linguistic principles as well as on attitudes toward discrimination rather than the systemic and structural barriers that perpetuate racism (Gupta, 1999). Gupta said, “Various multicultural policies have circumvented the issue of power relations. In practice, cultural and linguistic principles (principles 1, 3, and 4) have been emphasized. These principles focus on the attitudinal part of discrimination rather than on structural barriers” (p. 192). Critics continue to argue that multiculturalism, by presenting education as apolitical, reinforces the status quo rather than rallying social change. In this way, these critics say, multiculturalism and multicultural education mask systemic and structural issues, ignore power relations and dynamics, and reproduce social and economic inequities that contribute to differential access, experience and success across all levels of education.

**Anti-Racism and Anti-Racist Education**

Dei and Calliste (2000) discuss key areas of distinction between multiculturalism and *anti-racism* to clarify the ways that the terms may be conflated and used interchangeably when there are actually significant differences in meaning:

The Liberal claim for multiculturalism sees it as a cornerstone in nation building. It is an ideal of a democratic pluralistic society that recognizes a community and advocates empathy for minorities on the basis of a common humanity. It also envisions a future assured by goodwill, tolerance and understanding of diversity among all (Price, 1993). In other words, multiculturalism works with the notion of our basic humanness and downplays inequities of difference by accentuating shared commonalities. Anti-racism, on the other hand, views as suspect the whole nation-building enterprise as pursued by the dominant, together with the underlying assumptions of empathy, commonality and goodwill. Anti-racism shifts the talk away from tolerance of diversity to the pointed notion of difference and power. It sees race and racism as central to how we claim, occupy and defend spaces. The task of anti-racism is to identify, challenge and change values, structures and behaviours that perpetuate systemic racism and other forms of society oppression. (p. 21)
In the early 90s, Canadian critical race scholars and educators moved towards and embraced the model of *anti-racist education*. Mansfield and Kehoe (1994) differentiate anti-racist education approaches from multicultural education models:

The more recent anti-racist perspective emphasizes intergroup equity (Parker, 1992), educational disadvantage (Wright, 1987), institutional racism (Stanley, 1992), equality of outcome (Massey, 1991), unequal power relationships (Donald & Rattansi, 1992), and cultivating political agency through critical analysis (Massey, 1991). (p. 419)

Anti-racism is, therefore, a politicized ideology that acknowledges and confronts systemic social and economic inequities. Anti-racist education, it follows, is a politicized approach that seeks to redress structural inequities as they manifest in all aspects of education, including designing and delivering curriculum, managing educational organizations, and administering institutional policies and programs.

**Internationalization and Intercultural Education**

The term *international* refers to interconnected arrangements between two countries (Beerkens, 2003). *International education* is a concept that relates to the international content of curricula, the international movement of students and scholars to engage in learning and research, and institutional partnerships beyond national borders (de Wit, 2002). The term *internationalization*, in the context of higher education, suggests making something international. Knight (2004) defines internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension in the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 11). For example, diversifying the international content of the curriculum and classroom experience has been referred to as “internationalization at home”
(Knight, 2004). Bond and Scott (1999) describe the concept and process of internationalizing the curriculum as including the following elements:

- Infusing an international dimension throughout the curriculum;
- Using an interdisciplinary approach to explore a field of study;
- Emphasizing experiential and active learning;
- Integrating and coordinating with other international activities;
- Enriching readings with material that promotes comparative thinking;
- Broadening knowledge of at least one other country or culture (at home or abroad); and
- Encouraging self-reflection on our own culture and the way it influences our cognition (p. 65)

*Intercultural education* focuses on the study of foreign national states and global education, which focuses on the interrelationships among countries. Its goal is to develop, among students and teachers in an educational setting, cross-cultural attitudes, skills and competencies (J.M. Bennett, 1993) to more effectively engage across difference. Kymlicka (2003) describes the “intercultural citizen” as follows:

> [A]n intercultural citizen is someone who not only supports the principles of a multicultural state but also exhibits a range of more positive attitudes towards diversity. In particular, it is someone who is curious rather than fearful about other peoples and cultures; someone who is open to learning about other ways of life, and willing to consider how issues look from other people’s point of view, rather than assuming that their inherited way of life or perspective is superior; someone who feels comfortable interacting with people from other backgrounds. (p. 157)

Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003) “use the term intercultural sensitivity to refer to the ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences, and…use the term intercultural competence as the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (p. 422). Intercultural development theories and frameworks (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003; Hammer, 2009) for conceptualizing attitudes and mindsets that hinder more
culturally competent responses to difference and equity will be employed in my analysis of the narrative discourse collected in my research.

**Organization of Research**

Following this introductory chapter are nine chapters. The second chapter discusses the conceptual and theoretical frameworks underpinning my study. In that chapter I describe concepts of ideology, discourse, discursive and performative practices, cultural hegemony, and governmentality to contextualize a later discussion on the ideology and discourse of neoliberalism as a form of governmentality and cultural hegemony influencing institutions of higher education. This chapter also discusses my theoretical approaches and methodological choices, including critical race feminism, critical policy analysis, critical discourse analysis, and multi-level models of policy analysis. Chapter Three elaborates on existing literature supporting my conceptual, theoretical and methodological frames as well as scholarship related to my research topic. In this chapter, I provide evidence for my research problematic and make the case for the connection between neoliberal discourses and educational equity policy implementation challenges in the academy. In the fourth chapter, I describe my methodology in detail, from the research methods chosen, to the sampling process utilized, and data collection as well as analysis processes undertaken. Chapters Five to Nine are the substantive chapters discussing my findings. Chapter Five draws on secondary sources to elaborate the ideologies and discourses of neoliberalism in the broader public domain and the manifestations in the academy. The chapter traces the evolution of neoliberalism as the prevailing political ideology in Canada, describes how neoliberalism acts as a form of governmentality and cultural hegemony, and explores the
expression of neoliberalism in the academy and its implications for educational equity policy implementation. Particular attention is paid to the discourse of political correctness in this chapter. Chapter Six documents and discusses themes from Presidential installation speeches, as textual discourses to be examined for signs of neoliberal discourses. The chapter provides excerpts from speeches categorized, analyzed and interpreted under headings consistent with the four domains of educational equity: (a) improving access for historically underrepresented students, (b) fostering inclusive campus climates, (c) developing globally inclusive curricula, and (d) recruiting and retaining equity-seeking faculty and staff. The chapter also highlights potential discursive barriers and enablers to educational equity policy implementation as well discursive references to the identity of the administrator delivering the speech. Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine each document and discuss findings from narrative interviews with senior administrators. Chapter Seven focuses on analyzing and interpreting the findings related to the question of whether and how administrators perceive educational equity as a policy issues. Chapter Eight focuses on findings related to the question of the barriers and enablers to educational equity implementation from the perspective of senior administrators. Chapter Nine focuses on the question of whether and how senior administrator identities influence their perceptions, understanding, and actions concerning educational equity. The tenth and final chapter offers summative remarks about the study broadly and the findings specifically, discussing implications on educational equity policy implementation, recommending strategies for more efficacious achievement of educational equity, and suggesting possibilities for future research on the topic.
CHAPTER TWO
A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, I substantiate my research problematic, describe the literature supporting my conceptual frameworks and methodological choices, and discuss scholarship on which I draw and build my research. Some evidence of my research problematic is highlighted through two recent articles in *University Affairs*, a Canadian higher education publication. These articles are chosen because they quote senior administrators, among other institutional actors, who responded to interview questions about equity policies, procedures and practices in higher education. A substantive literature review follows, where I examine existing scholarship on or related to educational equity policy in higher education, including the work of Jill Blackmore, Francis Henry and Carol Tator, Sara Ahmed, Enakshi Dua, Audrey Kobayashi, and Adrienne Chan. My research draws from and builds on the work of these scholars who have contributed significantly to generating conceptual and theoretical knowledge on equity-related issues in the academy. These scholars have studied educational equity from various perspectives and using various approaches.

The work of Blackmore (2006; 2010; 2011), Henry and Tator (1995; 2002; 2007; 2009; 2010), and Ahmed (2006) has helped me to establish the context for my research and has provided frameworks for discussing and interpreting my findings. Respectively, these scholars develop and discuss concepts related to the implications of neoliberal discourses of diversity on equity policy implementation, the manifestation of discursive barriers and effects on equity
policy implementation, and the relationship between anti-racism and educational equity policy performativity. I employ and elaborate these concepts in my research, drawing from and building on the scholarship of Dua (1999; 2009) and her colleagues (Dua & Lawrence, 2000; Dua & Bhanji, 2012; Dua, Razack & Warner, 2005), from Kobayashi (1999; 2006; 2009), and from Chan (2005; 2007). These scholars offer the foundation on which I build my study of educational equity policy implementation in higher education as they explore and examine different aspects of educational equity policy and practice in the academy, employing slightly different methodologies to study a range of related subjects. These scholars have studied the following topics related to my research: anti-racism and anti-racist policies in Canadian academe (Dua, 1999, 2009; Dua & Lawrence, 2000; Dua & Bhanji, 2012; Dua, Razack, & Warner, 2005), systemic discrimination experienced by racialized faculty and the individual emotional manifestations of discourse on race and racism in the classroom (Kobayashi, 1999, 2006, 2009), and diversity discourse and power relations in the equity policymaking process (Chan 2005; 2007). I discuss each of the scholars’ works and relate these to the key concepts and theoretical underpinnings of my research methodology as well as the formulation of my research problematic, questions, and focus.

Before elaborating on extant literature and relevant scholarship, I will now provide some additional focus on my research interests. Specifically, I am interested in understanding the raced and gendered aspects of and implications for educational equity. There are three reasons for my interest in the race and gender dimensions of educational equity and the policy implementation process. The first reason relates to the reality of enduring reports in the media of race-related incidents and their consequent effects on campus climates that have continued throughout the past two and a half decades since I was an undergraduate student. The second reason relates to
the disproportionate representation of racialized women administrators in the academy. The third reason, a combination of the first and second reasons, relates to my lived experience as a racialized woman who experienced the effects of gender and race discrimination in the academy as a student over two and a half decades ago and, now, as a racialized woman currently navigating a raced and gendered academy in my administrative role. I will now turn to discussing, in more detail, the first two reasons for my interest in the race and gender dimensions of educational equity, framing the issues as possible symptoms of educational equity policy non-implementation. The third reason for my interest in the race and gender dimensions is elaborated in Chapter Three.

**Race and Gender Dimensions of Educational Equity**

Notwithstanding the complex integrative and intersectional nature of social identities, including race, gender, class, sexual orientation, disability, and so forth, I am particularly interested in exploring the raced and gendered dimensions of educational equity policy implementation challenges. The concept of intersectionality emerged to describe the ways that race, gender and class, three aspects of social identity and social relations, are distinct from and connected to one another. The term attempted to capture the “moment of social experience” created by the combination of “ideological practices of difference and power”, which arise from each of these aspects of social identity (Bannerji, 2005, p. 144). While I agree that social relations and power dynamics across multiple social identities cannot in reality be disaggregated from the lived experience, I do want to pay particular attention to the ways that educational equity discourses and policy implementation processes are raced and gendered in higher
Dumas and Anyon (2006) explore the dynamics and challenges of education policy implementation and transformation, particularly where class and race are central to the policy issue. Their work underscores the influence of ideological, political, and economic challenges hindering the implementation of education policies related to social justice goals in the academy. Dumas and Anyon depict the academic terrain as a “battlefield” (2006, p. 150) across which educational equity policy makers must navigate. As mentioned, there are three related reasons that I am interested in understanding the raced and gendered aspects of my research project. I will discuss the first two reasons for my interest in the raced and gendered aspects of educational equity policy implementation, under the headings of the race relations and climate for educational equity and the status of racialized women administrators. Under each heading, I will show evidence of potential challenges with educational equity policy implementation. The third reason, a composite of the first two reasons, is related to my identity and positionality, which I discuss in Chapter Three along with an elaboration of my conceptual framework.

**Race Relations and the Consequent Climate for Educational Equity**

Race-related barriers to educational equity are particularly salient in predominantly White and Eurocentric institutions of higher education, a profile which most, if not all, Canadian university fit. Within the last 10 years, frequent reports of overt and systemic racism at Canadian institutions have piqued the attention of the public. In response to incidents of racism across Canadian campuses, many universities have undertaken to establish task forces to investigate and report on allegations of systemic racism as well as to recommend initiatives to ameliorate institutional race relations. When they occur, overt acts of individual racism on Canadian
campuses trigger questions about whether these incidents are symptomatic of the broader insidious underlying problem of unchallenged systemic or institutional racism. Critical race activists and scholars leading and authoring these various institutional race relations reviews contend that inadequate attention to systemic racism, through educational equity policy implementation, has contributed not only to perpetuating implicit racial inequities within the academy, but also to creating a climate that has a powerful potential to enable the expression of overt racism (Dua, 1999, 2009; Henry & Tator, 2007, 2009; Kobayashi, 2006, 2009).

The concept of systemic or institutional racism describes the social processes that produce racial inequality through the differential distribution of social, economic, and political power to people. These processes involve, often invisible, institutional practices, policies and procedures, which perpetuate attitudes, practices and systems of discrimination and inequality.

Racial discrimination operates at several levels, including individual, systemic or institutional and societal. [It] can occur through stereotyping and overt prejudice or in more subconscious, subtle and subversive ways. Racial discrimination also occurs in significant measure on a systemic or institutional level. Policies, practices, decision-making processes and organizational culture can create or perpetuate a position of relative disadvantage for racialized persons. Organizations have a responsibility to take proactive steps to ensure that they are not engaging in, condoning or allowing racial discrimination or harassment to occur. Obligations in this regard range from collecting numerical data in appropriate circumstances, accounting for historical disadvantage, reviewing policies, practices and decision-making processes for adverse impact and having in place and enforcing anti-discrimination and anti-harassment policies and educational programs, to name just a few. (OHRC, 2009, p. 6)

The climate on campuses with regard to race relations and racism may hint at broader institutional challenges in advancing educational equity policies and ameliorating systemic racial and other inequities. An example of a systemic inequity that persists in Canadian academia is the postponement or obstruction of the recruitment, retention and promotion of racialized women to
senior administrative ranks. This reality, which I will now describe, could represent one important manifestation of the failure of educational equity policy implementation.

**Status of Racialized Women Administrators in the Academy**

While the status of all women administrators in higher education has not approached gender parity with all men administrators, the representation of racialized women among the most senior administrative ranks of North American universities is particularly troubling. Let me start by providing a context to the status of women in Canadian society followed by the reality in Canadian institutions of higher education. In 1970, the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women resulted in the establishment of a government office to “promote equality for women and their full participation in the economic, social and democratic life of Canada” (Status of Women, 2013) through the coordination of policy and administration of programs relating to the status of women. Other organizations such as the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW) emerged during this period to foster feminist research with the goal of advancing social justice and “equality for all women” (n.d.), guided by the fundamental principle “to respect and embrace the diversity of Canadian women – their realities, histories, and experiences” (n.d.). Both the Status of Women and CRIAW exist today and it is notable that their mandates continue to be relevant, especially in the higher education sector. Since it was founded in 1976, CRIAW has achieved many successes in support of its stated objectives to (a) encourage feminist research, (b) evaluate public policy, and (c) educate public and private sectors. Over the years, CRIAW has proven its ability to be successful in the following areas:
• bridging the work of feminist academics and community researchers/activists,
• developing ground-breaking analysis such as intersectional feminists frameworks,
• drawing meaningful attention to the issues that impact racialized, immigrant, Northern and First Nations women, lesbian women, and women with disabilities, and
• fostering global connections while emerging as a leader in critical discussion/exploration of “global feminisms” (CRIAW, n.d.)

A decade ago, Dianne Common, former Vice-President Academic and Provost at the University of Fraser Valley in British Columbia wrote:

Canada’s universities have come a long way in the three decades since Pauline Jewett was appointed president at Simon Fraser University. Until recently, the trends indicated that there were more and more women in senior university administration. After all of the struggle, it is frightening to embrace a new reality. (Common, 2002, p. 43)

To describe this new reality, Common referenced remarks made by Sheila O’Brien, then Senior Vice-President of Human Resources and Public Affairs at NOVA Corporation in Canada, at a 1997 conference entitled Maximizing Women’s Talent: Organizational Strategies for Success. O’Brien discussed the phenomenon of women entering the “pipeline” towards senior corporate positions in droves but then leaving rather than ascending to fill these roles (Common, 2002). Common went on to say, “From the recent experiences of executive search consultants for Canada’s institutions of higher education, the situation is repeated in our universities and colleges” (Common, 2002, pp. 43 - 44). She urged reflection on this situation and investigation into the role of “emotional culture” (p. 35), established by norms, values, language, and patterns of individual and collective behaviour, which has been shaped by men and survived by women.

The Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), of which 41 Canadian institutions are members, has, since 1998, collected, maintained and compared gender disaggregated statistical records of the senior academic and administrative staff among its membership of nearly 500 universities. This research was initiated, and is conducted every five
years, in recognition of the dearth of published, comparative data about the status of women in positions of management and leadership in the higher education sector in the Commonwealth. Data was collected in various categories of senior management, including Executive Heads (Vice-Chancellors, Presidents, Rectors), Heads of Administration (Registrars/Secretaries), Senior Management Teams (Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Deputy Presidents, Vice-Rectors, Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Pro-Rectors, Vice-Presidents), Deans, Finance Officers/Bursars, and Chief Librarians. In its 2008 publication, appropriately titled *Whispers of Change*, the ACU reported that “levels from which they can be expected to influence the participation and contribution of women at senior levels within their own institutions” (Singh, 2008, p. 11) remained relatively unchanged, with only marginal improvements since 1997 and 2000. The author reports, “Men still very much dominate the top management posts in these institutions” (p. 12).

While there is a growing, yet still limited, body of literature on the experiences and impacts of women in senior administrative positions in higher education in North America, there is a relative dearth of research and literature on the intersecting and entwined construction of race and gender in the academy. Racism and racialization represent additional hazards further complicating the already menacing gendered terrain across which racialized women, who aspire to and hold senior administrative positions in universities, must navigate and traverse. Such examinations may shed light on whether and how existing systems, enabling overt expressions of racism, may also be subtly or overtly obstructing the equitable recruitment and promotion of prospective racialized women administrators. Cole (2005) critiqued the academic milieu in North America by referring to the “3 W’s of higher education”: White, Western and Womanless environments. This dearth of racialized women administrators is, in part, related to systemic inequities that get borne out in recruitment, retention and promotion policies, procedures and
practices. Dua (2009), who interviewed human rights or equity officers at Canadian universities, found rights policies have only a limited effect in addressing racism. Thirteen of 14 officers interviewed said the most powerful barrier to implementing policies was the unwillingness of senior administrators to address systemic and structural racism in their universities. Dua (2009) argued that, in the context of higher education, the notion of leadership is indeed understood and represented through discourses that marginalize and exclude racialized women based on social constructions of identity and the differential distribution of power across these social constructs.

There is no shortage of literature on the topic of the differential experiences of and outcomes for racialized women academics in higher education. Studies continue to demonstrate how the academic climate still has a chilling effect on women seeking to progress through the ranks of the professoriate as well as to senior administrative positions in the academy. However, there are relatively few Canadian research projects that endeavour to explore the experiences of racialized women leaders in these academic environments. Indeed, much of the research conducted on the intersecting raced and gendered dimensions of educational equity in Canadian higher education has focused on examining and interrogating the barriers and challenges that exist in the academy and the related experiences of students and faculty (Dua, 2009; Kobayashi, 2009; Samuel, 2005; White, 2008). The university is a domain where ongoing barriers facing racialized women hinder their pursuit of both tenured academic and senior administrative careers in higher education. Within this highly raced and gendered environment, where there exists both implicit and explicit racism and sexism, I would argue that racialized women scholars and professionals face considerable barriers to advancing to a senior role in the university. To complement the growing literature on the subjects of the existence and manifestation of raced and gendered inequities in the academy, I argue there is a need to explore whether and how the
perspectives and roles of senior academic administrators factor into the advancement/progression or postponement/obstruction of educational equity. My research may shed some additional light on the implications of senior administrative policy decisions on the continued marginalization, if not exclusion, of racialized women from the professoriate and administrative ranks in the academy.

**Problematising Educational Equity Policy Implementation**

Across Canadian universities, the four educational equity goals have not consistently been understood or signalled as particular problems. Where an institution has identified one or more of the four related goals as an issue for the institution, the way and for whom those goals should be applied is also not uniformly understood or accepted. Two recent *University Affairs* articles published in 2009 and 2010 highlight the problem as it relates to race and racism in the academy by sharing perspectives and experiences of interviewed faculty members, department heads and senior administrators interested in advancing educational equity in their respective institutions. In one article, *Universities not facing up to race issues* (Drolet, 2009), the author reported on a panel discussion led by anti-racism scholars gathered at a March 2009 workshop in Ottawa as part of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences annual general assembly. The author wrote that panel participants, Carol Tator, Dolana Mogadime and Joanne St. Lewis, asserted, “too many White academics and university administrators just ‘don’t get it’ when it come to racism and race issues” (Drolet, 2009). Carol Tator was quoted as going further to state, “while many Canadian universities have equal-rights policies and vision statements about racial equity…they don’t follow up with action” (Drolet, 2009).
The lived-experience of one racialized female faculty member was presented in the Drolet article. The faculty member was quoted as saying, “University administrators, when challenged on why more visible minority academics are not hired, frequently cite the lack of acceptable candidates. But that…is because they are not looking in the right places” (Drolet, 2009). This faculty member shared the story of challenging the university by asking whether she could present her own pool of racialized candidates for hiring consideration when five positions opened up at her institution. She created the pool by contacting people in her own networks and asking them to give her the names of their most promising students. She followed up by speaking to professors who were influential in the department, and making sure they attended hiring meetings. The result, as she reported it, was that the university filled all five positions from her pool of racialized candidates. In this instructive case, the issue was the recruitment of racialized scholars into a department where non-racialized faculty argued adamantly there was not a sufficiently qualified pool of racialized candidates. This example underscores the individual and systemic forces acting against racialized scholars and professionals. The solution offered in this case was to engage in active outreach using creative methods to reach a greater diversity of potentially qualified candidates, including advertising in non-traditional places, using personal contacts, reimagining job descriptions, and so forth. The positive outcome underscores the need to interrupt and dismantle the individual attitudes and behaviours as well as the systemic institutional discourses and structures that perpetuate inequities faced by racialized female scholars and professionals in the academy.

In the second article, *Racism in the academy* (Eisenkraft, 2010), the author reported on interviews with individuals from various institutions, including the University of Alberta, University of British Columbia, University of Guelph, Queen’s University, Ryerson University,
University of Saskatchewan, and the University of Toronto. Interviews with these individuals uncovered the observation that racism continues to exist in the academy; racism was reported to be experienced in hiring and promotion procedures, governance systems, research processes, and curriculum design and delivery. Furthermore, interviewees commenting on efforts to combat racism suggested, from their experience, that having highly educated and committed people is a necessary but insufficient condition to guaranteeing non-discrimination. As well, in a highly decentralized university setting, these interviewees suggested that the advancement of educational equity could only be enabled with both senior administrative leadership and departmental champions. Interviewees remarked that the tendency for administrators to be tentative or cautious could have the effect of perpetually delaying action, reinforcing conservatism and the status quo. These respondents believed that progress on educational equity was essential in order to characterize any institution and its activities as excellent or meritorious. This progress, it is suggested, may be expedited by moving from a focus on awareness raising and training interventions to an emphasis on policies, procedures, and practices. The following are some of the comments of these interviewees (Drolet, 2009; Eisenkraft, 2010):

“Excellence in the academic setting requires equity and diversity.” ~ Tom Patch, Associate Vice-President Equity, University of British Columbia

“…attention to issues affecting racialized scholars and scholarship remains ‘perpetually deferred’ in Canada. After the issue of merit, ‘the intangibles of fit’ always surface. Will I feel comfortable with this person?” ~ Melinda Smith, Professor, Political Science, University of Alberta and Vice-President of Equity, Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences

“…structural racism may occur in hiring, promotion, governance or research and curriculum, or it may sustain a biased status quo on campus.” ~ Peter Li, Professor, Sociology, University of Saskatchewan
“…backlash to such reports makes administrators ‘careful’ [and one of the effects] is to prevent progressive people from acting progressively.” ~ Audrey Kobayashi, Professor, Geography and Research Chair of Racism and Equity, Queen’s University

“people running [universities] are highly educated and express a commitment to equity, but that doesn’t guarantee non-discriminatory hiring practices.” ~ Jeffrey Reitz, Professor, Sociology and Director of Ethnic, Immigration and Pluralism Studies, University of Toronto

“The topic of representation always leads to a discussion of merit. There is plenty of evidence that excellence and equity are compatible.” ~ Grace-Edward Galabuzi, Professor, Politics and Policy Administration, Ryerson University

“From department chairs on up, those administrators who fail to make progress on diversity are themselves ‘not meritorious’”. ~ Constance Backhouse, Professor, Law, University of Ottawa

“[Senior Administrative] leadership in the matter is ‘essential but not sufficient at a decentralized university’ [as] all levels must sign on.” ~ Sheldon Levy, President, Ryerson University

“Shifting from an emphasis on diversity or awareness training, which has its limitations, to the policy, procedural and practice levels to win the minds and hearts of people.” ~ Patrick Case, Director of the Equity and Human Rights Office, University of Guelph

Neoliberal Discourses of Diversity and Race Relations in Canada

In the context of Western democracies, Blackmore (2006) analyses the socio-political evolution of a diversity discourse, which emerged during the 1990s among neoliberal managerial discourses that accentuate self-interest. Against a neoliberal backdrop, Blackmore argues that “notions of diversity, while originating in collective demands of social movements of feminism, anti-racism and multiculturalism of the 1970s and 1980s, have in recent times privileged learning and leadership as an individual accomplishment and not a collective practice” (2006, p. 181). According to Blackmore (2006), a new dominant and normative discourse of diversity has replaced discourses of equal opportunity across sectors, including the educational
sector. She explains that recent discourses compel the educational community to respond to
diversity within their learner populations and suggest society should “expect greater diversity in
political, educational and business leadership” (p. 181). While this recent discourse purportedly
advocates for discrimination-free and socially just school systems that promote the benefits of
possessing knowledge, skills, and understanding to contribute to and benefit from the diversity
within the community and globally (2006), Blackmore interrogates the discourse’s outwardly
enlightened position on diversity:

Despite this seemingly progressive stance, the discourse of diversity during the 1990s, I
suggest, has been mobilized and operationalized in educational policy and practice within
market and managerialist frames that tend to limit the possibilities of delivering its
promise of more inclusive and equitable schooling. (Blackmore, 2006, p. 183)

Blackmore (2006) discusses how diversity is currently viewed within the Office of Training and
Further Education (OTFE) in her home of Victoria, Australia and contrasts this view with
emergent perspectives in the United States and the United Kingdom. She quotes the OTFE in
explaining the new discourse of diversity in education:

In most educational policy, diversity is now construed to be a positive force in education
work. The Victorian Office of Training and Further Education (OTFE, 1998:11-12)
states: Human diversity is a ‘source of societal resilience and educational vitality…a
compelling educational priority, important to every campus, every learner and the wider
society’; it is a ‘dimension of educational mission, community, curricular quality and
service to the larger society’. An organization ‘managing diversity through best practice’
was one ‘characterised by the presence of representatives from a rich variety of different
cultures, backgrounds and perspectives’, with a ‘genuine commitment towards
representation’, and an environment with a ‘respect for differences while fostering a
caring relationship, cross cultural understanding and common educational commitments’
(1998:13). ‘Managing diversity’ was about ‘negotiating the multiple interfaces of local
diversity, pluralistic citizenships and global connectedness’ (1998:14). Leaders were
expected to balance the tension between a respect for difference while developing and
nurturing shared organizational goals. (Blackmore, 2006, p. 183)
Blackmore (2006) queries how discourses of diversity interplay with and against neoliberal discourses. She concludes that, in most Anglophone nation states, earlier transformational discourses based on reducing inequality and discrimination have recently been overtaken by discourses that use language such as managing diversity and capitalizing on diversity, which she says originate from broader economic and free-market movements.

Transformative discourses of diversity emerged out of global social movements such as the civil rights movement and second-wave feminism and they acknowledge institutional racism and sexism, for example, embedded in organizations and in society. Where the redistribution of organizational and institutional power is a precondition of the transformative standpoint, the managing diversity standpoint does not acknowledge power differences in society and institutions:

One is the discourse of ‘capitalizing on diversity’, the ‘corporate discourse’ originating in business largely mobilized in mission and strategic statements as exemplified in the OTFE policies (Cope and Kalantzis, 1997). This discourse focuses on improving service delivery by meeting the individual needs of clients, appropriating cultural and linguistic diversity to gain new markets as a response to the globalizing of the market place with new flows of transnational migration, the growth of multinational companies seeking new global markets, and a shift in USA, UK, Australia, Canada and New Zealand from manufacturing to service economies. Greater workplace and client diversity means an increased reliance of person-to-person contact for productivity. (Blackmore, 2006, p. 184)

Blackmore (2006) contrasts anti-discrimination and affirmative action (educational equity in the Canadian context) policies with managing diversity discourse and its associated policies. She highlights that anti-discrimination and equity policies acknowledge and work to rectify structural and systemic disadvantages within an organization, whereas managing diversity policies focus on recruiting culturally diverse employees to shift individual values, beliefs and ideologies to benefit the organization. Blackmore (2006) studies the political ideological drivers of diversity
discourse in higher education, which, she posits, must be acknowledged and countered in order to advance equity goals in the academy. She suggests the managing diversity discourse in higher education was introduced with educational restructuring “informed by new managerialism and market notions of choice, competition and contractualism” (p. 86). Blackmore describes the new relationship between governments and higher education institutions in this new social, political and economic environment:

Governments sought to steer self-managing schools from a distance through funding based on enrolments; and a market focus that sought comparable national and international performances as measured by standardised educational outcomes. Furthermore, the discourse of diversity has also been mobilized within the policy context of the ‘internationalization of education’. Western education is now seen as a commodity to be sold to non-domestic (non-Western) students and states. Internationalization is underpinned by a weaker post-colonial discourse regarding the mutual benefits of cultural exchange (Matthews, 2001). Diversity is therefore a new source of commodification of education, of education capitalism promoting the expansion or multiplicity of educational providers, particularly in the private sector with outsourcing, and competition within and between public and private sectors. (p. 186)

According to Blackmore (2006), the conditions necessary to advance educational equity include the political will of governing bodies, self-reflection from leaders, mobilization of resources, and strong policies. She asserts transformative diversity leadership is “premised upon the four principles of recognition, redistribution, participation and agency” (p. 194). Respectively, these principles refer to aiming for representation of diversity in the profile of an institution, allocating resources to equity initiatives, creating inclusive policies, practices and pedagogies, as well as involving marginalized populations in decision-making. She argues diversity must be “framed by principles of social justice...to work within/through/against education markets and managerial accountabilities” (p. 196).
Neoliberal Discursive Barriers to Anti-Racism and Educational Equity

Henry and Tator are anti-racist theorists and practitioners who have, for over two decades, studied discourse surrounding race and racism in Canada. Most recently they have engaged with critical discourse analysis “to explore how forms of the ‘new racism’ are produced, reproduced, and transmitted through everyday discourses and representations in the daily news media and other dominant discourses” (Henry & Tator, 2007, p. 117). In a review and analysis of the literature on racism in the Canadian university, Henry and Tator (2010) reveal what they refer to as the all-encompassing existence and evolving forms of everyday, cultural, systemic, institutional, democratic, discursive, and epistemological racism. They assert the need for critique and change of the hegemony of White culture in the academy. The authors uncover various manifestations of racism in the academic discourse through powerful personal accounts as well as quantitative evidence. They identify and describe several discursive barriers through which resistance to change is expressed in higher educational setting, thereby hindering policy implementation.

Henry and Tator (2010) elaborate on the definition of democratic racism and the manifestations of discourses of democratic racism. As with any ideology, they say democratic racism is reflected in and expressed through structures, systems, and institutions. They also say individuals are responsible for developing and implementing the policies and procedures, which formulate and regulate these structures, systems, and institutions.

Democratic racism is an ideology in which two conflicting sets of values are made congruent to each other. Commitments to democratic principles such as justice, equality, and fairness conflict but coexist with attitudes and behaviours that include negative feelings about minority groups, differential treatment, and discrimination against them. One of the consequences of the conflict is a lack of support for policies and practices that
might ameliorate the low status of racialized people. These policies and practices tend to require changes in the existing social, economic, and political order, usually by state intervention. The intervention, however, is perceived to be in conflict with and a threat to liberal democracy. Thus, democratic racism holds that the spread of racism should only be dealt with – if at all – by leaving basic economic structures and societal relations essentially unchanged (Gilroy, 1987). Efforts to combat racism that require intervention to change the cultural, social, economic, and political order will lack political support. More importantly, they will lack legitimacy, according to the egalitarian principles of liberal democracy. (Henry and Tator, 2010, p. 9)

While resistance to change and resistance to advancing equity goals, can be expressed actively and openly, oftentimes resistance manifests in subtle forms articulated through discourse (Henry and Tator, 2010). Expanding on how democratic racism is manifested, Henry and Tator identify and explain 10 discourses of democratic racism in educational settings. These discourses are characterized as discursive barriers to anti-racism and educational equity efforts in the academy, and many of the discourses arise from or are perpetuated by neoliberal ideologies. Although Henry and Tator explore these barriers in the context of race, racism and (ethno)cultural hegemony, the same discourses act as discursive barriers to achieving equity goals generally.

As mentioned in previous chapters, using a critical race feminist framework, educational equity policies will necessarily be seen as anti-racist initiatives. The 10 discursive barriers described below represent “myths, explanations, codes of meaning, and rationalizations that have the effect of establishing, sustaining, and reinforcing” (Henry & Tator, 2010, p. 11) a dominant discourse in relation to anti-racism and equity in higher education. The framework for conceptualizing discursive barriers to equity in educational settings will be applied in my research to examine equity-related discourses articulated through personal interview narratives, political speech acts, and public social scripts. The discursive barrier framework will also help to uncover the ways in which dominant discourses may influence the educational equity policy implementation process. Among the 10 discursive barriers are various mindsets, arguments and
strategies used to stall educational equity progress, including discourses of denial, colour-blindness, equal opportunity, de-contextualization, blaming the victim, binary polarization, balkanization, tolerance, tradition, and political correctness.

Henry and Tator describe the *Discourse of Denial* as implicitly contained in all other discursive barriers. The discourse is “expressed as a wilful or negligent lack of recognition that difference, and therefore, challenges and opportunities associated with working across difference, exist” (2010, p. 225). The assumption underpinning this discourse is that difference and, therefore, inequities do not exist. Motivating this denial is disinterest, ignorance, and/or avoidance, often associated with a sense of personal threat to one’s own values, beliefs, and, in fact, identity (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009). The Discourse of Denial described by Henry and Tator is aligned with the description of the Denial attitude and mindset offered by M.J. Bennett (1993) and Hammer (2009). Almost three decades ago, M.J. Bennett (1993) advanced the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), a research-based theoretical framework and tool to describe individual intercultural competence along a continuum of intercultural developmental orientations that describe various ethnocentric and ethnorelative mindsets. Hammer (2009) built on the theory behind the DMIS and advanced a modified intercultural development model with an accompanying Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to assess individual intercultural competence along the intercultural developmental continuum. The descriptions of the affective, cognitive and behavioural manifestations of the intercultural orientations on the continuum are very useful in examining and understanding how individuals might interpret and act when they encounter difference or are faced with equity-related challenges in educational settings. M.J. Bennett and Hammer converge on the three most ethnocentric orientations – denial, polarization/defense and minimization mindsets – which, for
the purposes of my research, are particularly useful in identifying barriers to educational equity that manifest in individual attitudes and speech acts.

The most ethnocentric orientation is denial of difference. The mindset underpinning the denial orientation produces the kinds of discourses of denial described by Henry and Tator. This orientation manifests as ignorance about the existence of cultural difference as well as superficial statements of tolerance. According to M.J. Bennett (1993), denial is in essence a state of unawareness, or very superficial awareness, regarding difference. Individual in denial cognitively do not, or will not, recognize difference. M.J. Bennett goes further to say this state manifests affectively as indifference to difference, if you will. Hammer (2009) takes this a step further and says the state of denial about difference expresses itself behaviourally as disinterest and avoidance, fuelled by a fear of the cultural “other”. If and when individuals come to cognitively recognize difference exists and choose to confront it, coming out of a state of denial, they cognitively shift to a state of either polarization/defense or minimization.

According to intercultural development theory, the next most ethnocentric orientation, following denial, is polarization/defense (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009). Among the discursive barriers advanced by Henry and Tator (2010), the following discourses are most aligned with and manifest from polarization/defense mindsets: binary polarization, victim blaming, tolerance, and traditionalism. Polarization/defense, according to intercultural theory (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009) is a state of dualistic awareness. Individuals recognize difference within a binary often characterized as “us” and “them”. M.J. Bennett describes the effect of individuals within this mindset as feeling under siege. Acknowledging difference represents, for these individuals, loss of control, power, and privilege. M.J. Bennett (1993) and Hammer (2009) found that individuals in the polarization/defense mindset act in ways that attack
or target difference. Characterized by a self-protective judgemental perception of difference, individuals in polarization/defense may presume cultural superiority over that which is different from them.

Henry and Tator (2010) describe the Discourse of Binary Polarization as a way of “viewing the world and people as a series of polar opposites in constant competition and mutually exclusive” (p. 226). These arguments posit there must be a winner and a loser in all situations, and the environment created by this mentality is that of an “us vs. them” or “hero vs. villain” antagonistic rivalry. The Discourse of Blaming the Victim is also a manifestation of the polarization/defense orientation. As a discursive barrier, it is related to the equal opportunity argument in that responsibility for social issues and problems is placed on the individual experiencing the issue, whether it is poverty, unemployment, under-housing, and so forth (Henry & Tator, 2010). There is no acknowledgement, by those who use the discourse, of the existence of systemic power differences and inequities that affect the opportunities available to individuals who are faced with the social conditions just listed. The judgemental nature of this discourse is what aligns it with the polarization/defense intercultural orientation. Tolerance is a term used and viewpoint held whereby difference is seen “as an accepted anomaly or idiosyncrasy that is not necessarily desirable but accommodated” (Henry & Tator, 2010, p. 226). In this case, differences are acknowledged and reluctantly accommodated if possible, but there remains a sense of superiority over that which is different, thereby firmly aligning the discourse with the polarization/defense orientation. The Discourse of Traditionalism vs. Universalism is premised on an argument whereby difference is perceived to be in direct opposition to what is believed to be the best of human knowledge that will produce cultural literacy and educational competence (Henry & Tator, 2010). Traditionalism is linked to a sense of superiority over the norms and
traditions of cultures different from one’s own. Again, the superiority manifest in this discourse is what aligns it with the polarization/defense intercultural orientation.

Neoliberalism constructs and reinforces diversity and equity discourses in ways that impede educational equity policy implementation. Various values and principles underpinning the neoliberal ideology can be seen in several of the ethnocentric orientations as well as the discursive barriers discussed above. For instance, a prominent debate in the academy places meritocracy, quality, and efficiency on one side and equity, protection of rights, and redressing barriers to opportunity on the other side. This debate is one manifestation of a discourse of diversity acting as a binary polarization discursive barrier (Henry and Tator, 2010) in the form of coded language. Neoliberals primarily support the Classical Liberal equality of rights position with some limited intervention to distribute finite amounts of defined resources for the purpose of maintaining the system rather than for the goal of equalizing access to wealth, power, and status.

The next orientation on the intercultural development continuum, after polarization/defense, is minimization. Among the discursive barriers advanced by Henry and Tator (2010), the following discourses are most aligned with and manifest from minimization mindsets: colour-blindness, equal opportunity, de-contextualization, balkanization, and political correctness. Minimization is a mindset characteristic of universalism (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009). Individuals in this mindset cognitively acknowledge difference but often focus on similarities at the expense of recognizing how difference matters with respect to systems of power and privilege. Consequently, individuals in this mindset often display a superficial or trivial understanding of difference. Affectively, individuals in minimization project idealistic feelings about equity, usually from their own, ethnocentric, worldview. This idealism can negate
the reality of the existence of inequities based on individual differences. Both idealism and universalism are not negative qualities in and of themselves, however, they may mask the real presence of inequities. Behaviourally, individuals in minimization constantly work to point out commonalities and ways people can “just get along”.

The Discourse of Colour-Blindness is described by Henry and Tator (2010) as an argument whereby individuals insist they do not and should not consider difference and that it would be divisive to do so. Underpinning this argument is the idea that one can and should be neutral and objective in matters related to social identity and cultural diversity. The desired outcome is not equity but rather equality of treatment, regardless of social position and power. This lack of recognition of how difference matters aligns the discourse with the minimization orientation. Relatedly, the Discourse of Equal Opportunity takes the notion of equal treatment further. The Discourse of Equal Opportunity assumes that all individuals begin with the same opportunities, “given a blank slate from which to determine their own fates” (Henry and Tator, p. 226). This discourse refutes the presence of systemic inequities, which may have negative effects on access to equal opportunity among different individuals in society. The Discourse of De-contextualization describes a discursive practice whereby individuals “choose to view incidents of discrimination and bias as isolated and aberrant instances” (p. 226). While the discourse acknowledges individual inequities exist in the form of bias and prejudice, it does not acknowledge power and privilege within and among individuals, let alone systemic discrimination imbedded in institutions. The lack of recognition of the existence and prevalence of systemic inequities, which impact groups of diverse people everyday, aligns the De-contextualization Discourse to the minimization orientation. The Discourse of Balkanization is underpinned by the fear of division and disharmony as an outcome of paying attention to
difference (Henry & Tator, 2010). In this way, it is a discourse articulated by individuals who actively avoid distinguishing between differences and prefer focussing on similarities.

Finally, the Discourse of Political Correctness, which represents a fundamental neoliberal ideological position, is also a manifestation of the minimization orientation. Henry and Tator (2010) find that the political correctness discourse “is the most pervasive in academic culture” (p. 227). Its underpinning argument suggests that educational equity goals undermine academic freedom and the standards and values of excellence and intellectual integrity in the university. In this way, the argument is related to Binary Polarization, setting academic freedom and equity as opposite and mutually exclusive ends of a spectrum. In the neoliberal context, the term political correctness or PC has been appropriated in such a way as to undermine educational equity goals. According to Henry and Tator (2010), “[d]emands for inclusion, representation, and equity are deflected, resisted, and dismissed as authoritarian, repressive, and a threat to academic freedom” (p. 227). They describe the root of resistance to anti-racism and equity efforts:

Many people resist anti-racism and equity initiatives because they are unwilling to question *their* own belief and value systems and discursive practices, *their* organizational and professional norms, *their* positions of power and privilege within the workplace and society. Thus, they are unable to examine the relationship between cultural and racial differences and the power dynamics constructed around ideas about those differences. (Henry and Tator, 2010, p. 10)

Later in this chapter, I expand on the evolution of the PC discourse and its power to thwart educational equity efforts.
Ahmed (2006) builds on the concept of discourse to advance the notions of performativity and non-performativity. She reflects on institutional speech acts, which make claims about or on behalf of the institution. She considers the ways that such speech acts work to personify institutions:

By “speech acts” I include not just spoken words but writing and visual images – all the materials that give an institution interiority, as if it has a face, as well as feelings, thoughts, or judgments. They might say, for example, “the university regrets,” or just simply, “we regret”. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 104)

Ahmed examines documents like equity policies as institutional speech acts. These policies might claim the institution has a diverse quality and is committed to an equitable course of action. In this way, they are given “attributes, qualities, and even a character” (2006, p. 104). Considering whether these policies as speech acts are performative, Ahmed turns to Austin (2006/1962) who said an utterance or speech act is performative if it does what it says it will do (2006/1962). Ahmed suggests institutional equity policies read as if they are performatives but they are in reality nonperformatives:

Such speech acts do not do what they say: they do not, as it were, commit a person, organization, or state to an action. Instead, they are nonperformatives. They are speech acts that read as if they are performatives, and this “reading” generates its own effects. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 104)

Ahmed (2006) cites Butler who argues that performativity is not a result of an isolated speech act but rather is a result of the “reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effect that it names” (Butler, 1993, p. 2). Ahmed describes her model of the nonperformative using the equity policy example:
The speech acts that commit the university to equality, I suggest, are nonperformatives. They “work” precisely by not bringing about the effects that they name…In my model of the “nonperformative”, the failure of the speech act to do what it says is not a failure of intent or even circumstance, but it is actually what the speech act is doing. In other words, the nonperformative does not “fail to act” because of the conditions that are external to the speech acts: rather, it “works” because it fails to bring about what it names. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 105)

Put a different way, Ahmed suggests that speech acts are texts that are unfinished precursors to actions. What a speech act does depends on how they are engaged and taken up:

If texts circulate as documents or objects within public culture, then our task is to follow them, to see how they move as well as how they get stuck. So rather than just looking at university documentation on diversity for what it says, although I do this, as close readings are important and necessary, I also ask what they do, in part by talking to practitioners who use these documents to support their actions. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 105)

Ahmed interviewed staff from institutional units with diversity and equity-related responsibilities across several universities in the United Kingdom. Her study also included an analysis of institutional policy documents. She specifically looked at four forms of institutional speech acts, which she referred to as “admissions, commitments, performances, and descriptions” (2006, p. 105). Her research sought to examine the relationship between new discourses of racial equality and institutional racism. With respect to admissions, Ahmed described the paradox of institutions admitting they are racist as a way of claiming they have overcome racism. Ironically, she says, the admission of racism becomes viewed as a declaration of commitment to antiracism:

First, we say, “we are racist,” and insofar as we can admit to being racist (and racists are unwitting), then we show that “we are not racist,” or at least that we are not racist in the same way. What is important here is that the admission converts swiftly into a declarative mode: the speech act, in its performance, is taken up as having shown that the institution has overcome what it is that the speech act admits to. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 107 – 108)
With respect to statements of commitment to equity, Ahmed analyzed whether or not these statements commit the institution to doing something. Ahmed claimed that statements of commitment, in fact, “do not commit the institution to doing anything” (2006, p. 113), although she found in her research that they are useful insofar as they enable and support practitioner actions should they choose to mobilize efforts. Ahmed describes how statements of commitment expose what she refers to as the gap between words and deeds:

Statements of commitment then might do something, not in and of themselves, but because they enable the exposure of a gap between what organizations say they do, and what they actually do: indeed, they might “do something” insofar as they fail to describe what organizations do. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 114)

Ahmed cautioned that statements of commitment could relegate equity practice to “the tick box approach” (2006, p. 114). In this case, institutions could appear to have achieved good practice in equity by simply naming the values in a statement of commitment rather than actually creating and auditing implementable and measurable objectives.

Ahmed (2006) argued that institutional documents that act as admissions or statements of commitment to diversity are ways that universities perform an image of themselves doing well on equity. In this way, when audited, institution can cite their equity policies as following best practices. Ahmed described an audit culture as one that involves the “politics of documentation” (2006, p. 116), which can manifest if, for example, the audit process involves measuring how well institutional equity policy documents correspond with benchmark documents and organizations. In the Canadian context, the Human Rights Code and Commission, for instance, may provide the benchmark for how to describe diversity, inclusivity, and equity appropriately in policy. If the institutional audit focuses on the alignment of policy text to benchmark documents and organizations, then the audit is not really measuring institutional performance on equity.
goals. Rather, the audit might more accurately be a reflection of how well the policy is written, not how well it is implemented. Practitioners interviewed by Ahmed shared mixed feelings about the auditability of equity policies. Some interviewees insisted good performance on equity should always be associated with accountability, efficiency, and quality and these practitioners felt that those things subject to audit in a university setting are those things that are taken most seriously. At the same time, other practitioners felt that universities might simply become good at auditing and creating the perception of following best practices. While proponents say audits call for serious attention to equity policy implementation, opponents fear compelling action through audits simply causes policy makers to become good at creating “auditable systems” (Ahmed, 2006, p. 116).

On a final note, Ahmed examined how equity policies work as descriptions to personify universities. She discusses the strategic use of the term diversity in institutional documents not only to articulate their commitment but also to describe a quality they want to project:

Diversity seems more readily embraced, as something that is both taken on and taken in within the constitution of the university as a subject community. We might note, then that diversity is taken in precisely as it is associated with being a “world class university”; it functions in a way as a term that allows the university to measure up to its ego ideal or its ideal image. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 119)

Ahmed points to the market-oriented language of “world class” associated with diversity. She also discusses how the discourse of valuing diversity is often framed in similar economic terms.

The discourse of valuing diversity, is of course, mainstream, and it lingers between discourses of economic value (the business case for diversity) and moral value (the social justice case). This model of diversity simultaneously reifies differences as something that already exists in the bodies of others (“we” are diverse because “they” are here). It also transforms difference into property: if difference is something they are, then it is something we can have. (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 119 - 120)
The use of the term diversity itself is a topic for critical examination. Ahmed cited anti-racist educators and practitioners who argued that the term diversity is like a “big shiny red apple” that invokes an acknowledgement of difference along with warm and happy feelings associated with a sense of pride and celebration. These social justice proponents suggested that the term diversity does not necessarily evoke action towards equity or social justice (Ahmed, 2006, p. 121). In contrast, Ahmed also found some practitioners who felt the appeal of the term diversity could be a useful opportunity to “start to engage people” and to follow-up, once they are engaged, to do different things and to use different sets of terms. Once engaged, the argument goes, people might then begin to transform statements of commitment to action plans. They may also begin to understand and employ the range of equity-related terms, like inclusivity, anti-racism, and social justice, in more nuanced and appropriate ways:

The happy smiling face of diversity would not then simply rebrand the university but point instead to what gets concealed by this very image: the inequalities that are behind it and give it a surface appeal. In other words, the strategy of associating diversity with the organizational pride is that the word might yet work to challenge the ideal image of the organization. It is pride, after all, which is the condition of the possibility for being shamed for exposing gaps between ideals and actions. (Ahmed, 2006, p. 124)

Ahmed uncovered that many practitioners avoid using the term diversity in isolation, preferring to use the term in association with terms like equity or inclusivity or social justice (Ahmed, 2006, p. 123). These practitioners asserted the importance of using a complementary set of terms, all at once, in order not to obscure the existence of inequities and the need for action.
Anti-Racism and Anti-Racist Policies in Canadian Academe

To the extent that educational equity policies are designed with an aim to achieve some measure of success in addressing and redressing social and systemic inequities, I would argue they can be viewed as anti-oppressive and anti-racist policies. To that end, my research builds on the scholarship of Dua (1999; 2000; 2009) who notes that research which evaluates the effectiveness of anti-racist policies in universities is essentially non-existent, with the exception of extensive work by Henry and Tator (1995, 2002, 2007, 2009, 2010) in Canada and emergent work by Sara Ahmed (2006) who is leading the charge in the United Kingdom. Dua (2009) described her preliminary investigation of the extent to which universities in Canada have developed anti-racist policies and practices and whether these policies and practices have been effective in addressing individual and systemic racism. Her study involved 37 Canadian universities and included a review of policy statements and mandates of equity and human rights offices as well as collective agreements. In addition to document analysis, Dua interviewed anti-racist practitioners who held university positions as directors of human rights and equity offices, counsellors, and policy analysts. In some cases, Dua interviewed officials within faculty associations where those associations had taken up a lead role in advancing equity initiatives. Dua invited informants from 10 universities to participate in either a face-to-face or phone interview consisting of open-ended questions to maximize breadth and depth of information collected on anti-racist policies in the academy.

Through her investigation, Dua found three themes representing limitations to the effectiveness of anti-racist policies. First, she found policies that address racism emerged from “feminist activism and legal changes” (2009, p. 163) rather than from any specific institutional
response or commitment to anti-racist initiatives. Second, the design of the policies did “not allow for effective implementation” (p. 163). Third, all but one of the interviewees reported “resistance that these policies invoked among members of senior administration” (p. 164). Dua concluded that, while it is encouraging that so many Canadian universities have introduced anti-racist policies, “rarely are these policies effectively implemented”, and “the most serious impediment to the successful implementation of such policies is the unwillingness of senior administration to address racism” (p. 191). Like Dua, I will employ critical discourse and policy analysis as research approaches to analyze textual discourses among university administrators.

My study will review Presidential installation speeches as well as senior administrator interview narratives to uncover and examine discursive barriers to implementing educational equity policy. Dua (2009) maintained that universities are institutional settings with embedded historical, political, economic, social, and cultural discourses that construct racialized and gendered environments within which members of the academy must navigate. Her findings in relation to the experiences of informants who identify as women of colour were expected to form a basis from and against which I could build and compare the perspectives and experiences of interviewees in my study, who may have identified as racialized women, as well as my own perspectives and experiences as a racialized female among the ranks of administrators in a Canadian university.

In another study, Dua and Bhanji (2012) undertook to assess the representation of racialized and Aboriginal faculty across Canadian universities. Their interest in exploring this research topic was motivated by both anecdotal and empirical data collected from various studies. One review conducted by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) reported, “Despite some notable progress in the past decade towards greater diversity, the
Canadian academy remains largely white and male” (CAUT, 2010, p. 1). Dua and Bhanji (2012) observed that emerging reports on the numerical representation of racialized and Aboriginal faculty in higher education were variable, in part due to the fact that studies were often institution-specific and did not reflect general patterns across Canadian universities. Their research represented one effort to conduct such nationwide analysis of the status of “visible minorities” employed as faculty in Canadian universities. Their preliminary findings revealed, “that there is a relationship between Employment Equity policies and higher percentages of visible minorities and Aboriginal faculty” (Dua and Bhanji, 2012, p. 49). In other words, they found that collecting demographic data was critical to ensuring appropriate and effective policy interventions were developed and implemented to achieve equity in the area of hiring and retaining faculty. Data collection should, therefore, be viewed as considerably important to assessing progress on achieving equity, through policy development and implementation, across all domains of educational equity.

In yet another study, Dua and Lawrence (2000) organized a roundtable discussion involving seven Aboriginal women and seven women of colour who taught anti-racism and Indigenous thought in universities. Through this forum, Dua and Lawrence sought to learn about and understand the experiences of participants in relation to systemic discrimination in the academy. Their findings are worth quoting at length:

What was remarkable was that all of the women had similar experiences – each woman reported that she experienced hostility from students, a lack of support from administrations when they face racism, procedures employed by the university that perpetuate racism, and a range of reactions from colleagues, including polite indifference, hostility, and condescension. Some spoke of the pressure they felt to be silent about the racism they were facing, rather than risk ostracism within their departments. As importantly, all of the women reported that these forms of systemic discrimination are having a significant impact on their careers – from negative evaluations of teaching, to difficulties in the tenure and promotion process, to being marginalised in their
departments and institutions. Many of the women reported that their experiences with systemic discrimination had a profound personal impact – including long intervals of generalized ill-health, depression, strong feelings of self-doubt and at times a severe alienation within academic environments.

The discussion also raised the issue of retention as all of the women reported that their experiences with systemic discrimination made them question their future in academia. At the same time, it was clear that conditions of work varied for different women, depending on how “white” the university environment that they worked in was. Generally speaking, the women who worked in universities where there were other faculty of colour, or where there were large numbers of students of colour, or Aboriginal students, found that the teaching conditions they faced were somewhat different than those who faced virtually all-white classrooms. Meanwhile, it was also clear that while some of the women worked at institutions where anti-racism had been at least nominally addressed, and where environments were less “white”, the overall working conditions that each woman faced still resonated with experiences of racism. (Dua & Lawrence, 2000, p. 106)

An important insight from this study of faculty who teach anti-racism and Indigenous thought is that the experience of marginalization by these faculty, as a result of interactions with students taking their courses, colleagues in their departments, and administrators within the university, is enabled by a lack of integration of diverse and global teaching and learning content and pedagogy across disciplines (Dua & Lawrence, 2000).

**Individual and Systemic Manifestations of Racism in the Academy**

Kobayashi (2006) has contributed significantly to the field of anti-racism and equity in higher education, extensively studying and publishing works on the experiences of women of colour in academe. Her research in understanding the effects of systemic discrimination experienced by racialized faculty in the workplace and her findings related to the experience of racism for those who attempt to incorporate social justice into their teaching and research offer information with which to contrast the perspectives and experiences of participants in my study
who may identify as racialized women. Following Kobayashi’s work, but with a focus on senior administrators, my study aims to shed light on the distinct issues that may arise for those administrators who choose to engage in and promote equity and social change within institutions, while challenged to adapt and define their leadership or management approaches according to the dominant norms in Canadian academe. Kobayashi (1999) has also written extensively on the individual emotional responses and manifestations of racism in the academy. As I am interested in both micro-social or individual and macro-social or systemic analysis of educational equity policy implementation in higher educations, Kobayashi’s work in this area is instructive.

Attending to the perceptions and emotions of individuals undergoing personal change, rather than denying, avoiding, or pathologizing their responses, can help mobilize implementation and change. Reflecting on her time teaching a race and racism course to undergraduates, Kobayashi (1999) shares insights concerning the interplay of emotions, thoughts, and behaviours in the context of student responses to a particular topic during the teaching and learning process:

I am deeply aware that racism is an uncomfortable topic and that students must, in some way, face its uncomfortable realities if they are to learn and if, as I hope, they are to change. In the charged atmosphere of the classroom the shift from the intellectual to the emotional is often swift and unexpected. For this reason, many issues surrounding comfort cannot be addressed entirely by the book; they depend so much upon the context of the moment, on the emotional states of people who are often unwilling to share or reveal their emotions, and others who wish to reveal their emotions dramatically. They depend on saying the right word, or the wrong word, at crucial moments…The most important concern is that what is comfortable for some is uncomfortable for others, depending on the experiences of the individuals and groups that make up the class. (Kobayashi, 1999, p. 179)

In the context of educational equity policy, polarized ideological debates, like the debate that pits equity interests against quality interests, for instance, invoke personal emotional
responses, many of which remain unresolved in often depersonalizing settings and policy processes. It is not surprising that debates of this nature can be emotionally charged as they deal with and have great implications on real human issues. Conflict resolution, mediation, as well as community and coalition building settings, where parties seek to find common ground across different values and interests, would require empathetic and respectful dialogue between actors on either side of any polarized ideological debate. However, it seems that the stakes for parties on either side of the debate are too high, in the institutional context, for the debate to be fruitful. As a consequence, individual actors who have personal and organizational agency in the academy side step the debate and build a groundswell of supporters within their circle of influence to either implement or impede educational equity policy objectives, both from the bottom up and the top down. Engaging the debate in a way that strives to bridge understanding may have positive outcomes for individuals, but it is highly unlikely that it would result in systemic change. With so many actors in a highly politicized institutional system with complex levers influencing individual interests, university administrators, and others with agency to influence change, are left to make educational equity policy decisions. These decisions will necessarily counter the hegemonic social and cultural driving forces of neoliberal ideology and discourse that permeate all aspects of the academy.

The last area of Kobayashi’s research I follow relates to a recent study undertaken by a multidisciplinary team of critical race scholars who, in a national study of Canadian universities, have been investigating issues of race and racism in the academy. The study employs a mixed methodology including in-depth personal interviews, quantitative analysis of census and employment statistics, and discourse analysis of mission statements, equity reports, and other documentary materials found on University websites (Henry, Kobayashi, & Choi, 2012). In a
study of the representation of racialized faculty in Canadian academe, Henry, Kobayashi and Choi (2012) found that formally collected data on the ethno-racial background of faculty members is absent. In an attempt to redress this void and establish some baseline numeric representation of racialized groups in Canadian universities, they undertook a face and name recognition methodology whereby they examined photographs of faculty on departmental websites as well as links to faculty research web sites for clues to their ethno-racial identity. In this analysis process, they “searched administrative web sites to identify racialized faculty in administrative positions, but the numbers were too few to report” (Henry et al., 2012, p. 8). These studies on individual and systemic manifestations of inequity suggest that educational equity policies represent and reflect normative discourses concerning diversity and equity in higher education. To be effective in the milieu of implicit norms driven by prevailing individual ideologies as well as institutional structures and systems, educational equity policies must include intentional, proactive, and strategic interventions at the individual and systemic levels. Accurate demographic data is one critical element required to inform interventions and monitor progress.

**Diversity Discourse, Equity Policy, and Power Relations in Canadian Academe**

Chan (2005; 2007) posited that diversity discourse and equity policy implementation must be understood in the context of power relations and politics, which exist between and among individuals and groups. She studied policy discourse as a vehicle for institutional change in the area of diversity, an area she describes as a “contested territory” (2005, p. 129) in the context of higher education. Chan focused on subjective actions within educational institutions
as political sites. Specifically, she was interested in how power was held or managed by individual educators and how their individual agency was deployed across different situations. Chan describes her rationale for considering concepts of agency and voice in the study of policy discourse:

Concepts of agency and voice are related to power, whether through self-regulating internal surveillance or through acts of resistance. Discourse and policy discourses reveal how people exercise (variously) agency and voice in policy development and processes of practice, and how these everyday interactions and interpretations contribute to the wider understanding of policy. Human agency is critical to notions of diversity and difference: agency is fundamentally linked to individual and collective power, to social practices and therefore to social change. (Chan, 2005, p. 141)

Chan chose feminist, reflective narrative, and auto/biographical research methods as the means to investigate and understand the complexities presented by what she described as an interdisciplinary study. Through a case study of a University College in British Columbia, Canada, she examined the narratives of 10 educators including instructors, administrators, counsellors, and advisors, beginning with the question of “what facilitates change for diversity in an educational institution” (Chan, 2007, p. 5). By examining the lived-experiences of these educators and through their individual stories, Chan was able to explore and reveal “the workings of an educational institution” and “what motivates and immobilizes institutional actors to change” (p. 5). In addition to analyzing the narratives and speech acts of individual educators, Chan expanded the scope of her discourse analysis to include a review of institutional “policies and statements on diversity and inclusiveness, cultural competency, employment equity, and harassment, as well as the missions statement of the University College” (p. 246). In the final analysis, Chan asserted that changing organizational structures is “not a pre-requisite to facilitating change in institutions” (2007, p. 6), providing the example that individuals and
groups of individuals are capable of affecting “significant change in an organization without changing the inherent structure” (p. 6). Chan found the narratives of individuals in her study illuminated the political nature of the institution and how individual educators develop their own sense of agency to find some avenues to influence change within this environment. In the absence of structural change, she found individual actors with the “motivation and capacity to work with aspects of diversity without the framework of a group or committee” (2007, p. 269). Chan suggests that, while policies are critical instruments for systemic institutional change, individual actions must accompany and complement policy statements in order to sustain change efforts when dealing with diversity and difference:

Educators need to explore how dominant discourses and ruling relations function in effect, as cultural practices. These are practices that maintain the institutional culture and relations of power. The political nature of the institution has been described in detail in a number of the narratives. This dimension of the institution must be addressed in dealing with diversity and difference. The research has examined in detail how the characteristics of agency developed in the lives of the narrators. While their institutional roles gave them some avenues to influence change, the research emphasizes the interconnection with their personal lives. The future for diversity is about creating new rooms, new spaces. This requires educators who are willing to examine and take apart old rooms and structures. Self-knowledge and developing a sense of agency, voice, and self are critical to taking on this challenge. (Chan, 2007, p. 270)

Like Chan, I utilize a critical race feminist theoretical lens to analyze documented texts and speech acts to uncover diversity discourses and to understand and interpret the power relations among and between administrative actors as change agents. As well, like Chan, I seek to uncover those individual and institutional factors that enable or mobilize change to contrast with those factors that complicate or hinder change in the area of equity policy. In my study, I examine whether and how there is an interconnection between personal identities and professional roles as demonstrated in narrative interviews and/or public installation speeches.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has elaborated on the extant literature, which informs my conceptual theoretical frames, my methodological choices, and my research focus. I started by describing and providing a rationale for my particular interest in the raced and gendered dynamics of educational equity policy implementation. I followed this discussion by documenting some evidence of my research problematic and focus, as articulated in faculty and senior administrator quotes in recent articles on the subject of race and racism in the academy. Then, I outlined the scholarship from and on which I have drawn and built my study. I described in detail the work of Jill Blackmore, Francis Henry and Carol Tator, Sara Ahmed, Enakshi Dua, Audrey Kobayashi, and Adrienne Chan, scholars who have contributed significantly to generating conceptual and theoretical knowledge on equity-related issues in the academy as well as studied educational equity from various perspectives and approaches. Blackmore (2006; 2010; 2011) has studied the underpinnings and implications of neoliberal discourses of diversity on equity policy implementation in the academy. Henry and Tator (1995, 2002, 2007; 2009; 2010) have examined discursive barriers to anti-racism and equity policy implementation in universities. Ahmed (2006) has explored anti-racism and equity policy non-performativity in higher education. Dua (1999; 2009), on her own and with a number of colleagues (Dua & Lawrence, 2000; Dua & Bhanji, 2012; Dua, Razack & Warner, 2005), has extensively studied anti-racism and anti-racist policies in Canadian academe. Kobayashi (1999, 2006, 2007, 2012) has contributed significantly to the study of individual and systemic manifestations of racism in the academy and its implications on educational equity policy. Chan (2005; 2007) has investigated how diversity discourse and power relations factor into the equity policymaking process. Having made the case
for my research problematic and elaborated on the existing literature on the subject, as well as the various approaches to studying the problem, I will now describe the methodology for my study.
CHAPTER THREE
CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Introduction

In this chapter, I describe the conceptual underpinnings of my research methodology and the theoretical frameworks and approaches I use to analyze and interpret my research findings. The chapter will provide a context for later discussions on the extent to which neoliberalism, as the dominant political ideology in Canada today, acts to define and disseminate discourses that perpetuate discursive barriers to achieving educational equity in higher education. The first part of the chapter defines, describes, and discusses several concepts to provide a foundation for understanding the theories and approaches described in the second part of the chapter.

In the first section, I begin by situating educational equity as a public policy issue and clarify what is meant by a public policy. I then define and discuss the concepts of values, interests, ideology, politics, governmentality, and cultural hegemony as they relate to public policymaking processes. Next, I define and discuss the concepts of discursive and performative practices and describe how these practices act to construct, reconstruct, and reinforce ideologies. I then examine how discourse and performativity perpetuate culturally hegemonic ideologies and the implications of this process on policymakers and policymaking. Following this examination of how discursive and performative practices form and are informed by hegemonic ideologies, I discuss and provide examples of ideological underpinnings of different “discourses of diversity”, a phrase that I briefly describe in this chapter but return to, in depth, in later chapters. Finally, I end the first section with a discussion of how discourses are performed by various social and
organizational actors as well as the concept of complicity and its role in perpetuating dominant discourses and cultural hegemonies.

In the second section, I begin by describing the theoretical perspectives and analytical frameworks I employ in my study: the first theoretical framework I describe is critical race feminism, also referred as anti-racist feminist theory; the second analytical framework I describe is critical policy analysis; the third analytical perspective I described is critical discourse analysis, which is considered a theory as well as a method. Next, I outline and discuss the theoretical underpinnings of multi-level models of analyzing policymaking in social and organizational system. Following this discussion of multi-level models of policy analysis, I describe the two policy domains on which I focus my study: the macro-level or institutional systemic domain and the micro-level or individual intrapersonal domain.

**Public Policymaking: A Value-Laden and Interested Process**

What is public policy? According to Fowler (2013),

*Public policy* is the dynamic and value-laden process through which a political system handles a public problem. It includes a government’s expressed intentions and official enactments, as well as its constituent patterns of activity and inactivity. (p. 5)

Fowler clarifies that her use of the term government, in the definition of public policy she prefers, is broad and multilayered, including elected and appointed public officials at various levels of governments as well as bodies and agencies within which these public officials work. Social equity in Canada is viewed as a public good, and therefore, social inequity as a public problem worthy of the attention of public policymakers. It follows, then, than educational equity,
or equity in the educational sector, is a public policy issue. 2011 Atkinson Fellow in Public Policy, Dowsett Johnston (2011), recently said about public policy, “At its very essence, it’s a simple equation: evidence plus values plus politics equals movement” (p. 30). According to Dowsett Johnston, “Inaction [equalling] a vacuum in public policy” (p. 30) can stem from deficiencies, retractions, or negations in any part of the equation. Consider each of the variables in Dowsett Johnston’s equation, evidence, values, and politics, with respect to the policymaking process. The first variable, evidence, is information about a problem that compels policymakers to act. What, whether, and how evidence compels policymakers is value-laden and dependent on political philosophy and ideology. In the following sections, I will illuminate how the other two variables, politics and values, factor into the policymaking process.

Values, Interests, and Ideology

The policy decision-making process is laden with a complexity of values as well as competing interests for any particular social issue. Values are set by and reinforce individual beliefs and cultural norms, which in turn inform ideologies that prescribe how people should behave both alone and as members of a group. Therefore, an ideology is a set of values, beliefs, perceptions, and assumptions through which members of a social and cultural group view and understand the world. According to Fowler (2013), ideas, beliefs, and values are important because, among other things, “they shape the way people define policy problems” and “they constrain people’s ability to perceive possible solutions to policy problems” (p. 92.). Fowler describes the influence of normative values and ideology on the policymaking process:
Gibbins and Youngman (1996) liken ideologies to maps, which orient individuals in social groups and guide their social and political action. Individuals follow suggested routes across a social and political terrain to reach desired social, political, and economic goals. The metaphor of an ideology as a map is a simple view of how, once established, an ideology guides individual and group behaviour. However, the construction and conservation of an ideology is far from simple. The words “suggested” and “desired” are used intentionally, in the metaphor above, to highlight that ideologies are not accidental but, rather, are intentional. An ideology is formulated through complex socio-political processes. The processes that lead to the formation of ideologies are intentional and interested. In other words, ideologies are intentional, not necessarily in a conspiratorial or malicious manner, but rather in the sense that they are driven and manipulated by individual and group interests.

Fowler (2013) asserts all public policy, and especially educational policy, is value-laden. Furthermore, she suggests that the operative values in any policy environment are those “that directly advance the interests of particular individual or groups” (p. 92). She describes two self-interest values as well as three other values prevalent in Western democratic countries, like the U.S. and Canada. The two self-interest values on which she expands relate to economic interests and interests in power. Fowler argues, “Many people are motivated almost entirely by their own economic interests or by the economic interests of a group with which they identify” (p. 93). With respect to power, Fowler says, “Individuals and groups also often act to increase their
power” (p. 93). Consequently, in the policymaking process, questions about who benefits and who is penalized economically as well as who stands to gain or lose power will be considered by all actors in their capacity as individuals and members of the social groups to which they belong. Fowler discusses several other values that are influential in the policymaking process. She discusses general social values such as order and individualism. She also highlights democratic values such as liberty, equality, and fraternity. The former, liberty, is sometimes referred to as freedom or choice, and the latter, fraternity, is sometimes referred to as community or social cohesion. She also describes economic values such as efficiency, economic growth, and quality. All of these values and interest, Fowler says, interact and conflict with each other in the ever-shifting policymaking process depending on the actors and the dominant values in the policy environment (2013). With respect to educational equity policy in higher education, I will discuss several of these values and interests in later chapters, as they relate to discourses in the academy that either enable or hinder educational equity policy implementation.

Fowler (2013) emphasizes the implicit nature of ideologies and differentiates these from political philosophy. She says,

Although ideologies are based on several core assumptions about human nature and the nature of the universe, these ideas remain implicit. Adherents of the ideology take them for granted, perceiving them as common sense (Susser, 1995).…[T]he adherents of an ideology accept its major tenets without question and react emotionally rather than rationally when someone challenges them (Susser, 1995). People who reach full intellectual maturity may commit to accept some elements of the most prevalent ideologies; however, they have also subjected their beliefs to rational analysis and are willing to change them if presented with compelling evidence. Their belief systems are more accurately described as political philosophies than as ideologies (Levine, Carmines, & Huckfeldt, 2005). (p. 107)

Gibbins and Youngman (1996) claim, a political philosophy, consisting of social and political values and beliefs, is the epistemological foundation for understanding a social reality as it
informs political ideology, which becomes the program to maintain or change that very social reality. They describe their view of the nature of ideologies:

An ideology is a socially constructed and transmitted system of political beliefs with some significant measure of formal articulation, scope, internal consistency and durability. As such, it provides both a normative framework for understanding the political world and a practical guide for political action. (p. 20)

The normative framework referenced in the quote above by Gibbins and Youngman is an important concept that has implications on the boundaries of socially, politically, and culturally mediated speech acts and expressions of behaviours, which will be discussed in detail in later chapters. The notion that ideology provides a normative framework for understanding the world is expanded by Fleras and Elliott (1992), who suggest the norms established by ideology are defined by and define power relations in society. They view ideologies as frameworks for “organizing, maintaining and transforming relations of power and dominance in society” (p. 54). In this definition, Fleras and Elliott point to the interpersonal and relational dynamics of and influences on ideology. They also highlight the role of ideologies in maintaining or transforming social power bases that define dominant society. This differentiation between ideology and political philosophy suggests the possibility for values and belief systems to shift. This is an important concept given the view that education policy in North America is becoming increasingly ideologically driven. Perceived values and interests are socially, politically, and economically motivated and, in fact, play a significant role in defining and manipulating public opinion and political ideology. Whose interests are served in the end is contingent on a complexity of interacting factors, not least of which are social and cultural norms acting on any social or organizational setting.
Politics, Governmentality, and Cultural Hegemony

Values, interests, and ideology are inextricable from political processes surrounding policy development. Politics refers to the strategies used by those in governing positions to influence individual and collective behaviours of people. In other words, politics is the practice of exercising power for the purpose of organized control over groups. Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard and Henry (1997) assert that power and control are highly influential in the policy development process. Politics and power factor heavily in the processes of governmentality and cultural hegemony, two concepts I will now describe in more detail. Governmentality is a term originated by Foucault (2008). In his earlier work, Foucault (1969/1972) tackles the subject of power and conceives it as a constructive, yet elusive, force that permeates both individual or subjective domains as well as systemic or structural domains of a social and cultural organization. According to Marinetto (2003), in his later writings, Foucault turns to investigating “how discourse is subject to regulation, forms of control and relations of power” (p. 627). Foucault (2008) talks about differentiating between the study of the development of governmental practice, otherwise referred to as public administration or the science of policy analysis, from the study of the consciousness of the practice of government, or what he refers to as the art of government. He references the “government of men insofar as it appears as the exercise of political sovereignty” (p. 2).

The conventional study of public policy includes problem identification, decisions on the choice of tactics, and rationalization of the employment of instruments or interventions. According to Foucault (2008), the science of policy analysis has typically been an empirical exercise devoid of “consciousness” and self-reflection. Rather than studying “the rationalization
of governmental practice in the exercise of political sovereignty” (p. 2), Foucault examined and critiqued the processes by which concepts such as the nation state, society, the sovereign citizen, and subject are actually constructed. He referred to this as the art of government or the calculated means a government directs how citizens behave and act. Thus, governmentality can be understood as a set of practices, mentalities, rationalities, techniques, and strategies by which subjects are governed in order to produce citizens befitting policies prescribed by a government. Gramsci (1971) wrote about the process by which the state exercises its rule or power. According to Gramsci, a ruling social group “leads” its allies, but “dominates” its enemies (p. 59). Gramsci suggests governments, as dominant political forces in society, propagate ideologies, which, when taken up by ordinary citizens, fashion these citizens into subjects who think, feel, and act in ways to perpetuate the ideologies and interests of the government as if it were futile to resist. Ideological hegemonies, acting as dominant social, political, and cultural discourses, dictate citizen behaviours. Gupta (1999) suggests that hegemony consists of “elements of force and consent” (p. 189). She explains the relationship between ideology and hegemony:

Ideologies (Baldwin and Calder 1982; Wotherspoon 1987) are a body of connected and coherent beliefs, which explain to us the world that we live in. A single ideology is usually accepted by most people, although it depicts reality from the perspective of the dominant class or group. Through this process of common acceptance, it becomes hegemonic or dominant. The dominant ideology acts as a “glue” to keep everyone together. It maintains social order and control and neutralizes resistance and conflict. (p. 189)

Gibbins and Youngman (1996) suggest that political opinions are “the raw materials from which ideological constructs might be formed” (p. 20), and they go on to say political opinions play an important role in what they describe as a political cultural feedback loop. However, they neglect to mention that an essential component to consider in this process is the role of interests
and values in establishing political ideologies and cultural norms. The political cultural feedback loop, illustrated in Figure 1, demonstrates how individual political ideologies are underpinned by individual philosophies, values, and beliefs. These philosophies, values, and beliefs are constituted from a set of tenets or assumptions based on public opinion, which is influenced by real or perceived individual interests. In turn, individual interests are influenced by sociopolitical cultural norms. Thus, individual political philosophy and ideology influences political culture, which emerges as a composite of many, often diffuse, ideological communities that exist at any given point in time within a society. The feedback loop depicts the reinforcement and cementing of normative frameworks. The process illuminates how the construction of ideologies, driven by the interests and values of those with the most social, political, and economic power, may be engineered to arrive at a predetermined destination.

*Figure 1. Political Cultural Feedback Loop*
According to Gramsci (1971), governmentality is enabled by the phenomenon of cultural hegemony. As a corollary, Davies and Bansel (2010) suggest that senior university administrators turn from ordinary citizens to subjects when they adopt neoliberal goals set out by the government for the “market oriented, audit university” (p. 5). Commenting on how neoliberalism as a form of governmentality has the power to shape the hearts and minds of university administrators and academics, Davies and Bansel assert, “the single most important feature of neoliberal government is that it systematically dismantles the will to critique, thus potentially shifting the nature of what a university is and the ways in which academics understand their work” (p. 5). According to Lewis (2008), “Transformations in educational provision, whether articulated through the curriculum or imposed by policy, are always political acts, made all the more powerful when their intentions are hidden by an uninterrogated language of educational reform for improvement” (p. 45). Lewis notes, “most universities have not included equity and social justice issues as an aspect of the measures used to determine the ‘excellence’ of an institution’s performance” (p. 62). In the higher educational context, uninterrogated neoliberal discourse acts as a barrier to all aspects of educational equity policy implementation. Lewis posits,

As a consequence, the role teachers and intellectuals are required to play, on the one hand, or the contributions they are prevented from making, on the other hand (Lewis in press), is often a function of specific political moments, fuelled by particular economic and social imperatives, coincident with identifiable geographic locations, within distinct systems of power…The concern with the question of the direction that higher education has taken throughout the countries of Western Europe, North America and other Anglo-associated nations is considerable. This explosion of concern is not serendipitous. It has been triggered by specific political and economic shifts in ideology that are making a global sweep and catching education up in its wake, not by coincidence but because the control of education is a significant component of the process. (p. 46)
Ideologies and their Discursive and Performative Formations

Ideologies are constantly constructed, reconstructed, and reinforced through discursive and performative practices. This formative process is both consciously and unconsciously perpetuated, at both individual and systemic levels, while mediated by power relations. I will now define and describe the concepts of discourse and performativity as they relate to the formation of culturally hegemonic ideologies, which, in turn, inform the policymaking process.

Discourses and Discursive Practices

In describing his own use and contribution to the meaning of the word discourse, Foucault (1969/1972) commented on “treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements” (p. 80). Fairclough (2003) describes discourses as texts, of which speech utterances are one element:

I see discourses as ways of representing aspects of the world – the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the ‘mental world’ of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world. Particular aspects of the world may be represented differently, so we are generally in the position of having to consider the relationship between different discourses. (p. 279)

Consistent with Fairclough’s assertion that discourses represent, project, and imagine real or possible worlds, Foucault suggests that discourses “systematically form the objects of which they speak” (p. 54). Smith (1995) also discusses the role of ideologies in generating texts, which organize various discourses and the social relations they influence. She defines text broadly as
including orated speech as well as material forms, such as “print, film, tape, video, computer monitor or printout” (p. 23). Smith suggests that ideologies, therefore, act to organize and regulate public discourses that are mediated by these various and omnipresent forms of text:

Ideologies, concepts, and theories, etc. are particularly powerful in regulating public text-mediated discourses. By public text-mediated discourses I mean those relations of discourse to which, in principle, access is unrestricted within a given national population...Discourse is a form of social act therefore it has social organization. Ideologies, concepts, theories, etc. are among the organizers of its relations and process, whatever function they may be understood to have when addressed from other analytic stances. (pp. 24 - 25)

Social identity, social positionality, as well as personal perspectives and impacts, are important aspects to consider within any analysis of discourse and discourse communities. According to Fairclough (2003), belonging to or membership in a sociocultural group is related to belonging in a discourse community:

Different discourses are different perspectives of the world, and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world, which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities, and the social relationships in which they stand to other people. Discourses not only represent the world as it is (or rather is seen to be), they are also projective, imaginaries, representing possible worlds, which are different from the actual world, and tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions. The relationships between different discourses are one element of the relationship between different people – they may complement one another, compete with one another, one can dominate others, and so forth. Discourses constitute part of the resources which people deploy in relating to one another – keeping separate from one another, cooperating, competing, dominating – and in seeking to change the ways in which they relate to one another. (p. 279)

Furthermore, Hill (2006) argues different meaning can be attributed to the same policy “when implementers and policy makers [belong] to different discourse communities” (p. 79). She says,

Often, one term holds different meanings for different communities...implementation failure may stem from how language in these different discourse communities contributes to the assignation of different meanings to the same policy texts. (p. 68)
Hill suggests there are discrepancies in policy implementation, which are affected by individual cognitive processes and the organizational contexts that shape them. She claims that language complicates implementation:

[T]he ways individuals and organizations construct meaning from policy also depends in part on how policies deliver their messages. Accordingly, research should attend not only to how individuals interpret policy but also to how policy is shaped and reshaped as it is transmitted via symbols, objects, and metaphors (Yanow, 1996), professional development and curriculum materials (Hill, 2000; 2001), professional networks (Coburn, 2001a), and other media. One key medium for the construction and expression of policy is language, or the medium used to scaffold human activity and affiliation (Gee, 1999). (p. 67)

My research involves an analysis of the ways that senior administrators relate their professional roles and responsibilities to their social identities and social positionalities.

**Performativity and Performative Practices**

Expanding on the notion of discourse as a social act, I now turn to discussing the concept of the performative in relation to discourse. Austin (2006/1962) originated the term *performative* and used it in reference to utterances in situations where saying something was actually doing something. Austin pointed out that not all utterances “are (used in making) statements” (p. 55) to describe or state some fact. He said, some utterances “[express] commands or wishes or concessions” (p. 55). Austin referred to this type of utterance as a performative indicating that “the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action” (p. 56). However, Austin cautioned there are usually one or more conditions needed in order to deem the act to have been performed as promised by the utterance. He said, if the act suggested by the utterance is not realized, the
performative is said to be unhappy; if it does achieve the actions it purports, it is said to be a happy functioning performative (p. 58).

The term *performativity* is often used to describe the effects that speech, language, and non-verbal expression have on human events. Performativity has also been used interchangeably with the term performance, to describe individual behaviours dictated and mediated by social norms. Butler (1993) employs the term performativity, in this latter manner, when analyzing political speech and gender development, primarily in the context of gender and sexual identity politics. Butler defines performativity as “that reiterative power of discourse to produce the phenomena that it regulates and constrains” (p. 2). She describes performative acts as types of authoritative speech, which can only take place and be enforced through social norms. Butler argues performativity refers to both explicit speech acts as well as the reproduction of social norms in order to lay claim to public space. Simply uttering the words carries out a certain action and invokes a level of power.

Butler (2009) described gender as performative to highlight her argument that gender is “prompted by obligatory norms” (p. i) which are reproduced when individuals enact or perform expected gender norms associated with being one or the other of a binary conceptualization of gender. Butler says, the appearance or display of normative gender performances are then incorrectly interpreted and attributed to some “internal or inherent truth” (p. i). She asserts that these norms are not benign. Instead, these norms prescribe the ways individuals can appear and behave (perform) in public, and they reveal wider societal power relations. According to Butler, a hetero-normative environment predefines and rewards behaviours that fall within acceptable parameters for gender performance or expression. Analogous to this, within a Euro-centric institutional environment, where neoliberal market-driven and economic values and goals are the
norm, there will necessarily be boundaries delineating and restricting what is an acceptable utterance or behaviour in regard to diversity and equity issues generally. Consequently, those who act outside acceptable normative bounds, in the neoliberal academic context, risk being excluded, isolated, discredited, ostracised, vilified, overlooked, marginalized, harassed, and abused. Acceptable normative descriptions, interpretations, and evaluations of events concerning educational equity are articulated out loud, repeated, inscribed, and codified in policy, thereby both regulating and reinforcing what educational equity is and how it should be viewed and addressed. Thus, a particular discourse of diversity (Blackmore, 2006; 2011; Chan, 2005; 2007) becomes the ideological and cultural hegemony dictating acceptable performances in relation to educational equity in the academy. In the next section, I will expand on the concept of ideological and cultural hegemony.

**Hegemonic Ideologies and “Discourses of Diversity”**

Various discourse communities, depending on prevailing ideologies in those communities, articulate and enact respective equity-related discourses. By this, I mean that the ways members of social and cultural communities speak about and act on equity-related issues depends on their collective values, beliefs, and ideologies. The discourses associated with hegemonic ideologies, which drive dominant political, social, and cultural norms in society and in organizations, tend to marginalize discourses associated with those ideologies rendered radical and subordinate in contrast to the perceived central and dominant ideologies. For example, neoliberalism, democratic liberalism, and critical race feminism are ideologies that construct different equity-related discourses. For instance, the discourse of political correctness, the
discourse of multiculturalism, and the discourse of anti-racism are discourses characteristic of each of the ideologies listed above, respectively. As an example, according to Gupta (1999) multiculturalism is one example of a discourse and hegemonic ideology in liberal democratic societies that has served to integrate racialized citizens by perpetuating the discourse of “equal opportunity [which] remains a myth without ‘equality of condition’” (p. 190). Dei and Calliste (2000) say, “As a discourse and discursive practice, multiculturalism heralds the mosaic, cherishes diversity and plurality and promotes an image of multiple, thriving, mutually respectful and appreciative ethno-cultural communities” (p. 21). Dei & Calliste contrast multicultural discourses with anti-racist discourses, advanced by critical race feminists, which emphasize persisting systemic inequities within diverse communities, as a result of power relations that delineate dominant and subordinate social identities. According to Dei and Calliste, the discourses of multiculturalism depict cultural issues or conflicts as stemming from “misunderstandings or miscommunication” (p. 21) and manifesting in “intolerance and lack of goodwill” (p. 21), whereas discourses of anti-racism view these issues and conflicts as arising from deep-rooted inequities and power imbalances and manifesting in “bias, discrimination, hatred, exclusion and violence” (p. 21). These are important distinctions as the perspectives of the problem and its manifestation has implications on the kinds of policy interventions sought out to remedy the problem. Within the multicultural framework, Dei and Calliste suggest remedies include things like “education-sharing and exchange of ideas” (p. 21), while within the anti-racist framework, resolution is only possible with a vision of “fundamental structural/societal change” (p. 21).
Complicity and Performing “Discourses of Diversity”

Diversity and equity-related discourses permeate all levels of university life. In speaking the discourses of diversity and equity, individuals are in fact performing the discourse because their speech acts do something. Institutional actors are not simply describing but they are recreating and reinforcing social norms. Interpreting Butler’s performativity concept, Felluga (2011) describes how the discourse keeps intact and maintains the status quo.

For Butler, the distinction between the personal and the political or between private and public is itself a fiction designated to support an oppressive status quo: our most personal acts are, in fact, continually being scripted by hegemonic social conventions and ideologies. (¶ 65)

Such discourses illustrate the way social norms may dictate what is acceptable speech, language, and expression, in relation to equity. These discourses consequently dictate the ethos and cultural norms around educational equity. The interplay of hegemonic ideological discourse and cultural compliance can be understood as a form of complicity. Hutcheon (1989) uses a postmodernist lens to describe the phenomenon of complicity. Starting in the late 20th century, postmodernist ideas emphasized the importance of critical theory and the need to re-evaluate Western European value systems that informed institutional, social, and cultural ideals. Hutcheon says postmodern theory and practice suggest everything always is cultural and mediated by representations. She challenges the notion that any texts or discourses are transparent, apolitical, and innocent expressions of our experience of the world. She suggests they are more accurately constructs, rather than reflections, influenced by prevailing value systems and dominant ideologies of the western world. As such, postmodernism is primarily concerned with “denaturalizing” what we take for granted as “natural” but which is in fact cultural, like capitalism, patriarchy, liberal
humanism, and so forth (Hutcheon, 1989). That having been said, Hutcheon suggests that “postmodernism is a phenomenon whose mode is resolutely contradictory as well as unavoidably political” (p. 1). She says postmodernism is “neither neo-conservatively nostalgic, nor radically revolutionary” (p. 1). She likens postmodernism to “saying something whilst at the same time putting inverted commas around what is being said” (p. 1) so that the effect is to highlight and to subvert in an ironic way. This duplicity is a distinctive character of postmodernism. It installs and reinforces as much as it undermines and subverts the conventions and presuppositions it challenges. It holds the tension between inscription and subversion, between construction and deconstruction. In this way it is both critical of and complicitous with that which precedes it – the grand narrative. The grand narrative or dominant discourse from the perspective of educational equity is determined, in the 21st century, by neoliberal ideologies.

Whether conscious or unconscious, explicit or implicit, the perpetuation of attitudes and behaviours that inform discourses of diversity are complicitous. Butler (2009) argues discourses of diversity are performed and perpetuated by all actors to some extent in a “complicated interplay of obligation and desire…a desire that is and is not one’s own” (p. xi). She describes subjects as complicitous in this discursive interplay:

When we act, and act politically, it is already within a set of norms that are acting upon us, and in ways that we cannot always know about. When and if subversion or resistance becomes possible, it does so not because [one] is a sovereign subject, but because a certain historical convergence of norms at the site of [one’s] embodied personhood opens up possibilities for action. (p. xii)

The notion of complicity or co-construction of dominant discourses is a dilemma that brings to mind a relevant question posed by Lorde (1979/2007) in relation to any consideration of de/reconstructing neoliberalism as a dominant, normative hegemony: “What does it mean when the
tools of a racist patriarchy are used to examine the fruits of that same patriarchy” (p. 1)? Her response is: “It means that only the most narrow parameters of change are possible and allowable” (p. 1). Fairclough (1989) would propose critical approaches to both conceptualizing and implementing educational equity in the academy to interrupt the ways dominant discourses reproduce power and inequality in the academy. Davies, Gottsche and Bansel (2006) would say, if subversion, resistance, and de/re-construction are to take place, subjects must recognize when conscious or unconscious complicity begins to turn into docility to the extent that the neoliberal movement appears inevitable. Educational equity policy implementation or inaction can be examined using the aforementioned conceptual understandings of discursive and performative practices as well as the power dynamics underlying hegemony and complicity in the process of governmentality. Having discussed these key concepts and dynamics, I will now turn to describing the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of my study.

**Theoretical and Methodological Frameworks for Analysis**

The theoretical perspectives I adopt for analyzing educational equity discourses can be subsumed under the general heading of critical theory, which, according to Payne and Barbera (2010), “persists in confronting a recurring chain of skeptical epistemological questions” (p. 153). Payne and Barbera, drawing on Geuss’s (1981) elaboration of the definitions of critical theory, assert that critical theory “gives the highest importance...to the recognition that knowledge constitutes power” (2010, p. 153), among other concerns. Specifically, I employ a critical race feminism frame and utilize critical policy and critical discourse analysis theories and methods. These frameworks are not only appropriate for the qualitative nature of this study but
they are influenced by my identity and experiences as a racialized woman. Earlier I referred to three reasons why I am particularly interested in the raced and gendered aspects of educational equity. I described the first two: the plethora of reported incidents of overt and systemic racism on Canadian campuses, and the dearth of racialized women administrators among the ranks of senior administrators. The third reason, my own identity and positionality, is elaborated below as a preface to describing the conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of my research.

**Researcher Identity – The Insider/Outsider**

My particular interest in the raced and gendered aspects of educational equity discourse and practice may be most influenced by my own social identity, positionality, and personal and professional experiences in the academy. As a racialized woman administrator in an environment characterized by a dearth of racialized women among the ranks of senior administrators, I have a unique vantage point from which to examine issues of educational equity policy implementation. Dua (2009) suggests universities are institutional settings with embedded historical, political, economic, social, and cultural discourses that construct racialized and gendered environments across which administrators and scholars must navigate. Dumas and Anyon (2006) describe the academy as a “battlefield on colonial and racialized ground” (p. 150). The challenges presented to racialized women in higher educational environments were expressed by Essed (2000) as the “dilemmas emerging from the exceptional, visible, sometimes token, often solitary position of women of colour in university departments” (p. 889). Certainly, my personal and professional experiences as a racialized female scholar and my journey to a senior administrative role have involved continual consideration and navigation of the raced and gendered academic
environment. As a racialized woman, in a senior administrative position in a Canadian university, I am uniquely positioned as both an insider and outsider in the academy. Naples (1996) describes the dynamic relationship between insider and outsider positions:

I start with the assumption that, rather than one “insider” or “outsider” position, we all begin our work with different relationships to shifting aspects of social life and to particular knowers in the community and this contributes to numerous dimensions through which we can relate to residents of various communities. “Outsiderness” and “insiderness” are not fixed or static positions, rather they are ever-shifting and permeable social locations. Community processes that reorganize and resituate race-ethnicity, gender and class relations form some of the most salient aspect of the “outsider” phenomenon. (p. 83)

As an administrator, I have access to certain kinds of information and a level of decision-making that many others do not. In this way, I have insider privileges and hold some power and authority within the scope of my areas of responsibility in a non-academic department. At the same time, as a member of two designated equity-seeking social groups, I am an outsider to the dominant institutional social and cultural norms and less influential with respect to its political and cultural evolution. Not only am I in a marginal position with respect to my location in a non-academic administrative position, but I am also in a marginal position by virtue of my social location as a consequence of my social identities in this raced and gendered environment. Given my perspective, situated in the middle space of insider/outsider, my research will inevitably be mediated or filtered through the lenses of my social identity, positionality, and my personal and professional experiences in the academy. My work will thus seek to be both reflexive and praxis oriented, with the aim of encouraging research participants and readers, as agents of change, to critique their own approaches and contributions to educational equity policy implementation, while at the same time interrogating my own agency and accountability to the same.
Critical Race Feminism or Anti-Racist Feminist Theory

Educational equity is fundamentally about access to information, knowledge, and opportunity. As this access is arguably complicated by sociocultural and socioeconomic status in a stratified society, critical race feminism becomes an instructive theoretical framework from which to analyze educational equity policy decisions, from problematization of the issue, through placing the issue on institutional agendas, to developing implementable policies. Critical race feminism focuses on issues of power and oppression, and it relies and builds on tenets consolidated from antecedent iterations of feminist and critical race theories. Some scholars use the term critical race feminism interchangeably with anti-racist feminism, both of which are forms of post-structural feminism. Post-structuralism seeks to reveal the hidden ways that power is embedded in structures and systems and how it operates or functions to benefit select, socio-economically elite, members of society. It is a philosophy concerned with social justice and approaches this goal by problematizing arguably essentialist binary categories such as gender and racial identifiers, like “male”/“female” and “Black”/“White”, respectively. Davies and Gannon (2005) describe post-structural feminism, in particular, as concerned with discursive practices and regimes that underlie the processes of gendered and raced subjectification and social stratification. Post-structural anti-racist feminism is a “third wave” feminist theory, following “first wave” liberal feminism, which, according to Davies and Gannon, concerns itself with “a discourse of individual rights in order to gain access to the public domain” (p. 318), and “second wave” radical feminism, which “celebrates and essentializes womanhood in order to counteract the negative constructions of women and girls in masculinist discourse” (p. 318).
Post-structuralist feminism is an evolution of feminism that, anti-racist or critical race feminist theorists, like Dua (1999), say, better attends to issues of racialization as well as global and transnational identities and positionalities of diverse women. The central tenet underpinning anti-racist feminist theory is its integration of a race analysis into feminist theorizing. Dua describes anti-racist feminist thought as a “distinctive feminist epistemology” (p. 8) that brings an analysis of race to feminist theorizing. According to Dua, in the context of the “historical marginalization of anti-racist scholarship within feminist theorizing” (p. 8), anti-racist feminists seek to not only integrate issues of race and gender, along with other domains of oppression, but also to foreground racism, making it as central as, if not more central than, gender inequity. Dua points to the importance of contextualizing Canadian anti-racist feminist thought as stemming from the theorizing and writings of women of colour located in a society with a “history of post-colonial, white settler formation” (p. 10). She says,

Historically, the notion of who could be legally eligible for Canadian citizenship was tied to race, skin colour…Today, the stereotype of who is and is not a Canadian works to reinforce the historical process by which indigenous, mixed race, African-Canadians, Asian-Canadians, Arab-Canadians, and others have been marginalized from Canadian society, as it obscures the history of colonialism, settlement, immigration, and citizenship policies that ensured the racialization and gendering of twentieth century Canada. Anti-racist feminists have concentrated on analyzing the forces that have shaped the historically specific patterns of racialization in Canada. It is their focus on the process of racialization, which differentiates their writing from other kinds of feminist theorizing. (p. 7)

Anti-racist feminists have put forward three different approaches to studying race and gender: one is a standpoint approach; a second is a political economy approach; and, a third is a discourse approach. The standpoint epistemology begins with and centres the lived experiences of women of colour. Dua (1999) references anti-racist scholar Bannerji (1995) who ascribes to the standpoint theoretical framework and argues that it is from the lived experience that one can
“gain insight into the social relations and culture of advanced capitalism which allow for direct representation and a revolutionary political agency” (Bannerji, 1995, p. 63). Among scholars who advocate the political economy theoretical framework, Dua also references Stasiulis (1990), who focuses on the “inevitable intrusions capitalist relations within the construction of intersecting forms of oppression” (Stasiulis, 1990, p. 294). The third approach emphasizes the study of the discourse of race and its impact on racialization and racism. Whatever the methodological approach, critical race feminism as a conceptual framework generally places import on the need to: (a) recognize and address the integrative nature of socially constructed categories of race and gender, which also intersect with socio-economic status and other coded social identities, (b) consider a complex multiplicity of raced and gendered experiences, (c) acknowledge and interrogate the normalization of racism, and (d) disrupt and dismantle notions of equality that undermine the recognition of both individual and system racism.

**Critical Policy Analysis**

Fowler (2013) describes the policy process as “a sequence of events that occurs when a political system considers different approaches to public problems, adopts one of them, tries it out, and evaluates it” (p. 14). According to Sabatier (2007), conventional theoretical frameworks of the policy process have been influenced by what is referred to as the “stages heuristic model” or “textbook approach” (p. 6), advanced by policy analysts in the mid-1980s. These depict various stages of a policy cycle, including agenda setting, policy formulation and legitimation, implementation, and evaluation (Figure 2).
Althaus, Bridgman and Davis (2007) offer a more detailed graphic representation that highlights eight rather than four steps in the cycle (Figure 3). This depiction illustrates a more integrated nature of the various phases in the policy process and replaces the agenda setting label by teasing out the process of agenda setting to highlight its important constituents parts: identifying the salient issues, analyzing the policy problem, investigating policy instruments and choices, consulting with stakeholders, and coordinating the policy process. While the model does not depict discreet stages, it still presents a linear and sequential process. As stated by Fowler (2013), these classical models of the policy process have been criticized for presenting the process as more rational and orderly that it really is. However, the models do serve as useful frameworks from which to begin an examination of the policymaking process.
These models illuminate potential points where policy implementation can get stalled. The articulation of more detailed aspects of each stage in the cycle serves to emphasize the importance of attending to a complexity of processes proceeding and following implementation. Attending to all aspects drives the continuous cycle. Inattention at any point in the cycle can stall the process. In both diagrammatic renderings shown above, evaluation can be viewed as taking place both before policy formulation and after policy implementation, an important point that is also related to accurate and reflective goal setting and progress reporting. When institutional policymakers develop and implement educational equity policy, it is presumed that due consideration has been given to all other components of the policy cycle. However, challenges in
implementing educational equity policy may, and do, result, in part, from overlooking the integrated and iterative nature of the constituent parts of the policy process.

Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, and Henry (1997) suggest that, while descriptions of the stages heuristic framework appear as discreet, linear, and sequential stages, a critical perspective would suggests that “most policy is developed in a more disjointed, less rational and more political fashion” (p. 25). As Dowcett Johnston (2011) put forward, the policy-making process is influenced by available evidence, defined values, and shifting politics. In the problem identification and agenda setting phase, university administrators and policymakers must ask whether to address educational equity, and here is where it is imperative to understand and frame the equity problem (Delaney, 2002). In fact, Brown (1996) says that identifying and clarifying the problem area is a process that can be a “messy, confused and poorly understood” (p. 22). On the subjects of agenda setting and issue framing in public policy, Orsini and Smith (2007) state,

Agenda-setting is premised in large part on empirical rational-choice-inspired theories of policy making…[but]…issue definition…finds its roots in constructionist or interpretivist – even antiempirical – research strategies in political communications, emphasizing the importance of language and the subjective, manipulable descriptions that structure everyday politics. (p. 188)

Taylor (1997) argues that little attention has been paid to methodology in educational policy research and that literature on the policy process is mostly uncritical in its approach. She illuminates the utility of critical approaches, and specifically discourse theory, in analyzing and understanding equity policy processes and the politics of change. New approaches to policy studies in Canada have widened the field of public policy and introduced new concepts and frameworks that offer tools to examine and understand the educational equity policy process in Canadian universities. Orsini and Smith (2007) describe the public policy discipline as having
been historically dominated by a “technocratic form of policy analysis” and a “paradigm of rational choice” (p. 3). They suggest there are new post-empiricist alternatives to this conventional approach, and they use the term “critical policy analysis” (p. 1) to cover a suite of approaches and perspectives they believe are most relevant for the contemporary Canadian policy context, against the “backdrop of globalization and neoliberalism” (p. 4). Orsini and Smith consider how one might incorporate new knowledges into the policy process and whether these new ways of knowing require us to redraw the contours of the public policy field.

**Critical Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method**

Studying and understanding equity discourse is instrumental to analyzing equity policy implementation. Discourses and discourse communities are powerful and they may, in part, explain some of the challenges policy makers and practitioners encounter in identifying and defining the educational equity goals in Canadian institutions of higher education. Applying critical theory and inquiry to the study of discursive practices, brings me to critical discourse analysis. Jaworski and Coupland (2006a) argue that discourse analysis is not simply a method that can be understood through a “set of rules and procedures for discourse analysts to follow” (p. 125). Instead, they suggest that taking up the task of analyzing and interrogating discourses is, in and of itself, a post-positivist theoretical perspective that “rules out certain research methods” (p. 126). Fairclough (1995), one of the best-known contemporary scholars who critically analyze public discourses, says that critical discourse analysis is an “analytical framework for studying connections between language, power and ideology” (p. 23). Taylor (1997) also says critical discourse analysis declares and calls attention to the centrality of
language and meaning as well as the importance of social power relations, politics, culture, and practice in this methodology.

In everyday interactions, Fischer (2003) explains that discourses are not merely random discussions or conversations, but rather, represent social practices that produce and reproduce systems of power relations:

Discourse theory...starts from the assumption that all actions, objects, and practices are socially meaningful and that these meanings are shaped by the social and political struggles in specific historical periods...The meanings of the words used and the statements employed in a discourse depend on the social context in which they are uttered, including positions or arguments against which they are advanced. At the level of everyday interaction, discourses represent specific systems of power and the social practices that produce and reproduce them. (p. 2)

Thus, Fischer suggests that the goal of discourse analysis is to uncover how the range of actions and objects considered discourses, including “verbal statements, historical events, interviews, ideas, politics, among others” (p.2), are socially constructed and how they influence social organization and interaction. Language is critically important at all stages of the policy process, but particularly impactful at the policy agenda setting stage. Various terms and discourses are used strategically and ethically to frame equity problems and rationalize equity policy implementation to align with institutional ideological and political perspectives and goals.

Adoption of educational equity policies is influenced by the degree to which the institution is able to define and frame its equity issues and goals. In turn, these framing challenges have implications for getting multipronged educational equity goals on the institutional policy agenda, let alone designing, implementing, and evaluating these policies to achieve identified objectives. The policy choices presented and the decisions ultimately taken for implementation will be heavily influenced by discourse: the terminology used to describe the problem, the meanings
attributed to term used, real and perceived ideological associations with each term, as well as interpretations and understandings of the issues. In the implementation phase, the policy question turns to how Canadian universities should act to address educational equity.

According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2002), discourse takes on different forms and discourse analysis comprises a series of interdisciplinary approaches to examine these forms. They say, whatever the approach, as a theoretical framework, discourse analysis is premised on a critical perspective that seeks to understand the relationship between language and subject, and how “aspects of the world construct different identities for speakers” (p. 2). The undergirding perspective informing the analytical approach I take is rooted in social constructionism. Jorgensen & Phillips describe the social constructionist approach as being premised on four philosophical assumptions: (a) a critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge, (b) historical and cultural specificity, (c) a link between knowledge and social processes, and (d) a link between knowledge and social action. The first assumption asserts that any knowledge we have of the world should not be considered as an objective or absolute truth. The second assumption suggests that our perspectives and understanding of the world are contingent or mediated by our historical and cultural experiences and realities. The third assumption describes our way of viewing and understanding the world as being shaped and sustained by social interactions and social processes. The fourth assumption connects the possibility of taking social action to particular worldviews, thereby arguing that worldviews have social consequences. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) suggest that “underlying the word ‘discourse’ is the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people’s utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life…” (p. 1). Specifically, they identify two domains in which patterns of discourse may be studied. They discuss the “macro-sociological analysis” of social
practice and specific texts as well as the “micro-sociological analysis” of everyday actions and conversation (2002, p. 66). The next section describes the rationale for the domains in which I choose to analyze equity discourse and its implications on educational equity policy implementation in higher education.

Multi-Level Social Domains of Discourse and Policy Analysis

Canaan and Shumar (2008) assert that researchers have not, until recently, systematically studied the higher educational system in the context of multiple levels of influences. Malen (1994) uses micro-political theories and models to advance a multi-level framework within which to analyze educational institutions as organized systems. The field of micro-politics examines obvious and hidden processes through which individuals and groups within an organization obtain and employ power to disseminate and defend their interests.

Scholars in these fields [sociology and politics of education] have long recognized that schools are mini political systems, nested in multi-level governmental structures, charged with salient public service responsibilities and dependent on diverse constituencies. Confronted with complex, competing demands, chronic resources shortages, unclear technologies, uncertain supports and value-laden issues, schools face difficult, divisive allocative choices. As in any polity, actors in schools manage the inherent conflict and make the distributional decisions through processes that pivot on power exercised in various ways and in various arenas. (Malen, 1994, p. 148)

While her research focuses on public school systems, Malen’s work, to demonstrate how “politics is in large measure about the acquisition and exercise of power in a polity” (pp. 159 - 160), has application in any educational organization, including universities. Malen summarizes what she refers to as the “faces” of power, which are evident in the study of policy implementation in any educational system:
Some employ ‘pluralist’ views and concentrate on the overt manifestations of power evidenced by influence (or non-influence) on salient, contentious decisions. Others draw on ‘elitist’ views that emphasize the more covert expressions of power apparent in the suppression of dissent, the confinement of agendas to ‘safe’ issues, the manipulation of symbols and the ‘suffocation’ of ‘demands for change in the existing allocation of benefits and privileges’ (Backarach and Baratz, 1970: 44). Still others draw on ‘radical’ (Lukes, 1974) or ‘critical’ views. These delve into the more opaque if not invisible ‘third face’ of power and derive inferences on how power relations shape aspirations and define interests through subtle but presumably detectable processes of socialization/indoctrination that elude the awareness of the individuals who succumb to them but may be evident to the analyst who searches for them (Gaventa, 1980, Lukes, 1974). All these views of power have their advocates and critics (Geary 1992). All have made their way into studies of the ‘micropolitics’ of schools. (p. 148)

Malen (2006) offers a framework that considers micro and macro-levels of sociological and political analysis and emphasizes the role of power relations between diverse individual actors as well as institutional forces that create the condition for or against equity. At the micro or individual level, factors and processes play out in the intrapersonal and interpersonal domains. At the macro or systemic level, institutional and cultural barriers to implementation of educational equity policy are situated in the societal, organizational, and group domains. This multi-level approach to studying educational equity policy is consistent with social ecological models (SEMs) of behaviour change, such as the five-level SEM advanced by McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, and Glanz (1988). According to McLeroy et al. (1998), the two key concepts that form the premise of the SEM model are that (a) behaviour affects and is affected by multiple levels of influence, and (b) individual behaviour shapes, and is shaped by, the social environment. The SEM proposed by McLeroy et al. describes five levels of influence: intrapersonal, interpersonal, organizational, community, and public policy. Figure 4 depicts an adaptation of McLeroy et al.’s SEM using the higher educational context to populate domains.
At the intrapersonal level, individual attitudes, knowledge and skill that influence behaviour come into play. At the interpersonal level, processes that occur within family and peer groups, which influence behaviour, come into play. At the organizational level, institutional rules, regulations, policies, and structures that constrain or promote behaviours come into play.
At the community level, processes that occur within social networks that influence community norms and, therefore, individual behaviour come into play. At the public policy level, local, provincial and national policies, and laws that regulate or support behaviours play a role.

Malen’s (2006) two-tiered framework of analysis can be viewed as combining McLeroy et al.’s (1998) intrapersonal and interpersonal levels into one micro-level domain as well as combining the organizational, community, and social levels into one macro-level domain. Malen suggests the interplay between educational equity discourse and policy implementation can be understood by exploring both macro-level systemic organizational power issues as well as micro-level individual and human relations impacts. According to Malen, access to various forms of power, embodied in financial, informational, social, and cultural capital, is necessary to influence policy development and implementation. She describes the relationship between power, politics, and policy-making. She says,

> Politics pivots on power – here meaning the relative capacity of actors to exert influence on policy developments. The actors’ power can be gauged by analyzing the resources that actors can draw upon to exercise influence in organizational contexts (Dahl, 1984; Kanter, et al., 1992). Some refer to actors’ resources as the capital that they command by virtue of their organizational position, individual attributes, social connections, professional networks and reputed stature (Orr, 1999; Stone, 1998; Wells & Serna, 1996). (pp. 87 - 88)

Malen posits that assessing actors’ assets, with respect to the forms of capital referenced in her quote above, can provide an indication of an actor’s level of power and, therefore, resources and policy currency. However, she cautions that such power may not be sufficient to influence policy if actors do not have the “skill and will” to translate their assets into policies and practices to meet “pressing problems at opportune moments” (p. 88). She describes her framework as one that helps policy analysts to “examine the politics of policy adoption and implementation (or lack of same)” (p. 84). She explains,
Actors have different interests, here meaning the complex webs of values, views, orientations, dispositions, preferences, and convictions that shape their perceptions of public problems and the policy solutions that may be attached to them (Morgan, 1986). Generally speaking, actors seek to promote and protect their vested material and ideological interests; they seek to secure private benefits and to advance their diverse conceptions of the public good. Policies embody values, theories of interventions, and orientations to social and educational issues that may or may not conform to the ideas, interests, and ideals of the actors who were involved in their adoption or the expanded slate of actors who are involved in their implementation. These alignments and discontinuities matter. (p. 87)

Malen (2006) goes on to say the policies that do not correspond with groups of actors’ interests will necessarily be met with resistance. The task here, she says, is to anticipate how policies will be construed among various actors in order to leverage and exploit sources of both allegiance and resistance. According to Malen, “since policy both regulates and precipitates conflict, the overarching analytic challenge is to get at the reciprocal relationship between politics and policy” (p. 85). Politics refers to the ways that individuals and groups of people promote particular views, negotiate with and among each other, as well as establish and enforce social and cultural rules or norms. Malen uses a “games” metaphor that traces the interplay between the players, their stakes, resources, strategies, and tactics as well as the rules that govern their play in the political game represented by the particular policy. I would argue that the terms that Malen uses more accurately reflect a “war-games” metaphor, so, while potentially instructive in describing the relationship between various political aspects in the policy process, I find the analogy to be somewhat adversarial or militant. That being said, the politics and political movements of various institutional actors and groups in relation to educational equity policy shine the light on power differences and, as such, can evoke personal concerns related to identity, inclusion, belonging, dignity, opportunity, rights, and safety for instance.
Hurtado et al. (2012) offer another multi-level model for specifically analyzing diversity and equity in the higher education context. They describe,

…micro-systems that include individuals and roles, meso-systems, or spheres of interaction, exo-systems (external communities and associative networks) or concrete social structures that influence and constrain what goes on in meso-systems, and how macro-systems (larger policy and socio-historical change contexts) exert an equally powerful influence over all. (p. 48)

My study frames the analysis of educational equity policy implementation in the academy across three domains, the macro-, meso-, and micro-levels, which I also refer to as the public, political, and private domains of analysis, respectively. Like Malen (2006), I consider the intrapersonal and interpersonal levels together in the micro-level or private domain of my research. However, I separate the social level and consider it alone as the macro-level or public domain of my study. The organizational and community levels are considered, in my study, as the meso-level or political domain of analysis. At the macro-level, or in the public domain, my study explores the influence that politically and culturally hegemonic neoliberal ideology in Canada has had on social and institutional diversity and equity discourses. This is accomplished through a review of secondary source literature on the subject. At the meso-level, or the political domain, my research examines how certain social and institutional diversity and equity discourses, in the context of a neoliberalism, may impede educational equity policy implementation in the academy as manifested in Presidential installation speeches. At the micro-level, or private domain, my research analyzes individual interviews of senior administrators, including their reported sense and employment of personal agency to affect social change in the academy as it relates to educational equity.
Chapter Summary

This chapter defined and discussed the conceptual underpinnings of the theoretical approaches I use in my study as well as the theoretical frameworks themselves. I began by describing concepts such as values, interests, ideology, politics, governmentality, cultural hegemony, discourses, as well as discursive and performative practices. I then turned to describing my theoretical approaches, starting with a discussion of my identity and positionality as researcher and the implications of these on my research topic and focus. The chapter lays the foundation for the analytical lens through which I consider whether and how neoliberalism, as a dominant hegemonic ideology, informs discursive and performative practices that, in turn, influence educational equity policy in higher education.

First, I described the ways that values and interests undergird ideologies and the process by which ideologies become culturally hegemonic. Then I discussed how power and politics interplay in the process of governmentality and public policymaking. Once I described how hegemonic ideologies and governmentality work through discursive and performative practices, I turned to discussing the analytical frameworks I would employ to answer my research questions. In summary, I described and rationalized my choice of critical race feminist as well as critical policy and discourse analytical frameworks to examine educational equity discourse in higher education across systemic, institutional and individual domains: the macro-level public domain, the meso-level political domain, and the micro-level private domain. Having rationalized the relevance and appropriateness of my selected analytical frameworks, I now turn to describe my methodological choices for the design of my research build on the work of scholars described in the preceding literature review.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, I describe the research methodologies I chose for my study. I begin by recapping my research problem and questions as well as the overall conceptual and theoretical frameworks undergirding my research. Next, I discuss the methodological philosophy that follows from my conceptual and theoretical perspective and the research strategies I chose to collect, analyze, and interpret data. I also discuss the various domains from which I collected data for my research. Following this discussion, on research strategies and domains, I identify the objects and subjects I chose for analysis. I then discuss the sampling process and rationale I employed to select the objects and subjects of my study. Finally, the methods of data collection and analysis I used are defined and described.

Problem and Purpose Overview

My study aims to uncover and examine the dominant social and institutional ideologies and discourses informed by and informing the perspectives and practices of senior administrators, and the consequent implications of their ideological perspectives and discursive practices on educational equity policy implementation in Canadian academe. My research questions are designed to enable the study of macro-, meso-, and micro-level domains of analysis:
1. What are the ideological underpinnings of dominant discourses in academe and how do these discourses relate to educational equity policy implementation?

2. How might senior leader discourses and ideologies affect educational equity policy implementation?

3. What barriers and enablers are thought to influence educational equity policy implementation according to senior administrators?

4. How do senior administrators perceive and practice educational equity?

5. How do senior leaders think their own social identities and positionalities influence their perspectives and practices in relation to educational equity?

The first question relates to the macro-level or public domain of analysis; this domain represents the broader systemic societal factors influencing ideology and discourse in the academy. The second and third questions relate to the meso-level or political domain of analysis; this domain represents the systemic institutional and organizational manifestations of educational equity discourse and policy implementation. The fourth and fifth questions relate to the micro-level or private domain of analysis; this domain represents individual intrapersonal and interpersonal perspectives and practices that have implications on educational equity policy implementation.

**Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks Informing Methodology**

Recall in the previous chapter I described my theoretical perspective as a composite of a few paradigms. I use critical race feminist as well as critical policy and discourse analytical approaches to examine educational equity discourses that may impact educational equity policy
implementation. These overarching theoretical frameworks call for the use of qualitative research strategies and methods. As a corollary to utilizing quantitative methods to build knowledge through the collection and interpretation of empirical evidence and logical argumentation, I utilize qualitative methods to build knowledge through the collection and interpretation of theoretical evidence and conceptual argumentation (Lewis, 2010). I use phenomenological and discursive methods of inquiry, to interpret phenomenon and practices to make sense of and transform social spheres and relations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

**Methods**

Certain university texts, written and spoken, reveal both institutional and individual discourses, which may facilitate or hinder educational equity policy implementation. Such texts might include some of the following: Presidential installation speeches; everyday conversations of and language used by senior administrators; press releases and publicity statements; values, vision and mission statements; strategic academic and research plans; and, diversity, inclusivity, and/or equity plans. All of these texts arguably represent the symbolic or real values, goals, and commitments of uppermost administration. Together these texts contribute to reinforcing the institutional discourse around educational equity. In turn, the discourse establishes the environment or climate in which senior administrators draw information about and inform institutional norms in relation to educational equity. This environment is both influenced by and influential on the perceptions and practices of individual administrators as well as the collective administrative ethos concerning educational equity.
My study employed phenomenological and historical strategies to collect and analyze textual data through narrative and document discourse analysis methods (Josselson, 2011). Phenomenology is an appropriate strategy to uncover the conscious personal experiences of interview participants and to reveal how these participants understand their experiences in relation to educational equity. The strategies are also characterized as historical in that the questions invite participants to speak about their historical personal and professional experiences and to relate these to their present perceptions and practices with respect to educational equity. Narrative methods of inquiry and analysis are “concerned with the production, interpretation and representation of storied accounts of lived-experiences” (Shacklock & Thorp, 2005, p. 156) and depicting how these socially constructed and contextual lived-experiences contribute to the complexity among individuals and within society. Narrative accounts of lived-experiences, perceptions, and understanding of participants, in relation to the research topic, were drawn out through semi-structured interview questions. As a method for data analysis, I used discourse analysis to study “forms of text and talk” (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 2). The scope of critical discourse analysis I undertook included the systematic analysis of text-oriented forms of discourse, including spoken and written language, an approach advanced by Fairclough (2003).

As my research focused on the discourses that influence and emanate from senior administrators, I selected to analyze oral texts from stories narrated by senior administrators as well as written texts from documented installation speeches delivered by university Presidents. These stories and speeches represent primary sources of data obtained directly from senior administrators. I refer to these two domains of source data as private and political domains, respectively. Private stories and political speeches were contrasted with what I refer to as public scripts generated by and through dominant discourses in society, and by extension institutions of
higher learning. These public scripts were explored through secondary sources from documented research of scholars who have extensively studied the subject of neoliberal ideology in relation to equity-related discursive and performative practices. In particular, I reviewed and employed the work of key scholars who have used the discourse analysis method extensively to study discursive barriers to educational equity and social justice in society and in the academy. In Figure 5, I offer a graphical representation and description of the private, political, and public domains of analysis to which I refer.
Sample and Sampling Process

As a qualitative study, the sample size was necessarily contained in order to achieve depth of information from interviews and other textual narratives analyzed. My intention was to secure 10 interviews with senior administrators among the ranks of Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Provosts, Vice-Provosts, Associate Vice Presidents, and Associate Vice-Provosts across top-ranked research-intensive medical and comprehensive universities in Canada. The shortlisting process included selecting universities based on both their ranking and geographic location so that the sample would, to the extent possible, reflect regional representation among the top ranked institutions. Top research-intensive medical and comprehensive universities were selected as sites of analysis because, not only do they project a national and international reputation for excellence in higher education, they offer opportunities and benefits to world-class scholars, faculty and students alike, by virtue of their robust programs across medical, professional, and graduate studies. While different configurations or groupings of schools could have been selected for such a study on educational equity policy discourse and its implications, I was particularly interested in how Canadian schools that seek to project a global image of excellence in higher education contend and fare with educational equity issues as part of this image.

The sampling pool selected was specific to Canadian universities that have been ranked in top spots for research intensive and comprehensive institutions. This sample selection criterion was chosen with the express interest in exploring whether the label of “top” university is correlated with educational equity commitments and outcomes. The fact that these universities are ranked among the top Canadian schools may be one of very few, if not the only, commonality. The schools in the sample represent very different geographic locations and political influences,
reflect very different community and campus demographic profiles, espouse very different organizational priorities and values, and transmit very different institutional cultures. This may or may not be a limitation, but certainly must be a consideration when interpreting findings. An examination of four sources of national and global university rankings, led to the identification of a shortlist of Canadian universities from which senior administrators would be invited to participate in phone interviews and from which Presidential speeches would be retrieved and analyzed. That being said, recall that Queen’s University was excluded from this study as it is my home institution and I declared a conflict of interest at the outset of my research. Also, I elected to exclude French language universities, such as the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, Université du Quebec, and Université de Sherbrooke to eliminate the need to account for particular social, political, and cultural differences between these schools and English language universities. In the tables below, ranked French language universities are greyed out.

Several bodies annually rank universities around the world, based on a variety of criteria. The publications of ranking bodies I reviewed in selecting institutions to include in this study are the MacLean’s Annual University Rankings, the Higher Education Strategy Associates, the Times Higher Education World University Rankings, and the Academic Ranking of World Universities. These four ranking bodies are among those most referenced and referred to in Canadian higher education. When selecting institutional Presidential installation speeches to review, the rankings described above were considered along with the institutions included among the U15, a group of 15 leading research-intensive public universities in Canada. The U15 body claims to have been established to “capitalize on the full benefits of cooperation, collaboration and knowledge-sharing to address public policy challenges and to advance research and
innovation that improve the quality of life in Canada and around the world” (U15, n.d., ¶ 2). The ranking bodies are described below and the tables highlight institutional rankings.

The Canadian news magazine Maclean’s is one notable publication that documents annual rankings of publicly funded universities in Canada, split into three categories: medical doctoral, comprehensive, and primarily undergraduate. The first category includes schools with professional medical programs as well as a wide range of graduate doctoral programs; the second lists schools with extensive selections of both undergraduate and graduate programs; the third includes schools that emphasize undergraduate studies with few or no graduate programs. Table 1 lists the top 10 Canadian universities according to the 2014 Maclean’s University Rankings (n.d.).

Table 1
2014 Maclean’s University Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Medical Doctoral</th>
<th>Comprehensive</th>
<th>Primarily Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Mount Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>Acadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Lethbridge*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Queen’s</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>UNBC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Guelph/Memorial*</td>
<td>Saint Mary’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>UPEI/St. FX**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Calgary*</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Bishop’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Western*</td>
<td>Ryerson/Wilfrid Laurier**</td>
<td>Lakehead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*tied for 9th place  *tied for 5th place  **tied for 10th place  **tied for 7th place

The Higher Education Strategy Associates (HESA) is a body that undertakes higher educational research projects on behalf of institutions and governments. In 2012, the HESA (n.d.) conducted research to measure academic research impacts across Canadian universities.
They subsequently ranked the top 10 Canadian universities based on their research strength split across Science and Engineering as well as Social Sciences and Humanities (Table 2).

Table 2
2012 Higher Education Strategy Associates’ Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Science and Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences and Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>UBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>McGill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Université de Montréal</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Guelph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>Université de Montréal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>McMaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Concordia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Times Higher Education World University Ranking is generated by Thomson Reuters and touted as “the only global university performance tables to judge world-class universities across all of their core missions – teaching, research, knowledge transfer and international outlook” (n.d., ¶ 2) This ranking body provides a list based on region or subject. Times Higher Education also produces a World Reputation Ranking that lists universities by the power of their global university brand, based on the subjective judgement of senior published academics. Table 3 lists the Canadian universities ranking in the top 400 of the institutions in the North American region and their rank if they made the top 100 world reputational ranking.
The Academic Ranking of World Universities (n.d.) is another list published annually by Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China. This ranking body, which is more science focused than the Times Higher Education World University Ranking, takes into account the number of alumni and staff winning Nobel Prizes and Field Medals, the number of highly cited researchers, the number of articles published in *Nature* and *Science*, the number of articles in science and social sciences citations indexes, and more. Table 4 lists the 23 Canadian universities that were ranked in the top 500 by this body in 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 100 World Reputational Ranking</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Top 400 World University Ranking - North American Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Université de Montréal</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The University of Calgary</td>
<td>201-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Université Laval</td>
<td>201-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>201-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>226-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Queen’s University</td>
<td>226-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>226-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Western University</td>
<td>226-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>251-275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>276-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>York University</td>
<td>276-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>301-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>351-400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
2013 Academic Ranking of World Universities – Top 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking in Canada</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>World Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>101-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Université de Montréal</td>
<td>101-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>151-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Université Laval</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Queen’s University</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>The University of Calgary</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Western University</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>301-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>301-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>401-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>401-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>Université du Québec</td>
<td>401-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>Université de Sherbrooke</td>
<td>401-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>York University</td>
<td>401-500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After analyzing the rankings (Table 5), having removed Queen’s University, French-language universities, as well as any university that did not rank nationally or internationally based on the criteria described, a sample of 17 universities was shortlisted for possible inclusion in the study of senior administrator interview narratives and Presidential speeches. The sample included the University of Alberta, Dalhousie University, University of Calgary, Carleton University, Guelph University, University of Manitoba, McGill University, McMaster University, Ottawa University, University of British Columbia, University of Saskatchewan, Simon Fraser University, University of Toronto, Victoria University, University of Waterloo, Western University, and York University.
Table 5
Analysis of Rankings for Sample Shortlist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Top 10 MD</th>
<th>Top 5 C</th>
<th>Top 400 Regional</th>
<th>Top 500 World</th>
<th>Top 5 S/E</th>
<th>Top 5 SS/H</th>
<th>U15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample for Narrative Interviews with Senior Administrators

To maximize the number of respondents among institutions consistently ranked among the top Canadian schools according to Maclean’s, Times Higher Education, and the Higher Education Strategy Associates, Canadian universities among the top 10 medical-doctoral and the top five comprehensive institutions were selected for inclusion in the phase of the study that involved interviews with senior administrators. The schools selected for possible inclusion were English-language educational institutions representing Western Canada, Ontario, Quebec, and Eastern Canada. Among the 17 shortlisted universities, three tiers were established for the purpose of conducting rolling invitations by tier (Table 6). The rolling invitation process was
undertaken so as not to overshoot the goal of securing at most 10 interviews with senior administrators across a diversity of these select institutions.

Table 6
Sample for Analysis of Interview Narratives and Presidential Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Interview Invitations</th>
<th>Interviews*</th>
<th>Presidential Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Tier Shortlist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Presidents, Provosts, Vice-Presidents/Provosts, Associate Vice-Presidents/Provosts)

For each institution approached, the current President as well as Provost and Vice President Academic was always invited. Additionally, senior administrators holding Vice- or Associate President and Vice- or Associate Provost positions in those universities were invited if they oversaw portfolios with responsibilities that intersect with any part of the broad definition of educational equity.

The first round of invitations was sent to three or four senior administrators in each of the eight first tier institutions: Alberta, Dalhousie, McGill, McMaster, Ottawa, UBC, Toronto, and Western. All Presidents and Provosts were invited along with select senior administrators.
holding positions as Vice-Presidents, Vice-Provosts, Associate Vice-Presidents, or Associate Vice-Presidents in areas of Human Resources, Operations, Student Services, Equity Services, or International Services, depending on the context of the school. Twenty-three invitations sent drew seven interview participants from this first tier of universities. The second round of invitations was sent to administrators in each of three universities identified in the second tier of schools: Calgary, Guelph, and Waterloo. As in the first round of invitations, the second round of invitations were sent to three or four senior administrators among which were all Presidents and Provosts as well as select Vice-Presidents, Vice-Provosts, Associate Vice-Presidents, or Associate Vice-Presidents. The second set of invitations sent to nine administrators in this second tier of universities yielded three additional interviewees, at which point I had reached my research quota of 10 participants. I did not send invitations to the third tier of schools identified through my shortlisting process.

To secure 10 participants, a total of 33 senior administrators from 11 universities were invited. Contact information for prospective informants was obtained from university websites. Administrators were invited to participate in this research through a personalized letter in the form of a Recruitment Notice emailed to their Executive Assistants. In the invitation email, which was sent with the Recruitment Notice, I introduced myself as a current doctoral student and Assistant Dean of Student Affairs at Queen’s University. Letters of Information and Consent were also emailed with the invitation. The Letters of Information included details about my research purpose and focus as well as a summary of what they could expect from the questions. It was my intention to be as transparent as possible about my interest in exploring the discourses surrounding diversity and equity in academe, the perceptions and practices of participants with respect to educational equity, and the challenges and opportunities to achieving educational
equity from the perspective of the participants. To maximize participation, I chose not to be overly specific about my conceptual approach to my research in the invitation email and Letter of Information. This was a conscious decision in order not to inadvertently detract and distract potential participants who might misconstrue or misjudge concepts such as critical race feminism and terminology such as anti-racism. It was my desire that interview participant would focus on educational equity as an outcome and speak to their own thoughts about the best approaches to realizing educational equity. Referencing educational equity broadly served to prevent seeding or leading their responses towards any particular approach and to mitigate any reluctance to participate due to any apprehension about meanings they attribute to concepts and terminology like anti-racism and critical race feminism. The following are excerpts from the Letter of Information and Consent Form sent:

The purpose of this study is to learn about existing equity policies and practices in Canadian universities and to gain a better understanding of both the challenges and opportunities to achieving educational equity goals from the perspective of senior administrators. Specifically, my research goals include: identifying discourses surrounding diversity and equity and examining their influence on equity policy performativity in Canadian academe; (2) learning about the perspectives and practices of senior administrators in relation to diversity and equity and discerning the implications of these attitudes and behaviours on equity policy performativity; and, (3) identifying any factors and conditions which enable the advancement of equity in the university setting.

You will be asked to answer questions related to diversity and equity policies and practices at your university. Specifically, you will be asked to comment on whether and how you think educational equity is an issue for Canadian universities, your understanding of educational equity goals in the university setting, as well as the challenges and opportunities in achieving equity goals in higher education. A free flowing discussion will ensue depending on the topics you choose to remark on. Information collected is meant to contribute to establishing a set of best practices for achieving equity goals in Canadian universities. You will also be invited to answer whether and how you think your gender and racial identities factor into your perception, experience, understanding and actions surrounding equity in the academy.
In the first round, 24 senior administrators representing 8 institutions in Western Canada, Ontario, Quebec, and Eastern Canada were invited. Seven agreed to participate, 10 declined, and 7 did not respond. In the second round of invitations, three additional institutions, from the shortlist of schools based on my selection criteria, were identified. Nine additional administrators were invited, yielding three more interviewees. Five declined and one did not respond. Of the 13 total invitees who declined an interview, the common reason cited was time constraints. Some participants indicated they were unavailable due to being in employment transition, some leaving their posts, some just arriving at the institution, and others holding a temporary acting post. Ten invitees did not respond and no reminders were sent. Interviews with the 10 invitees who did agree to participate were scheduled for no longer than 30 minutes and conducted through February and March of 2013. Administrators who agreed to participate sent email confirmation of phone interview dates and times either directly or indirectly through their Executive Assistants. The 10 interviewees secured represented 9 different institutions. It is important to make absolutely clear, at this juncture, the anonymity of the participants. Indeed, based on the institutional inclusion and selection criteria, the 10 participants who agreed to participate in interviews necessary belong to one of the institutions among the 17 examined in the Installation Speech review. However, the reader is reminded that Presidents, Provosts, as well as Vice and Associate Presidents and Provosts were invited to participate. In other words, Presidents who delivered the installation speeches analyzed in this study were not necessarily also interviewees.
Sample for Presidential Installation Speech Analysis

To select comparable universities for the phase of the study examining Presidential installation speeches, the sample was drawn from the same shortlist of 17 universities used for the interview phase of the study. However, installation speeches for the President of Carleton University, Roseann O’Reilly Runte, and for the President of the University of Victoria, Jamie Cassels, could not be found on institutional websites. As a result, these two universities were excluded from the analysis of installation speeches. Table 7 lists the 15 Presidents whose installation speeches were examined alongside the name of their institution and the date of their installation.

Table 7
Presidential Installation Speeches Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of President</th>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Installation Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indira Samarasekera</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen J. Toope</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Cannon</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseann O’Reilly Runte</td>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>July 2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Florizone</td>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Summerlee</td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David T. Barnard</td>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Munroe-Blum</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Deane</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Rock</td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilene Busch-Vishniac</td>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Peter</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Naylor</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>November 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feridun Hamdullahpur</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Cassels</td>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>July 2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amit Chakma</td>
<td>Western University</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamdouh Shoukri</td>
<td>York University</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*no Installation Speech available online
Data Collection and Analysis

Data was collected from each of the private, political, and public domains previously discussed. In the public space, discourses identified and discussed by other critical race scholars were applied in my analysis and interpretation. In the political space, written scripts prepared, orally delivered by Presidents, and documented for institutional and governmental audiences were collected and examined. In the private space, oral speech acts in the form of narrative personal accounts in interview conversations with senior administrators are captured and analyzed. Arguably, the discourses in each of the public, political, and private domains are mediated by the extent to which the authors and narrators seek to and are successful in controlling the message delivered. In the context of speech acts by senior academic administrators, the narrators are certainly invested in ensuring their words and deeds cause the least amount of conflict or confusion to avoid any private or public relations controversies. Analyzing discourse across public, political, and private domains seeks to differentiate between discourse that, on the one hand, may simply be rhetoric and discourse that, on the other hand, more closely approaches the reality of happenings in specific universities as well as across higher education institutions generally.

To understand the perspectives and practices of senior academic administrators in relation to educational equity, oral and written textual narratives were collected by conducting phone interviews with consenting senior administrators as well as by securing select documented installation speeches delivered by current Presidents, respectively. Interview participants were among the uppermost echelon of senior administration: Presidents, Provosts, Vice-Presidents, Vice-Provosts, Associate Vice-Presidents, and/or Associate Vice-Provosts. All Presidential
installation speeches analyzed were located on and downloaded from institutional websites. Textual scripts of installation speeches delivered by Presidents represent words deliberately written by or with Presidents for these occasions.

To collect narrative accounts, two semi-structured open-ended trigger questions were asked in every phone interview. The semi-structured nature helped to focus the interviewee on the goals of the interview while the open-ended questions allowed flexibility to draw out emergent themes from the perspectives of the participants. Through individual interviews, my aim was to stimulate dialogue on some or all of the topics broached in the questions and uncover other information facilitated by the open-ended aspect of the semi-structured interview questions. At the beginning of each interview, participants were informed that, for the purposes of this study, the definition of educational equity being considered was a broad definition including four related goals, which were read to each interviewee. At the beginning of interviews, participants were told the definition of educational equity includes the following four elements:

(a) The attraction, engagement, and promotion of representative proportions of staff and faculty from designated equity-seeking groups;

(b) The incorporation of globally inclusive curricular content;

(c) The establishment of inclusive campus environments, responsive to diversity and equity challenges; and,

(d) The recruitment, retention, and success of representative proportions of historically underrepresented students.
Participants were invited to speak to any one or more aspects of this definition of educational equity, as they thought it might relate to either of the two open-ended questions that would be posed to them. The first question asked participants to comment on whether and how they perceived educational equity as an issue for attention in the academy. The prompts associated with the first question intended to surface any barriers or enablers to educational equity policy implementation perceived by each administrator. The second question asked participants to optionally self-identify across race, ethnicity, and gender and to comment on the extent to which they perceived a relationship between their identity and their commitments to educational equity. The gender identity and ethnic background of the interviewees is an aspect of import in this study and, when invited to self-identify, each participant willingly disclosed how they identify on these two dimensions of social identity. The interview questions and prompts asked are as follows:

**Question #1:**
Given the context of the Canadian social, economic, and political landscape, and its influence on universities, can you please comment on whether and how you think educational equity is an issue for Canadian universities?

**Prompting and probing questions to help expand on question #1:**
In what ways do you think your university is meeting educational equity goals?
- If there are challenges, what do you think might be impeding equity policy effectiveness and what strategies may improve effectiveness?
- If there are successes, what strategies are working and how do you know?

**Question #2:**
If you are comfortable, please comment on whether and how you think your gender and racial identities factor into your perceptions, experiences, understanding, and actions around educational equity in the academy.

Every participant spoke at length and fully utilized the entire 30 minutes allotted for the interview. Senior administrators gave rich narrative accounts of their perceptions and practices
with respect to educational equity. Furthermore, they shared personal reflection on their
identities and positionalities in relation to their approaches to educational equity. Although the
data in the Findings sections are presented as short excerpts of interviews relevant to the issues
discussed, it is important to note that, in their entirety, each interview constituted a
comprehensive narrative or story that belonged to each senior administrator.

Interviews were digitally audiotaped with the consent of each participant. At the
conclusion of the interview, and within the 30-minute time frame, a brief member checking
 technique was used whereby a short summary of key components of the interview were restated
to the interviewee to confirm understanding. Interviewees were also reassured that they would
have an opportunity to review the transcripts to enhance the accuracy of information collected
and recorded. All interview audiotapes were transcribed and transcriptions were sent, as
promised, for participants to have the opportunity to provide feedback and correct any misheard
content. Some participants returned corrections and others did not, which I interpreted as signally
concurrence with the content. All final transcripts were coded with a pseudonym intentionally
chosen to match the ethnicity and gender of the interviewee, while maintaining their anonymity.

Themes from personal stories narrated by senior administrators were triangulated with
themes from Presidents’ political installation speeches and contrasted with public institutional
scripts about educational equity. This data was triangulated across domains to surface any
themes related to perceptions, discourses, and practices of senior administrators which may have
implications on educational equity policy implementation.
Chapter Summary

This chapter described the research methodologies I chose for my study based on my underpinning theoretical perspectives. It began by restating my research problem and purpose as well as describing the theoretical frameworks informing the methodological philosophy. A detailed discussion of the methods, sampling process, and sample followed. Once the sample population was described, the strategies I used to collect and interpret data across public, political, and private domains were discussed. Now, I turn to an examination of the evolution of neoliberalism as the dominant social and political ideology in Canada today, influencing public discourses, which have implications on educational equity policy implementation.
CHAPTER FIVE
NEOLIBERAL IDEOLOGY AND DISCOURSE

Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the characteristics of neoliberalism as a political ideology, with the goal of understanding the extent to which it, as a form of governmentality, influences discourses of diversity and complicates educational equity policy implementation in Canadian universities. Uncovering whether and how neoliberal interests and values manifest in and reinforce university discourses of diversity provide clues to help understand the cultural and institutional barriers to educational equity policy implementation. To understand neoliberalism, we must consider the ideological underpinnings from which it emerged and continues to be reinforced. Thus, I begin the chapter by describing the evolution of neoliberalism and its ideological assumptions. The first part of this chapter is dedicated to exploring the origins and development of neoliberalism as a political ideology in Canada. Identifying and understanding the tenets or hallmarks of neoliberalism is critical to examining data collected in my research. Later I discuss how particular discourses of diversity emanating from this ideology perpetuate discursive barriers to educational equity in the academy. After establishing the foundations of neoliberalism in society, I turn to discussing how neoliberalism acts as a form of governmentality and cultural hegemony to influence citizens and subjects. I then move the discussion to the rise, domination, influence, and effects of neoliberalism in the academy. From there, I connect the manifestations of neoliberalism in the academy to the perpetuation of discourses, which undermine the process of educational equity policy implementation.
Evolution of Neoliberalism as a Political Ideology in Canada

According to Gibbins and Youngman (1996), the dominant political culture and prevailing ideology in Canada is determined by a number of complex individual and collective factors, including: moral and religious beliefs, life experiences, personal and political needs and interests, national and global economies, domestic demographics, and, social stability, for example. All of these factors influence and reinforce the dominant political ideology, but this is not to say that the development of ideologies is benign. In the last decade, neoliberalism has emerged as the most influential ideological movement in Canada and globally, affecting social and, by extension, educational policies and programs. Neoliberalism in North America gained popular support in the 1970s, when increasing public debt, unemployment, and inflation began to rise. The ideology emerged as a market-driven approach to economic and social policy based on neoclassical theories of economics that stress the efficiency of private enterprise, liberalized trade, and relatively open markets. Foucault (2008) discusses the emergence of neoliberalism from criticisms of post-war programs, introduced between the 1920s and 1960s, to support “reconstruction, planning and…socialization and social objectives – all of which entailed an interventionist policy on the allocation of resources, price stability, the level of savings, the choice of investments, and a policy of full employment” (p. 80). In North America and in Europe, the rejection of these policies and programs gave birth to neoliberalism and neoliberal governmentality in quite deliberate ways. Today, neoliberalism is the dominant political ideology in Canada and has been advanced deliberately for various social, political, and economic reasons, many of which are intrinsically tied to the higher education agenda.
Liberalism: Classical and Reform

Society and culture in Canada has been comprised of a range of socialist, liberal, conservative, and other political philosophies within the wider framework of liberalism. Gibbins and Youngman (1996) summarize the central tenets and assumptions of liberalism:

- The human being is a rational and self-interested individual.
- Liberty is necessary for human progress.
- Humans rationally choose to form societies and follow laws.
- Resources should be awarded according to talent and effort.
- Humans will naturally compete to attain these rewards.
- Government should be limited, and should not intrude into moral arenas.
- The free market best allows humans to compete and progress [in relation] not only to economics but also to ideas. (p. 31)

According to Gibbins and Youngman, Canadian political culture in the 21st century continues to reflect the pervasive nature of liberalism with the following unique characteristics: a commitment to democratic values and principles, salient federalism, Canadian and Quebecois nationalism, increasing immigration and cultural diversity, emerging conservative and populist movements, persistence of regional distinctions, tensions between linguistic communities, and growing assertion of Aboriginal rights. This liberalism was founded upon liberal democratic principles established by early Canadian British settlers fleeing from religious persecution and entrenched social class structures. These settlers preferred a society that emphasized individual rights, negative liberty defined as the freedom from restraint, and a free-market economy (Gibbins & Youngman, 1996). With changing social and political conditions, the liberal ideology did not remain static as new strands of liberal ideological thought emerged, including a division into classical and reform liberalism. The distinct characteristics of classical and reform liberalism are described in Table 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform Liberalism</th>
<th>Classical Liberalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines left wing of the liberal spectrum</td>
<td>Defines right wing of liberal spectrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Theory: (John Maynard Keynes)</td>
<td>Economic Theory: (Adam Smith)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of government intervention necessary</td>
<td>Laissez-faire (non-interventionist, free market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critiques:</td>
<td>Critiques:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to deal with high levels of inflation and</td>
<td>Unstable markets; high poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment simultaneously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Theory: (“positive” liberty)</td>
<td>Political Theory (“negative” liberty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty as Freedom to act</td>
<td>Liberty as Freedom from restraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require ability as well as opportunity to act.</td>
<td>Opportunity to act is sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality of opportunity needed because</td>
<td>Equality of right sufficient to ensure an equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality of right does not protect against discrimination.</td>
<td>starting place (Horatio Alger myth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government intervention needed to ensure all</td>
<td>Government intervention only to ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals have the same access to the tools</td>
<td>equalization of individual legal and political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary to achieve a particular result.</td>
<td>rights to compete fairly for a chance to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a particular result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Theory:</td>
<td>Social Theory:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize effects of systemic discrimination based on</td>
<td>“Blind” to individual differences such as gender, race,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender, race, sexual orientation, disability; attack</td>
<td>sexual orientation, disability and effects of systemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty, racism, sexism and homophobia.</td>
<td>discrimination based on these differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support government intervention for redistribution of</td>
<td>Oppose large-scale government intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wealth through social programs; affirmative action</td>
<td>Advocate downsizing, deficit management,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs; universal access to health care public</td>
<td>deregulation, and decentralization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Adapted from Gibbins and Youngman (1996)
Negative Freedom (from) vs. Positive Freedom (to act)

Understanding the distinctions between classical and reform liberalism and their respective freedom from and freedom to conceptualizations of liberty has significant political and public policy implications, especially in relation to educational equity. There is a debate within liberalism about the conceptualization of liberty and its consequent influence on the interpretation of equality. Consider the two kinds of liberties referred to, by different strands of liberalism, as “negative freedom” or freedom from government or legal restraint or control as opposed to “positive freedom” or freedom to act. Negative freedom is advanced by classical liberalism and results in the opportunity to act. A minimal governmental state, with restricted taxation and a narrow range of powers, supports the concept of negative freedom and the goal of individual self-interest. In contrast, positive freedom is advanced by reform liberalism and is described as the ability to act. A government that harnesses its resources to reduce barriers and equalize opportunities to act creates conditions for the ability to act. Positive freedom requires a large government with broad taxation and powers to redistribute wealth by which to support the common welfare of its citizens. Positive freedom is aligned with goals including greater social equity and protection of civil liberties to promote individual self-interest.

It is instructive to consider notions of freedom and equality on a continuum, which situates the range of ideological positions in relation to one another (Table 9). Liberalism does not consider equality of result nor does it consider inequality of rights as viable options. Liberal ideology suggests equality of result, on the one hand, violates the principle of meritocracy and, thus, deters competition and progress. Inequality of rights, on the other hand, violates a fundamental tenet of the liberal ideology. The debate between reform and classical liberal
notions of equality of opportunity and equality of right, respectively, has implications for determining what exactly constitutes a fair starting point or equal footing from which individuals should compete or be judged. These positions are important considerations for the development and implementation of educational equity policy in higher education.

Table 9
Equality Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUALITY OF RESULT</th>
<th>EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY</th>
<th>EQUALITY OF RIGHT</th>
<th>INEQUALITY OF RIGHTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialism</td>
<td>Reform Liberalism</td>
<td>Classical Liberalism</td>
<td>Conservatism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liberal argument: violates principle of meritocracy; deters competition and progress

Classical Liberal argument: gives greater rights to disadvantaged and overly permissive

Reform Liberal argument: does not protect against discrimination

Liberal argument: violates principles of meritocracy

Outcomes:

aims for equal wealth, power and status

Outcomes:

aims for economic interventions and redistribution of wealth to address social inequalities (e.g. Employment Equity Legislation)

Outcomes:

aims for equalization of political and legal rights; associated with 4 Ds (downsizing, deficit reduction, deregulation, decentralization)

Outcome:

results in uneven distribution of social, political economic resources

On a two-dimensional map of ideological space, neoliberalism is situated left of centre, on the large state (extreme left) to small state (extreme right) spectrum of political thought, and north of centre, on the individualist (northernmost) and collectivist (southernmost) axis of political thought (Figure 6).

---

6 Adapted from Gibbins and Youngman, 1996, p. 41
Neoliberalism adopts the economic interests of relatively more conservative classical liberals and the social and political beliefs of relatively more socialist reform liberals. Neoliberals advocate for a free market economy, which requires smaller government intervention while advocating extensive social and political equality and liberty, which requires bigger government and greater state intervention. However, the neoliberal philosophy does not go as far as supporting universal social programs. Neoliberalism functions through an ideological paradigm that leads to social, cultural, and political practices and policies that use the language of markets, efficiencies, consumer choice, transactional thinking, and individual autonomy to

---

7 Gibbins and Youngman, 1996, p. 47
shift risk from governments and corporations onto individuals and to extend this kind of market logic into the realm of social and affective relationships. In other words, neoliberalism has established market orientation and work output or productivity as criteria for determining individual and societal success (Roberts & Mahtani, 2010).

Gibbins and Youngman (1996) highlight the paradox of neoliberalism simultaneously supporting the extremes of both classical and reform liberalism. Neoliberalism “occupies a broad central band on the left-right” (p. 32) spectrum of ideological thought. To reconcile these seemingly opposing positions, the crux of the neoliberal position is the argument that balance can be achieved by recognizing governmental limitations while targeting efforts towards the needs of those who really require help. Foucault (2008) suggests these positions may not be contradictory at all given the neoliberal agenda. Foucault emphasizes the ways in which neoliberalism not only recycled classical liberal ideas, but also transformed some of these ideas in quite profound and intentional ways. First, he highlights the neoliberal agenda of uncoupling the market economy from the political principle of laissez-faire policies. He discusses how neoliberalism advocates “permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention” (p. 132) on the part of the government to control the space in which competition in the market can function. Foucault says, “neo-liberal government intervention is no less dense, frequent, active, and continuous than in any other system. But what is important is to see what the point of application of these governmental interventions is now” (p. 145). Neoliberalism maintains the classical liberalism tenet opposing any state intervention in the economic activity of the free market. However, neoliberalism is differentiated from classical liberalism in that it will not intervene to correct the destructive effects of the market on society, as did successive liberal administrations in introducing welfare and other similar social policies. Neoliberalism supports intervention to
maintain the competitive mechanisms of the market, thereby regulating society through the market (Foucault, 2008). This brings the discussion to the subject of neoliberalism as a form of governmentality.

**Neoliberalism as a Form of Governmentality**

As an ideological framework, neoliberalism is constructed and reinforced by a set of interconnected social, political, and economic interests. In the constant struggle for social, political, and economic power, these interests are protected through the process of governmentality and cultural hegemony, discussed in previous chapters. Foucault (2008) refers to “the presence and effect of state mechanisms” and “the gradual, piecemeal, but continuous takeover by the state of a number of practices, ways of doing things, and if you like, governmentalities” (p. 77). He elaborates,

There is no question of deducing this set of practices from a supposed essence of the state in and for itself. We must refrain from this kind of analysis first of all because, quite simply, history is not a deductive science, and secondly, for another no doubt more important and serious reason: the state does not have an essence. The state is not a universal nor in itself an autonomous source of power. The state is nothing else but the effect, the profile, the mobile shape of a perpetual statification (étatisation)\(^8\) or statifications, in the sense of incessant transactions which modify, or move, or drastically change, or insidiously shift sources of finance, modes of investment, decision-making centers, forms and types of control, relationships between local powers, the central authority, and so on. In short, the state has no heart, as we well know, but not just in the sense that it has no feelings, either good or bad, but it has no heart in the sense that it has no interior. The state is nothing else but the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities. (p. 77)

Neoliberal governmentality, according to Ong (2006), characterizes and promotes the goals of liberal democracies where societal power is decentralized and citizens play an active role in their governance.

\(^8\) Stratification (étatisation): bringing under state control (Foucoul, 1978-79, p. 77)
own self-government. Ong describes neoliberalism as an ideological regime that “furnishes the concepts that inform the government of free individuals who are then induced to self-manage according to market principles of discipline, efficiency, and competitiveness” (p. 4). She highlights the two main elements of neoliberalism as a political philosophy:

The main elements of neoliberalism as a political philosophy are (a) a claim that the market is better than the state at distributing public resources and (b) a return to a “primitive form of individualism: an individualism which is ‘competitive,’ ‘possessive,’ and construed often in terms of the doctrine of ‘consumer sovereignty’” (Peters, 1999). It is important to note that neoliberal reasoning is based on both economic (efficiency) and ethical (self-responsibility) claims. (p. 11)

While Foucault exposes the active interventionist nature of neoliberalism, Ong (2006) focuses on this interventionist aspect and investigates two concepts: neoliberalism as exception and exceptions to neoliberalism. She suggests neoliberalism as exception can come into play when neoliberal interventions are introduced “in emerging countries where neoliberalism itself is not the general characteristic” (p.3). In contrast, she says exceptions to neoliberalism occur when countries governed predominantly by neoliberalism intervene to protect certain programs for specific populations (p. 4). Ong suggests that these exceptions to neoliberalism actually act to further marginalize the citizens for which social, economic, or political welfare benefits have been preserved. She posits that articulating a class of citizens governed by neoliberal norms and a class of citizens outside of those norms manifests in “ethical dilemmas, threatening to displace basic values of social equality and shared fate” (p. 4). She elaborates,

I conceptualize the exception more broadly, as an extraordinary departure in policy that can be deployed to include as well as to exclude. As conventionally understood, the sovereign exception marks out excludable subjects who are denied protections. But the exception can also be a positive decision to include selected populations and spaces as targets of “calculative choices and value-orientation” associated with neoliberal reform. In my formulation, we need to explore the hinge between neoliberalism as exception and
exception to neoliberalism, the interplay among technologies of governing and of disciplining, of inclusion and exclusion, of giving value or denying value to human conduct. (p. 5)

It seems to me that any philosophy and process seeking to determine who is among the deserving begs the question: Who has the right and capacity to make such a moral and ethical determination, and is this task even achievable or appropriate? Though the threshold, established by elected governments, for determining deserving and undeserving citizens is said-to-be informed by evidence-based research, there exists subjectivity and bias among politicians, creating the potential for discriminatory criteria for policy-making. The process of differentiating the deserving from undeserving invariably privileges those who hold values and behave in ways that are in conformity with dominant social and cultural values, perspectives, and ideologies. Bias, stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination across race, gender, and class often creep into decisions about who is “deserving” and who is not, thereby disadvantaging those who most often experience economic, political, and social inequities. As an example, McDaniel (2003) asserts “bashing and trashing of women on social assistance as abusers of the system, as lazy, or as bad or inadequate mothers, have become commonplace facets of neoliberal political policies” (p. 267). Such ideologies view problems of poverty as problems of culture (Dumas & Anyon, 2006) and blame historically marginalized populations for the social conditions in which they find themselves.

Davies (2005) asserts, “Neoliberalism, one way or another has achieved cultural hegemony” (p. 27). Neoliberalism has caught hold of the citizenry in a very insidious and systematic way such that it is now the normative or hegemonic ideological approach in the public and education sectors. Roberts and Mahtani (2010) remind us that neoliberalism in Canada has “reshaped the ideal conception of the relationship between citizen and society (and
the corresponding obligations that each has to the other)” (p. 252). Ong (2006) also argues that neoliberalism “is reconfiguring relationships between governing and the governed, power and knowledge” (p. 3). She says,

Neoliberalism is often discussed as an economic doctrine with a negative relation to state power, a market ideology that seeks to limit the scope and activity of governing. But neoliberalism can also be conceptualized as a new relationship between government and knowledge through which governing activities are recast as non-political and non-ideological problems that need technical solutions. Indeed, neoliberalism considered as a technology of government is a profoundly active way of rationalizing governing and self-governing in order to “optimize”. The spread of neoliberal calculation as a governing technology is thus a historical process that unevenly articulates situated political constellations. (p. 3)

As a deliberate act of governmentality, one can consider neoliberalism as distorting the central tenets of liberalism while coopting and leveraging the liberal nomenclature to suggest a transformed or reinvented ideology. Ong provides a compelling example of this distortion. She describes the type of liberalism endorsed by the U.S. Democratic Party as different from that promoted by the Republican Party, and she illuminates this difference between types of liberalism in the way each party considers the notion of liberty:

_**Liberty** has become a word that designates “free economic action” rather than political liberalism, which has become a dirty word. In rather broad terms, one can say that the Democratic Party promotes itself as the defender of individual rights and civil liberties against the excesses of an unfettered, market-driven ethos, while the Republican Party relies on a neoliberal (read neoconservative) discourse of individual solutions to myriad social problems. Both kinds of liberalism focus on free subjects as a basic rationale and target of government, but while the Democrats stress individual and civil freedoms, the Republicans underline individual obligations of self-reliance and self-management. (p. 2)

The prefix “neo” in neoliberalism deceptively signifies a somehow better liberalism. The majority of the Western world, after the Enlightenment, has historically been captivated by the
principles conjured by liberalism, whether or not they understand the nuances and effects of the central tenets. The prefix “neo” added to liberalism acts as a powerful discursive tool enabling the contemporary movement to imply both a retention of those ideological tenets still held in high regard by some of the citizenry. It also represents a departure from those liberal tenets with which others members of the citizenry may have become disenchanted. Among those keen to embrace a “new” liberalism were classical liberals or social conservatives, who may not have been entirely enamoured with post-war and post-depression reform liberalism and the emergence of broad social programs between the 1930s and 1960s. During this time period, the government assumed considerable responsibility for the welfare of its citizens in areas of health care, education, employment, and social security. Neoliberalism has resulted in the significant scaling back of these programs. Others who may have welcomed this “new” liberalism include reform liberals enticed by the promise of a transformed ideology in relation to the delivery of social programming, described to be more efficient and disciplined (Ong, 2008). Foucault (2008) asserts the following about neoliberalism:

[Neoliberalism] is no more than the reactivation of old, second hand economic theories...just a way of establishing strictly market relations in society...[and] no more than a cover for a generalized administrative intervention by the state which is all the more profound for being insidious and hidden beneath the appearances of a neo-liberalism” (p. 130).

Returning to the understanding and interpretation of liberty as discussed earlier, Ong (2008) suggests that Republicans strategically cast political liberalism as “un-American”, thereby widening the gap between “political liberal ideals of democracy and the neoliberal rationality of individual responsibility and fate” (p. 2).

Canadian political parties reflect a similarly increasing chasm in their conceptions of tenets of liberalism, with the New Democratic Party the furthest from neoliberal ideology, the
Conservative Party the most aligned with neoliberal ideology, and the Liberal Party somewhere in between. Lewis (2008) discusses the blurring of “traditional distinctions between the left and right” (p. 47), evidenced by leftist indecisiveness concerning commitments to social justice and public benefit, on the one hand, and the private and corporate benefits of capitalist ideologies, on the other. Davies (2005) reaffirms that “neoliberal systems of government are now the new and favoured forms of government on both the left and right sides of politics” (p. 27). Neoliberalism has continued to have a stronghold in Canadian politics and society. This stronghold has been further reinforced by almost a decade of federal Conservatism reflecting the most neoliberal of the parties of Canada, with the Conservative Party winning and sustaining a minority government since 2006. In the provincial domain, where responsibility for higher education policy-making and fund distribution lies, both Liberal and Conservative Parties have led government administrations across Canada in the last decade. They too have advanced neoliberal ideologies in the service of broader global market forces and interests. Speaking about the mechanism of cultural hegemony, Gramsci (1971) suggested that if those in positions of power are successful in occupying the heads of people, then their hearts and hands will follow; in other words, inhabiting the psyche of individuals lays the foundation for engaging their emotions and regulating their activities. Using Gramsci’s analogy, I will now turn to examining whether neoliberalism occupies the heads of university senior administrators and how this preoccupation translates to their hearts and hands with regard to educational equity discourse, policy-making, and practice in the Canadian academy.
Neoliberalism in the Academy

As social systems influenced by dominant social discourses and, in Canada, dependent on both public and private funding, the administrative structures of universities tend to manifest ideologies that parallel prevailing political ideologies of the day. Universities as organizations are social systems within social systems, linked and held together by a network of complex social relations. The university is made up of a network of decentralized organizational units and departments, each with a group of interrelated individuals with specific functional responsibilities. While each university has its own unique personality and culture, they do nonetheless collectively conform, within the higher education sector, to the social, economic, and cultural norms embodied in and promoted by the prevailing ideology of Canadian higher education. A volume co-edited by Canaan and Shumar (2008) uses a framework that situates higher education within larger macro-level social and political forces acting on the system. Specifically they compiled a series of ethnographic, qualitative, and policy-oriented analyses of higher education in the context of the rise of neoliberal economic ideology in different countries. Canaan and Shumar express their position in the following way:

We as co-editors conceptualize higher education as being pressured by a set of neoliberal practices and structures that are reshaping institutions and individuals, based on our growing recognition – as researchers, teachers and administrators – that the institutions to which we belong now are profoundly different from those in which we were educated largely during the 1970s and 1980s…the higher education institutions in our nations and others covered by contributors to this volume are now being re-framed in the light of neoliberal (and neoconservative) assumptions of a globalizing knowledge economy. We maintain, then, that higher education institutions are subject to profound change, which is transforming the identities of those who work and learn in these institutions. (pp. 3 - 4)
According to Tudiver (1999), the Canadian government poured funds into the post-secondary system through the 1960s and 1970s as higher education was seen as an investment, with a significant future return on profit and productivity for companies and the nations who employ graduates or benefit from their discoveries: “Education as an investment was a significant departure from conventional views of public spending as pure cost, and as a result universities began to receive substantial support as a choice investment for the future” (p. 43). In the 1950s, 4 new universities were established, 18 new universities were built between 1959 and 1969, and 5 new universities emerged in the 1970s (Tudiver, 1999).

Arguably, it is during this era and point in history that universities began their transformation into corporations and higher education began its transformation into a commodity. This transformation, from education as a “public good” to a “private good”, marked the beginning of the privatization of higher education (Lewis, 2008). The great expansion of the higher education sector created, as Tudiver (1999) put it, “the multiversity – large, complex institutions which forever altered the face of higher education” (p. 47). According to Tudiver, the multiversity “addressed extensive market demand for greater quantity, diversity, and quality with sprawling campuses and extensive programs” (p. 47). Hardy (1996) also discusses drastic changes in the higher education system after the 1970s, when, she says, governments’ attitudes towards education changed and their interest in growth became an obsession with the economy and efficiency. What followed, with the recessionary pressures of the 1980s, was a period of financial restriction and restraint (Hardy, 1996). In her overview of the education system in Canada, Dunning (1997) summarizes the role of post-secondary education, according to the then federal government’s 1991 discussion paper. Dunning reports,
Post-secondary education has become an important component of the nation’s economic policy. As the 21st century approaches, most Canadians agree with these words from the federal government’s 1991 discussion paper, Learning Well...Living Well: “If we wish to maintain our prosperity, we must build on our past performance in education and invest as effectively as possible in the development of our people. A highly qualified work force is essential to ensure that all Canadians have better employment opportunities, more employment security and higher wages. (pp. 47 - 48)

According to Dunning, in the context of government cutbacks, high unemployment, and a changing economy in the 1980s and 1990s, higher education became increasingly market-driven. She described decisions within universities that supported the observation that higher education was increasingly becoming motivated by economic objectives. Such decisions included, terminating programs that were not cost-effective, making budgetary and funding decisions based on enrolment and specific economic demand, developing specialized programs under a full cost-recovery model, considering private universities, and using key performance indicators to measure progress and determine funding (Dunning, 1997). Lewis (2008) explores the economic and political turn in higher education to neoliberal ideologies of privatization and commodification. She discusses the implication of this ideological turn on the historical role of the academy “as a site of social critique and important cultural production” (p. 47). Lewis explains this turn as one of a shift from conceptualizing education as a public good to that of private value, re-envisioned “within a modernist framework of liberal individualism” (p. 47). She argues that this ideological shift and hyper-individualism, or intense individualism, has eroded any gains made by socio-political movements, from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s, for the rights and equality of persons representing marginalized identities (Lewis, 2008). Lewis describes how market principles underpinning neoliberalism rationalized massive cutbacks in government funding to social programs and persuaded citizens this was an inevitable outcome:
Lack of adequate public financial support for services, services that Canadians had come to take for granted as a right of citizenship, leaves them open to the pressures of privatization, which subsequently, turns them into commodities unequally accessible to the privileged. Through this process, aimed systematically at convincing citizens that personal solutions to collective problems were the only viable option, individuals and families (the units-of-responsibility over-articulated by the privatization process), rather than communities and the nation as a whole, were left to figure out how to negotiate between their personal health, education and social support needs, and the profit-making interests increasingly more firmly entrenched in the economic structures. Education, along with health care and social supports, it seemed, became personal, rather than a collective, responsibility. (p. 48)

In earlier years, education generally and higher education particularly was seen as a way to develop morally and civicly responsible individuals within a democratic society. In the late 1930s, John Dewey advanced the idea that the purpose of education and schooling was to prepare individuals to live independently in their current environment (Dewey, 1938). Describing Dewey’s conceptualization of the role of education in a democracy, Ong (2006) said, Dewey argued that education was central in shaping a democratic nation, in the constitution of moral citizen-subjects who cherished the opportunity to work for equal opportunity and to expand the moral frontiers of democracy. (p. 141)

Decades later, George Counts (1978) critiqued Dewey’s position as too focused on the individual. Counts suggested that the purpose of education was to prepare individuals to live as members of society. According to Counts, education is valuable in that it equips individuals to fully participant in society and to use their agency to change the social order dictating their environment, as needed. In the 1980s, as neoliberalism was emerging, Mortimer Adler (1982) put forward another position regarding the purpose and value of education. He combined what Dewey and Counts said and added a third element. Adler suggested that education served the purpose of developing individuals through their own personal growth and self-improvement, developing individuals as citizens in relation with others and the state, and developing
individuals to prepare them for work in society. Educators and philosophers since Adler have articulated similar goals for education, always acknowledging that, particularly in higher education, the purpose of schooling is inextricably linked now to economic as well as social needs. The question is whether these are social and collectivist goals or strictly private and personal goals. Ong (2006) discussed the tension between two ways of viewing the purpose and benefits of education in order to frame examinations of neoliberalism in higher education. The first is a view that schooling is about moral education, and the second is a view that schooling is about professional skills development and training. I quote Ong at length:

First of all, it seems important to stress that education is a social technology – in the Weberian sense of appropriate means to an end – for constituting subjects in particular spaces of calculation. In modern societies, education is a technology of power involved in the construction of modern ethics and knowledges, the beliefs, attitudes, and skills that shape new kinds of knowledgeable subjects. To put it rather simply, the educational enterprise involves both moral education and technical training. The balance between the two has always created a tension, with stress placed in the earlier years on moral education and in later years on professional skills. This process is intended to form morally normative and economically productive citizens for the nation-state. As American universities become global sites for training an array of knowledge skills, a gulf is opening up between moral education and technical training, between education for national citizenship and training for what might be called borderless, “neoliberal” citizenship (p. 139).

On a broader level, education to a very important extent contributed to shaping a middle-class citizenry that was generally aligned according to basic values, attitudes, and competencies considered desirable in citizens. The basic values of self-reliance, income-earning, equal opportunity, open inquiry, and political representation were instilled in each schoolchild who passed through the American education system, thus structuring individual disposition and sentiments, a homogenizing effect that Pierre Bourdieu calls *habitus*. (p. 142)

The rise of neoliberalism in Canada has been the driving force behind intensifying managerialism and commercialism in universities, which behave more like big businesses today than social educational institutions. Fifteen years ago, Fisher and Rubenson (1998) analyzed
what they referred to as “the new discourse on vocationalism at both the federal and provincial levels of government” (p. 78). At that time, they described this discourse as being “shaped by three overlapping social forces: the fiscal crisis of the state, the ideological dominance of neo-liberalism, and the perceived need for human resource development” (p. 78). Fisher and Rubenson describe the changes in Canadian political economy, which have, since the 90s, been driving the post-secondary education system agenda:

The social demand that once directed the growth of the postsecondary education system is gradually giving way to a new, economically driven imperative that places importance on highly developed human capital, science, and technology to support Canada’s need for economic restructuring and greater international competitiveness. This economic imperative has been amplified by severe limitations on public expenditures and the emergence of the accountability movement, which is based on a general suspicion of public institutions and a belief in the greater efficiency of free market forces. (p. 79)

Historically, religious, government, and corporate institutions have sought to control the university. However, more recently, the corporate sector has played a much larger role in setting the university agenda. About the 21st century university, Tudiver (1999) asserts, “Corporate culture has infiltrated the everyday language and practice of the university, now a lean and mean system paying more attention to cost and management control than to quality and independent thought” (p. xiii).” According to Tudiver, “The traditional university produces knowledge through research, and distributes it freely in the public domain through teaching, publication, and community service. To the corporate university, knowledge is intellectual property, a commodity to be bought and sold” (p. 155). Tudiver says,

University education is supposed to nurture independent thinking rather than conformist opinion…Creative intellectual production requires diversity rather than uniformity, with critical and informed debate from all points of view. Universities must create an atmosphere for challenging the status quo and supporting it…
The corporate university reinforces inequalities. Those who cannot pay are less likely to receive services from universities that direct their resources to business partners with deep pockets. Nonprofit and poverty organizations cannot pay for information or research they need. If universities rely on corporate funds to replace lost public revenue, those sectors with fewer resources will receive less service when they need it most. Social and political costs of academic-corporate fusion are incalculable. Universities are crucial repositories for independent inquiry and the capacity to see beyond the horizons of conformity. (p. 169)

The extent and nature of commercialization in post-secondary education in Canada is explored in a compilation of articles first presented to the Canadian Association of University Teachers’ Conference (Turk, 2000). Turk (2000) asserts that the “basic role of universities in democratic society is at risk” (p. 3) due to the effects of growing commercialization on higher education. He also says commercialization or “the attempt to hitch universities…to the private sector” (p. 4) is winning out over the goals of broader education in response to pressure for universities to contribute to local and national industry and global economy. Turk reminds us the mission of the university ought to be the unwavering pursuit and dissemination of knowledge through a process of informed and critical analysis as well as uncompromising intellectual integrity. The value and benefit to society, he argues, is the possibility of identifying social, economic, and political inequities and opportunities and then acting to challenge and change the status quo across governmental institutions and society. Turk points out that the aspects of the higher education mission, which seek to empower citizens through knowledge are increasingly undermined by university administrations and governing bodies, that take up and/or respond to neoliberal ideologies which serve market-oriented goals and priorities. As public educational institutions, Canadian universities arguably must serve public rather than private interests. According to Turk, there are, however, particular political and philosophical ideologies underpinning a paradigm shift in the academy that is threatening “the foundation for a
democratic, egalitarian, just and humane society” (p. 13). These ideologies, he says, create a worldview that sees products and services delivered to individual education consumers and credential-seekers rather than co-participants in a collective interactive human learning process.

Canaan and Shumar (2008) accentuate the transition of universities from public institutions of higher learning to institutions “subject to the rules, regulations and assumptions that govern the private sector” (p. 4). This transformation, according to Canaan and Shumar, is underpinned by two neoliberal tenets:

First, that its institutions should compete to sell their services to student “customers” in an educational marketplace, and second, that these institutions should produce specialized, highly trained workers with high-tech knowledge that will enable the nation and its elite workers to compete “freely” on a global economic stage. (pp. 4 - 5)

In this consumer-driven institutional milieu, university principals and presidents are becoming first and foremost executives and administrators rather than educators and academics. From this vantage point, they strive to achieve corporate managerial objectives, which include: increased productivity and profits; reduced labour costs through casualization and labour-replacing technology; greater centralized control of product and service delivery, which represent new management referents for curriculum and education; offloading of administrative functions to faculty; the modification and elaboration of faculty workload; and more. This approach advocates a restructuring of post-secondary education to fully realize productivity and profit gains. Boards and administrators are increasingly viewing education and the broader learning environment as goods and services, respectively. Canann and Shumar describe the different but related processes of marketization and commodification that become relevant as neoliberalism changes “the relationship between the state and the market to the higher education system” (p. 4):
Marketization refers to the process by which the state uses market principles and disciplinary apparatuses to create greater efficiencies in non-market institutions. Commodification, on the other hand, refers to the process of turning social goods and processes into commodities. Both processes are related as, for instance, in the UK (and in some US states) higher education is first being disciplined by having its modes of operation and the services that support these modes of operation marketized as part of the long-term goal of turning an educational service into a commodity bought in the marketplace. (p. 4)

Turk (2000) identifies several ways commercialization is manifesting in universities, accelerated in large part by an environment of decreasing public funding of post-secondary institutions. Universities are also becoming reliant on private funds from individual student tuition and fees as well as private and corporate donors. While governments generally continue to reduce non-specified operating funds to universities, new government funding models incentivize growth of undergraduate student bodies by tying fund transfers to student registrants counted as “basic income units”, a market-oriented term. Enrolment planning, then, is implemented with a view to generate revenue; the concern is that this aspect is increasingly deciding strategic enrolment outcomes instead of considerations of quality and capacity issues. Enrolment growth continues in the context of increasing and, in some faculties and schools, de/unregulated tuition costs. Growing student tuition and fees, rationalized as a result of massive government funding cuts to post-secondary education, reduce financial accessibility to higher education, especially among certain historically underrepresented groups such as learners of Aboriginal ancestry, particular racialized groups, economically marginalized individuals, as well as first generation university students. Furthermore, there is an emerging issue of highly educated segments of the population who have obtained an expensive education but for whom there are minimal job prospects. Canann and Shumar (2008) discuss the policy implications of neoliberal discourses, which raise critical social issues and have effects on educational equity.
policy implementation generally. They provide an example of the “widening participation/access discourse” (p. 15) in higher education:

The discourse of access is in part... a progressive discourse as it aims to enable those who have been excluded from higher education to be more actively included in both higher education and the higher tiers of the information economy. This is because this discourse offers an economic development platform for political regions. A more educated workforce is said to attract industry and create a larger tax base. In addition, however, the discourse of access entails commodification as universities seek to pay for their bottom line by bringing in more tuition-paying students who substitute for state funding (as well as encouraging academic income generation through winning grants and doing consulting and other work with the private sector). Finally, the discourse of access enables conservative groups to rethink social policy. They ask if some groups should have an advantage over others for university attendance, as has been the case in the late 20th century, or if entry should be a market decision entirely. These different perspectives conflict with each other as different groups push their agendas and struggle politically for control of [higher education]. (p. 15)

Tudiver (1999) traced the expansion of corporate influence in the academy beyond contributions to campus infrastructure. Between the 1960s and the mid 1980s, he found a trend whereby increasing numbers of the “economic elite” (p. 46) held governing positions in higher education. By the new millennium, Tudiver found it was commonplace for executives of major corporations to be overrepresented on these governing boards and, therefore, to have significant influence on university policy. A corporate and private sector mentality among university administrators and governing bodies reinforces a discourse at odds with the values and goals required to achieve educational equity in higher education. In an environment where public funds are scarce and a university education is a potentially profitable endeavour, universities have turned to the private and corporate sector to finance their operations, programs, and capital initiatives. Tudiver comments on the disproportionate access to private and corporate contracts and grants:
Administrative and business studies attract contracts and grants through their close affinity to corporations. Research in disciplines close to the market, such as technology fields, agriculture, engineering, and biological sciences, can produce considerable commercial value (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). (p. 155)

Tudiver argues that the transformation of the academy to a business operating under corporate values and principles has favoured some professions and disciplines over others:

Corporate conversion favours professions and professors whose work may prove valuable to a corporation, industry, or market. Compromising their independence may seem a small price to researchers scrambling for support for their work. Support is less likely for scholars doing basic scientific research, or for social scientists, philosophers, or historians whose value to business is not so readily apparent. Studies geared to political analysis or understanding social dynamics may never find corporate sponsors; nor will inquiries that question capitalist values, criticize corporate practices, or advocate for the poor and downtrodden. Money to support research and practice in these endeavours is shrinking. Interested private sector buyers for social sciences and humanities research are few and far between. Business is not interested in supporting its critics. Poverty research is out of fashion. (p. 168)

Agreements to receive corporate and private funds often come with donor expectations of greater agency to drive university agendas and steer their future business directions as well as the research conducted. Campuses are becoming cites of brand name product marketing in exchange for corporate funds. In many universities, major donors and benefactors sit on the Board of Trustees, making financial decisions for the academy. If there is limited corporate interest in topics such as domestic and global poverty and disease, one can see how research in these areas can become sidelined, and the graduate students and faculty members pursuing these fields could become marginalized in the academy.

In 2000, Turk highlighted the increasing proportion of part-time and non-tenure-track contract appointments of professors in the United States and he pointed to anecdotal evidence suggesting the Canadian landscape was following the U.S. trend. Turk discussed the casualization of labour among faculty and staff and suggested this phenomenon effectively
reduces the employment rights of faculty and staff while increasing their vulnerability. He also pointed to the introduction of information technologies as a possible problem in a particular context. Specifically, he says, if technology is used as a replacement for, rather than a complement to, a range of teaching pedagogies and learning tools, then it may narrow the educational methods available to a diversity of learners. Certainly, the online distance modality necessarily will capture a larger cohort of students and, therefore, improve access to some historically marginalized students. That being said, Tudiver (1999) reports that some still criticize programs that use entirely online modes of educational delivery, as they are sceptical that the rationale for these programs is revenue generation rather than a balance of mixed pedagogical and learning tools:

Teaching is under pressure to bring in more income at lower cost. New markets are available, as people seek degrees, certificates, and training to survive in the information economy, but reaching them means changing the way universities run their teaching enterprise. (p. 162)

Ong (2006) describes the influence of neoliberalism on the very missions of universities:

[The] globalization of the American university goes beyond incorporating multiculturalism or fostering cosmopolitan culture; increasingly, universities have become an extension of world trade. What is at stake is the preservation of the fundamental mission of Western universities. Is moral education that shapes a shared view of modern humanity tenable with a narrowed focus on individualistic careerism? By going global, are universities in the danger of stressing the rational ethos – an instrumental and unrestricted quest for self-gain – at the expense of the mission of inculcating liberal democratic values? Thus, while philosophers and political theorists worry about how political liberalism can be stretched to accommodate cultural diversity in advanced liberal societies, they pay little attention to how their leading universities are also educating an increasing number of foreigners to be knowledge workers, unschooled in the humanities. (p. 140)
Davies, Gottsche, and Bansel (2006) suggest, “the discourses and practices of neo-liberal governance may themselves have been implicated in both discursively constituting and problematizing the ‘old’ university, and systematically installing the ‘new’ university” (p. 313). These scholars point to a very powerful managerialism tactic deployed by neoliberalism as it successively restructures and reforms institutions, that is, the positioning of the “new” university such that it is believed to be necessary and inevitable (Davies et al., 2006). According to Davies et al., the danger of this belief, in the inevitability of neoliberal practices, is that it can lead to a sense of futility and docility among those “taken over (and taken in) by it” (p. 315), including those who are, or may have been, neoliberalism’s greatest critics.

**Neoliberal Values and Interests in the Academy**

Stone (2002) describes five concepts she identifies as policy goals and which, she says, also function as values: equity, efficiency, security, liberty, and community. According to Stone, these policy goals are viewed as values because they are used as “justifications for a policy, for a government action, or for the government’s not taking action” (p. 37). Thereby, she says, these goals and values function as criteria or standards for assessing public policies. When developing policies, Stone defines the equity value as “treating likes alike”, the efficiency value as “getting the most output from a given input”, the security value as “[satisfying] minimum human needs”, and the liberty value as “[doing] as you wish as long as you do not harm others” (2002, p. 37). According to Stone, the community value speaks to the paradoxical theme of “[evoking] a common goal [even while] sacrificing the commonality” (p. 37). Wirt and Kirst (1992) suggest there are four key values of relevance to educational policy: quality, efficiency, equity, and
choice. They define the quality value as “a means to…the fulfillment of diverse human purpose” (p. 82), related to the concept of “quality of life”. They describe efficiency as a two-fold value, related to economics and accountability, in that it is concerned with minimizing costs, maximizing gains, and overseeing and controlling “the local exercise of power” (p. 82). The equity value is described as “the use of political authority to distribute critical resources required for the satisfaction of human needs” (p. 82). Finally, the choice value is described as “authorities having the opportunity to make policy decisions or to reject them” (p. 82).

According to Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, and Thurston (1992), many of the values described above are often simultaneously at play to some degree, and the most salient value will depend on the “personal value hierarchy” (p. 223) and social locations or positionality of people with decision-making power. Values, on their own and in concert with others, present a complexity of dilemmas and conflicting interpretations by varying stakeholders. Within a society governed by neoliberalism, the values of efficiency and liberty, as defined by Stone (2002), and the values of quality and choice, as defined by Wirt and Kirst (1992), are paramount. Recall that neoliberalism is driven by principles of market-orientation and hyper-individualism. Equity, human security, and community are de-emphasized, if not avoided, by neoliberalism. Canaan and Shumar (2008) resist the manner in which, they say, neoliberalism appropriates practices of accountability. They acknowledge the importance of accountability but cite Vidovich and Slee (2001), who suggest neoliberalism focuses on “managerial accountability to governments and market accountability to customers” (p. 432) while ignoring “professional accountability to peers [and] democratic accountability to the general community” (p. 432).

Related to the concept of values acting on the policy process is the notion that guiding principles are also influential in the process. These principles, rather than setting standards for
evaluating policies, define tenets or assumptions generally established by the cultural norms that are both premised on and dictate values. Values and principles then work together to influence policy decisions. Gallagher (1992) describes four principles that are typically considered when developing policies in public educational systems and which, I would argue, demonstrably dominate the discourse in higher education:

1. technical feasibility;
2. economic and financial possibility;
3. political viability;
4. administrative operability. (p. 45)

Technical feasibility is a principle that aims to ensure policies achieve their purpose. The economic and financial possibility principle aims to ensure the benefits of a policy justify the costs. Political viability is a principle that tests whether or not a policy will be accepted by various stakeholders, and particularly the most powerful or influential groups. The administrative operability principle aims to check whether the policy can be practically implemented with adequate financial, human, and other material resources (Gallagher, 1992).

Proponents for educational equity policies suggest these policies can support equity, quality, liberty, and efficiency all at once. The nuanced arguments explaining how these four values are supported by educational equity policies are now described. Proponents would say educational equity policies fundamentally support the equity value, by promoting equal opportunities for all citizens to fully access and meaningfully engage in studies and work within higher education. They would also say, these policies support the quality value by enforcing the right of students and employees to a dignified experience, as they participate in their studies and work at the university, and to equal opportunities to meet their academic and vocational potential. Arguably, through educational equity policies, the quality value extends from campus
life to life beyond the academy, by broadening and enhancing employment options and prospects as well as potential for improved socioeconomic status that might not have been possible without higher education. Proponents would also argue that effective educational equity policy supports the liberty value through the promotion of “positive freedom” or the ability to act as a result of government intervention. Recall that this way of regarding liberty recognizes the existence of systemic inequities, which call for government intervention in order to harness resources, reduce barriers to opportunities to act, and, thereby creating the conditions for the ability to act. Finally, proponents assert the efficiency value can be achieved through educational equity policy by taking a long-range perspective. Specifically, educational equity policies can help enrich the learning environment and global competitiveness afforded by greater diversity, inclusivity, and equity in all aspects of the academy, thereby contributing to long-term financial and reputational gains. These gains arguably translate into greater potential to attract the most talented students, recruit world-renowned faculty, appoint experienced administrators, and engage generous alumni, who, in turn, might influence increases in tuition revenue, research grants, dividends from fiscally responsible management, as well as sponsorships and donations, for example.

Opponents of educational equity policies would say these policies undermine the equity value by differentially treating special populations. These opponents would also suggest that educational equity policies undermine the quality value by privileging diversity over meritocracy. This equity-quality debate and its implication on equity policy implementation will be explored in depth in later chapters. Challengers of educational equity policy would point to it undercutting the liberty value, which they define as “negative freedom” or the opportunity to act as a result of freedom from governmental restraint or control. This political perspective is held by those who are resistant to recognizing and situating educational inequity within social systems
and are, therefore, reluctant to support public intervention or redistribution of power to address educational equity. Educational equity policy antagonists would also suggest that it counters efficiency values. They point to scarce financial, human, and temporal resources and suggest that educational equity policies attempt to centralize or control academic and operational decisions that should be localized in the departments.

There are as many conflicting viewpoints across the four principles – technical feasibility, economic and financial possibility, political viability, and administrative operability – as there are with respect to whether and how educational equity policies support or undermine the equity, quality, liberty, and efficiency values. Most of the principles are discussed in a manner that overlaps substantially with the efficiency value, as the focus tends to be on quantitative and monetary benefits and outcomes. This focus can hinder educational equity, which has many qualitative and non-monetary, human capital as opposed to financial capital, benefits and outcomes. While there are some cost-neutral strategies to advance educational equity, the economic and financial possibility principle applies a monetarily motivated cost-benefit analysis which may not find increased financial investments in educational equity will result in financial returns in the short-run. Unfortunately, when viewed in purely monetary terms and without a longer time horizon, opponents may argue that the benefits derived from the policy may not be worth the investment. Opponents do not account for the qualitative benefits nor the potential long-term financial savings or gains, especially in averted conflicts and liabilities that arise as a result of neglecting overt and systemic inequities experienced by equity-seeking groups. Related to the quest for quantitative and financial outcomes and benefits, assessing technical feasibility of educational equity policy tends to be a difficult task. There are rarely clearly articulated or understood educational equity outcomes and measures, sometimes
referred to as performance indicators. Consequently, the technical feasibility principle might, at best, compel institutions to develop performance indicators and measureable objectives, or, in the worst and most typical case scenario, become a justification for lack of progress on implementation and evaluation. Also, related to resource availability and allocation is the administrative operability principle. While implementing educational equity policies may require some direct financial investment, it most certainly requires human and physical resources, which indirectly are linked to finances. This principle translates into a barrier, particularly during fiscally restrained times, as opponents cite resource scarcity as proof that the policy is impractical. And finally, political viability can also be a limiting factor. Support or opposition to educational equity may be divided down political ideological lines. Buy-in by various stakeholders depends in part on the normative political ideologies of the government of the day as well as the current institutional governing bodies. For instance, increasingly neoliberal, socially conservative, and market-oriented values and ideologies can work to politicize educational equity policies such that they are avoided by and, therefore, receive little support from those in positions of power. This last principle links to the subject of politics generally and its role in efforts to mobilize educational equity policy.

**Neoliberal Discourse of Diversity in the Academy**

According to Chan (2005), notions of diversity and policies that govern equity and equality in Canada have emerged from a set of normative/established social, political, and economic national values and entrenched legislation. Although explicit diversity and equity policies do not exist at the national or provincial levels, Chan suggests diversity and equity-
related concerns are implied by and addressed in various Canadian policy statements on multiculturalism, human rights, employment equity, as well as the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Chan asserts, “federal and provincial policies provide the context for institutional policy discourses” (p. 131). Discussing the subject of national attention to issues of social diversity and equity, Abu-Laban (2007) contends,

[While the] study of the state has been central to the agenda of political scientists, social diversity has been unevenly taken up in the consideration of issues pertaining to power, state processes, and public policy in Canada. In other words, the dominant examination of governance and its consequences by political scientists has tended to be shaped by a selective understanding of Canadian society. (p. 137)

Abu-Laban (2007) makes three major arguments. First, she states,

[T]hough political scientists in Canada have paid increasing attention in recent years to multiculturalism as an ideal and, to a lesser extent, as a policy, attending to public policy in a way that takes seriously ethnicity, language, and processes of racialization can and must go further. (p. 139)

Second, she asserts, “attending to public policy more fully requires political scientists to explicitly acknowledge the legacy of colonialism permeating all social relations, with potential reverberations even in the present” (p. 139). Third, she suggests, “in this era of globalization and the war on terrorism, the potential terrain that confronts public policy analysts is multi-layered and complex” (p. 139). There is no doubt institutions of higher learning today are influenced by complex national and global socio-cultural, political, and economic forces. In this context, universities that aspire to remain relevant and competitive among the best institutions of higher learning must adapt by increasing their capacity to reflect and respond to diversity in their student body, staff and faculty complement, curricular and co-curricular programs, research activities and institutional governance, and leadership. Canann and Shumar (2008) point out
“conflicts and contradictions” (p. 3) that universities face in this neoliberal context and the consequent “contradictory social spaces” (p. 3) that individuals in the university occupy.

Understanding the mainstream discourse or grand narrative about the Canadian reality of and record on social diversity and equity is essential to analyzing educational equity policy implementation in the academy. Several Canadian critical scholars have discussed the national discourse on diversity and record on race relations. Dua, Razack and Warner (2005) discuss, what they refer to as, the unique way in which race, racism, and empire are expressed within the Canadian context. They describe a national discourse on race and racism, which portrays a mythology with respect to Canada’s record on race and racism. This mythology works to expunge the existence of historic and present-day systemic discrimination:

Canada provides an interesting site for investigation on race, racism, and empire. On the one hand, it has a long history of indigenous colonization, white settlement policies, settlement of people of color through racialized immigration policies, participation in free-trade regimes, and in British and U.S. imperialist agendas. On the other hand, Canada is located in a peripheral location within Western hegemony and is characterized in national mythology as a nation innocent of racism. In the postwar period, state policies of multiculturalism have represented Canada as a welcoming haven for immigrants and refugees, while in reality these policies worked to create structures that kept new Canadians of color in a marginal social, political, cultural, and economic relationship to Canada. Internationally, Canada is often constructed as a “peacekeeping nation” that is outside larger imperialist agendas. Such national mythologies erase the history of colonization, slavery, and discriminatory immigration legislation. (p. 1)

According to Blackmore (2006), there is a diversity discourse that is evident in the grand narrative and mythology around race relations in Canada. For instance, Kymlicka (2004) explores the discourse in Canada regarding the nation as a global model for accommodating ethno-cultural diversity. He outlines the origins and evolution of this discourse and unpacks three central assumptions regarding the motives for promoting claims that: (a) there is a distinctly Canadian model of managing diversity, (b) this model is working well in Canada, and (c) other
countries can learn from the Canadian experience. In his thesis, Kymlicka concludes that it is an overstatement to suggest that Canada’s comparative international success in dealing with diversity is rooted in a distinctive culture of acceptance that is a part of the national ethos. Whether or not one finds Kymlicka’s arguments compelling and his thesis palatable is aside from the point I would like to make here. Despite being challenged by learned scholars in social and political science fields of study, the discourse that Canada is a global model for diversity, inclusivity, and equity endures. Abu-Laban (2007) also challenges the mythology of Canada’s record in the areas of social diversity, inclusivity and equity:

[T]he consideration of race and ethnicity in Canadian policy studies and political science must move beyond multiculturalism as a policy arena/framework to consider ways in which what the Canadian state does (or does not do) is linked to the legacy of European colonialism and to specific assumptions about the nature of Canadian society. (p. 7)

Abu-Laban goes on to say that the “public policy challenges associated are with the politicization of diversity in Canadian society” (p. 6). In their introduction to a compilation of essays exploring and framing the historical geography of race, nature, and whiteness in Canada, Baldwin, Cameron and Kobayashi (2011) elaborate on the national liberal democratic discourse and its implications on marginalized citizens in Canada:

Canada is routinely constructed in liberal democratic discourse as a tolerant multicultural state, lending Canadians a degree of innocence when compared to more overtly intolerant national cultures; however, as a number of critical scholars now argue (Brown, 2006; Thobani, 2007), multiculturalism, along with the principle of tolerance that underwrites it, can be a profoundly depoliticizing ideal. On the one hand, tolerance poses as a discourse of justice, especially when used in conjunction with political liberalism (Brown, 2006)…Such a discourse was recapitulated in Canadian nationalist multiculturalism…Multiculturalism would mark a new beginning in so-called race relations, replacing denigration with toleration as the dominant value deployed to manage difference in the public domain. And yet, on the other hand, it is precisely the use of tolerance as a political tactic that calls attention to its depoliticizing effects (Kobayashi, 1993; Brown, 2006). While tolerance appears to correct historical injustices by offering
the marginalized an entry into the dominant social order, it simultaneously depoliticizes by denying that the marginalized are constituted by history and power. The marginalized are simply objects to be tolerated, but their marginality never requires explanation. (p. 8)

In the U.S. higher education context, Ong (2006) describes the notion of neoliberalism serving global forces and interests as a double movement, “a shift from a national to a transnational space for producing knowledgeable subjects, and a shift from a focus on political liberalism and multicultural diversity at home to one on neoliberalism and borderless entrepreneurial subjects abroad” (p. 140). Ong says,

The current debates over diversity and multiculturalism have dwelt on the role of education in preserving democratic ideals in the United States. But what is the role of American higher learning in relation to diversity in the global marketplace? Diversity is often invoked to mean multicultural representation in student enrolment and in a democratic composition of diverse cultural views in education. (p. 139)

The neoliberal ideological paradigm shift in Canadian institutions of higher learning, fuelled by and fuelling marketization and managerialism, ultimately defines corporate and individual values within institutions of higher learning (Henry & Tator, 2010). This paradigm shift gives rise to a discourse of neoliberalism in the academy, which has evolved as a politic of “subordination of democratic values to commercial interests” (Henry & Tator, 2010, p. 16). Henry and Tator describe neoliberalism in the academy as a “political economic ideology linked to main tenets of capitalism”, among which is included the “rule of marketplace, globalization, corporate deregulation and free trade” (p. 16). Absent from the language of neoliberalism are notions of: collective civic responsibility; social agency, fairness and justice; and protection of public good. Rather, the discourse, dismissing the concept of institutional inequities, gives importance to and emphasizes individual explanations and solutions to social issues and problems.
Matus and Infante (2011) contend that universities align themselves with the normative rules of a neoliberal democratic society, which are premised on free market principles, hyper-individualization, consumerism, and managerialism. Neoliberal discourses of diversity are employed to maintain and reproduce the separation of mainstream “normal” subjects from marginal “deviant” subjects, or perhaps more accurately “objects”. National and international narratives concerning multicultural harmony, universal human values and goals, and tolerant communities are examples of neoliberal discourses of diversity that permeate institutions of higher education and marginalize and neutralize identity and cultural politics. This neutralizing effect is made possible by neoliberal agendas, which suggest value-free practices are possible and desirable. It is unclear how value-free practices are possible, having described earlier how politics and policymaking is a value-laden and interested process and that values and beliefs are the foundations of ideologies. It is clear, however, that proponents of the neoliberal agenda seek to neutralize and ignore human social and cultural differences in order to advance the theory that free-markets and meritocracy can help any individual improve their social, political, or economic status if only individuals choose to participate in their own success. This brings me to a discussion on the differentiating effects of neoliberalism, and particularly its racializing effects.

**Racializing Effects of Neoliberal Discourses of Diversity**

Bannerji (2005) emphasizes the importance of considering how capitalism relates to race and racism. She argues that race, gender, and class are firmly rooted in capitalism and cannot be independent of or disentangled from one another given the ways that social identities and relations are organized in society. Bannerji says, “Economic participation, the value of labor,
social and political participation and entitlement, and cultural marginalization or inclusion are all part of this overall social formation” (p. 149). According to Bannerji (2005) and Dua (2005), capitalist goals legitimize economic and political restructuring of society and have important implications for our understanding of race and racism. Thus, the capitalist underpinnings of the discourse of race and racism suggest that neoliberalism, as a capitalist market-oriented ideology, is implicated in perpetuating racist discourses.

Roberts and Mahtani (2010) suggest neoliberal movements such as managerialism, credentialism, and consumerism may in fact be having racially differentiating impacts on institutions and institutional policies. Examining neoliberalism in relation to race, Roberts and Mahtani argue that research needs to go beyond mapping “how the processes of neoliberalization have racialized results” to study how underlying neoliberal philosophies are “fundamentally raced” (p. 248). They theorize that racism is “mutually constitutive with neoliberalizing policies” (p. 250):

We recommend a move from analyses of race and neoliberalism towards analyses that race neoliberalism. This kind of analysis more clearly delineates how race and racism are inextricably embedded in the neoliberal project. To begin the process of racing neoliberalism, it is essential to understand neoliberalism as a facet of a racist society that works to both reinforce the racial structure of society, while also modifying the processes of racialization. (250)

They also argue the neoliberal ideology creates a double-edge sword for socially marginalized citizens by masking systemic and structural inequities in society:

Ideally, within a neoliberal theorization of society, the success of the individual is directly related to his/her work output. Modalities of difference, such as race, do not predetermine one’s success as each individual is evaluated solely in terms of his or her economic contribution to society. What becomes clear is that this ideal relationship is not equally realized by all members in society. For immigrants to Canada, there appears to be a different set of rules and expectations. Herein lies the double-edged sword of
neoliberalism. Constituting the immigrant as not-quite Canadian allows for the continued disconnect between their ability to play the neoliberal game and the rewards that they receive for successful play. As a consequence, neoliberalism effectively masks racism through its value-laden moral project: camouflaging practices anchored in an apparent meritocracy, making possible a utopic vision of society that is non-racialized”. (p. 253)

To further highlight this masking of racism, Roberts and Mahtani (2010) reference Davis (2007), who offers the following explanation of racialization through neoliberalism:

Neoliberal practices put into its orbit a market of ideas about a lot of things including the family, gender, and racial ideology. It is...“saturated with race”…using capitalism to hide racial (and other) inequalities by relocating racially coded economic disadvantage and reassigning identity-based biases to the private and personal spheres. (p. 349)

My research aims to illuminate “the process through which the ideology of neoliberalism is actualized through various policies, discourses and social relations” (Roberts & Mahtani, 2010, p. 248) by using discourse analysis as a tool to critically analyze the deployment of language in “the ideological and discursive constructions” (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006b, p. 390) of raced and gendered spaces. I will now explore in detail one frequently employed neoliberal discourse of diversity, the discourse of political correctness, and its implications on educational equity and policy implementation in the academy.

**Political Correctness: A Neoliberal Discursive Barrier**

Henry and Tator (2010) suggest the use and meaning of the term PC – shorthand for the phrase “politically correct” or the notion of “political correctness” – is one of several neoliberal discourses of diversity, which acts as a powerful discursive barrier to achieving equity. Weir (1995) traced the “re-signification of prior meanings of political correctness” (p. 52), which
originally was an approving phrase denoting “someone who steadfastly toes the party line” (p. 53). According to Weir, beginning in the 1960s, the term PC and its discourse were uniquely used and circulated within and among members of various social movements. It was used as an internal or intra-cultural critique by individuals who were opposed to “dogma and aligned with forces of social change” (p. 52). In her historical analysis of the evolution of the terms PC, Weir found,

PC in its social movement form acted as an internal critique of social movement culture. The phrase was addressed to other social movement members. As a gesture of self-critique, PC was applied restrictively to the practices of a particular social movement: it pertained to the culture or practices of the women’s movement or gay liberation or Marxist party, but not to a common culture cross-cutting these movements. It defined a shifting line of conflict between the cultural forms of social movements and cultural capital of the social groups/processes to which particular movements were antagonistic. (p. 53)

In this original context, emerging within social movements, the use of the term PC criticized aspects of the movement without attempting to discredit the movement entirely. PC, in this context, “connotes rigidity and self-righteousness, the…enforcement of an orthodoxy that results in factionalism, though it can be used in a self-mocking fashion” (Weir, 1995, p. 58). Weir points out that in this context, the antithesis of PC, political incorrectness, consequently refers to things that are within the confines of acceptable individual attitudes and behaviours from within the social movement, things like diversity, anti-racist speech practices, transgression, and so forth, depending on the particular social movement (Weir, 1995). Weir suggests the PC offensive emerged in the 1980s, by neoconservatives who sought to counter and delegitimize gains made by anti-racist and feminist movements and politics in universities. In the 1980s, the mass media utilized the term PC in a way that began to transform its original meaning. Weir argues that the term was appropriated by neoconservatives and disseminated by the mass media in the 1990s.
Whereas, before the 1990s, PC was a term still fairly nonthreatening to the continuity of social movements, after the 1990s, neoconservative and neoliberal ideologues alike leveraged the mass media to seed and disseminate a new meaning associated with the term. Weir describes the process by which individuals external to and opponents of various social movements used the term PC as a strategy to delegitimize and dismantle the social movements:

In mass circulation Canadian and American newspapers of the 1980s, PC was also applied critically to the cultural effects of particular social movements. Writer and reader were often positioned as engaging in PC practices, or negotiating their relations with PC, but no commitment to building a social movement was assumed.

Unlike the hybridized voice of PC in the mass media of the 1980s, which was derived from and tied to social movement usage, the neoconservative variant of PC situates its speaking position and readership wholly external to social movements; it is about them, the dangerous people in universities supposedly stifling democratic rights. (pp. 53 - 54)

While historically the term PC at worst connoted, according to Weir (1995), a “pesky form of social change peripherally impinging on everyday habit and consumer culture” (p. 71), the present-day meaning, initiated by neoconservatives and perpetuated by neoliberals, is used with hostility to target individuals sympathetic to feminist and anti-racist goals as “intolerant, aggressive and tyrannical” (p. 71) and opposed to free speech and democratic values. Weir (1995) describes this reversal and re-signification of language and meaning as a hallmark of neoliberalism; “The presence of antithesis and paradox in PC discourse allies…with one of the common patterns found in the…right wing press in articles dealing with racism – a pattern of denial and reversal” (p. 71). van Dijk (1992) also wrote about this process of reversal in his study of the reproduction of racism in discourses. He found that denial plays a prominent role in perpetuating racism and that this denial can take on multiple forms, including “disclaimers, mitigation, euphemism, excuses, blaming the victim, reversal and other moves of defence, face-
keeping and positive self-presentation in negative discourse about minorities, immigrants and (other) anti-racists” (p. 87). In fact, he asserts, “the strongest form of denial is reversal: ‘We are not guilty of negative action, they are’ and ‘We are not racists, they are the real racists’” (p. 94).

van Dijk further describes the reversal form of denial:

This kind of reversal is the stock-in-trade of the radical Right, although less extreme versions also occur in more moderate anti-anti-racism (Murray, 1986)...generally, anti-racists tend to be represented as the ones who are intolerant, while lightly accusing innocent and well-meaning citizens (i.e. us) of racism. We see that reversals are no longer forms of social defence, but part of a strategy of (counter-)attack. (p. 94)

van Dijk also provides an example of how the discourse of reversal often engages the discourse of positive self-representation. He describes how the reversal tactic creates an alternate reality of social power relations and protects the social self-image of the dominant group:

[T]his strategic play of denial and reversal at the same time involves the construction of social roles in the world of ethnic strife, such as allies and enemies, victims, heroes and oppressors. In many respects, such discourse mimics the discourse of anti-racists by simply reverting the major roles: victims become oppressors, those who are in power become victims. (p. 105)

In this way, van Dijk suggests, reversal occurs when the Right is defending its own self-image, and its “ideological and political opponents are seen as symbolic competitors in the realm of moral influence” (p. 108).

PC, having been coopted by neoliberals, is becoming the fundamental discursive mechanism in the academy to argue that educational equity goals undermine academic freedom and the standards and values of excellence and intellectual integrity in the university. Richer and Weir (1995) assert that what is “at issue in ‘the PC debates’ within universities are issues of profound cultural change and the normative criteria for public and private policy designed to promote social change” (p. 6). Neoliberal discourses position “the inclusive university in
opposition to academic freedom and merit” (p. 7). Richer and Weir (1995) elaborate on the ways that PC is coopted to resist building an inclusive university:

Given that the attempt to build an inclusive university challenges so much of the daily practice of the academy – from textbooks to the organization of classroom talk to hiring practices – resistance was entirely predictable. If, as Bourdieu (1988) argues, there are ‘two antagonistic principles in hierarchization’ at work in the university – a cultural hierarchy rewarding intellectual contributions and a social hierarchy serving to reinforce extramural temporal power within academe (p. 48) – we believe that the neoconservative campaign against PC serves to further consolidate social hierarchy. More precisely, the anti-PC campaign uses the universalistic values justifying the first principle against attempts to intervene in the second. The specific campaign against PC may fade, but the struggles around academic culture and policy will continue under differing guises into the foreseeable future. (p. 6)

Neoliberal PC discourses construct a polar opposite relationship between human rights and employment equity, on the one hand, and principles of academic freedom and merit, on the other. These neoliberal PC discourses typically employ other discursive forms of coded language to stall or undermine educational equity initiatives, as demonstrated by van Dijk’s (2002) multiple forms of discourses of denial and reversal as well as by Henry and Tator’s (2010) list of discursive barriers. Recall van Dijk (1992) presented discursive practices such as: disclaimers, mitigation, euphemism, excuses, blaming the victim, face-keeping, reversal, and other moves of defence against equity initiatives. Similarly, Henry and Tator (2010) presented 10 discursive barriers including: denial, colour-blindness, equal opportunity arguments, de-contextualization, blaming the victim, binary polarization, balkanization, tolerance, tradition, and political correctness. The full range of these discursive arguments is present in the broader neoliberal ideological code and, therefore, necessarily held in the minds of educational equity policy makers. Smith (1995) argues that, together, these neoliberal discursive arguments, underpinned by a dominant neoliberal ideological code, are “powerful in regulating public text-mediated
discourse” (p. 24) which is “self-replicating” (p. 27). Weir (1995), supporting this notion of self-replication, describes politics as “socially organized in part through discourse”, which then acts as “a kind of struggle to modify…and impose its own set of meaning” (p. 52).

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter described the characteristics of neoliberalism and the extent to which this political ideology influences discourses of diversity that complicate if not impede educational equity policy implementation in Canadian universities. The evolution of the neoliberal ideology was chronicled followed by an explanation of its core values and assumptions. This led to a detailed discussion of how neoliberalism acts as a form of governmentality and cultural hegemony and the ways that the ideology permeates the academy, driving institutional agendas. After establishing the influence of neoliberalism on the academy, the chapter turned to discussing the racializing effects of the neoliberal ideology as well as the ways that one particular neoliberal discursive barrier, political correctness, acts to impede educational equity efforts. The next chapter will document the findings from the analysis of Presidential installation speeches.
CHAPTER SIX

FINDINGS FROM PRESIDENTIAL INSTALLATION SPEECHES

Introduction

In this study, installation speeches were selected as one manifestation of political discourse intentionally and overtly communicated by university Presidents to their internal campus community members, their external public and private sector funders and partners, as well as the public more broadly. This chapter examines discursive themes that emerge from an analysis of installation speeches given by Presidents of 15 Canadian institutions. The themes are organized and discussed under headings, which align with the interview questions asked of senior administrators in the narrative data collection part of this study. Headings are: (a) whether and how educational equity is perceived as a policy issue, (b) barriers and enablers to educational equity policy implementation, and (c) the implications of identity on the policy-making and implementation process. Institutions, and their respective Presidential installation speeches, were chosen using the same sampling criteria for choosing institutions from which to invite senior administrator interview participants for this study. Table 10 lists the 15 Presidents in this analysis, along with their respective institutions and the date when their installation speeches were made. As a reminder, the Presidents delivering the speeches analyzed in this chapter are not necessarily the same senior administrators who agreed to participate in the interview portion of the study.
Table 10
List of Institutional Presidents and Dates of Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of President</th>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Installation Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indira Samarasekera</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen J. Toope</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Cannon</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Florizone</td>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Summerlee</td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David T. Barnard</td>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Munroe-Blum</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Deane</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Rock</td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilene Busch-Vishniac</td>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Petter</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Naylor</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>November 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feridun Hamdullahpur</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amit Chakma</td>
<td>Western University</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamdouh Shoukri</td>
<td>York University</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Analysis of Whether and How Educational Equity is a Policy issue

Themes Aligned with Interview Question 1:
*Given the context of the Canadian social, economic, and political landscape, and its influence on universities, can you please comment on whether and how you think educational equity is an issue for Canadian universities?*

This section examines the themes in Presidential installation speeches that are aligned with the first question posed to senior administrators in the interview phase of the study, which inquired about whether and how educational equity was perceived as an issue for Canadian universities. Analysis of senior administrator responses to the first interview question will be examined in Chapter Seven. Across all installation speeches delivered by Presidents, diversity and equity-related matters are referenced to and spoken of frequently, signalling either that the subject is perceived to be of import and relevance to the mission of the university and particularly to the incoming President or, in the very least, that the President knows the subject ought to be of import and relevant.
With respect to the question of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue in Canadian universities, analysis of the 15 speeches of Presidents in the study sample uncovered four themes drawn out from the remarks of 10 different Presidents. In these Presidential installation speeches, references are made to the university as a place to promote global citizenship and to establish the foundations for a strong, civil, inclusive, just, and sustainable society. One President gave examples of the ways that higher learning, or the lack thereof, could make substantive impacts on the social circumstances and outcomes of individual citizens. One administrator said it another way by questioning whether the advancement of any university goal could ever be desirable if it directly or indirectly weakened an already disadvantaged group or community in society. The four major themes, in order of most to least frequently referenced, included the role of the university in developing socially conscious and responsible citizens, addressing systemic social disadvantages and inequities, engaging students in critical thinking to influence social change, and creating inclusive social spaces and societies. Below are relevant excerpts from speeches, followed by further discussion of the themes.

As a university, we exist to both serve and stimulate our communities locally, nationally and internationally – that’s our responsibility. (Richard Florizone, 2013, Dalhousie)

I want to talk…about the university as a place where the world comes together. Our story is strengthened by our diversity: in our ability to be a gathering place for ideas that transcend nationality, ethnicity, race, and sexual orientation. At Dal, diversity has been a part of our DNA from the very beginning, when Lord Dalhousie sought to establish North America’s first non-denominational university. Dal welcomed, with open arms, Jewish students from Europe who were fleeing persecution during the rise of Nazi Germany. Our Transition Year Program…for more than 40 years has been addressing systemic disadvantages by empowering African Nova Scotians and Aboriginal youth to pursue higher education. Dal’s record is far from perfect. We have further work to do to make Dal a truly welcoming place for our indigenous Black and Aboriginal Nova Scotians, and for international scholars and students. A diverse and global campus is a stronger campus. An inclusive and global community is a stronger community. To grow and prosper, we need to open our doors to the world. (Richard Florizone, 2013, Dalhousie)
Our universities...help us develop a more comprehensive understanding and appreciation of the complexity of societal life, and of the consequences of the decisions we make. (Feridun Hamdullahpur, 2011, Waterloo)

I saw first-hand how young lives especially are shaped by learning...I came to understand that crime prevention has as much to do with literacy as with the law. I was able to see that learning has an impact on body as well as mind, since education levels influence the state of our health and the length of our years. I saw at close quarters the enormous contribution that universities make to our economy. Their graduates...their research...[influencing] nothing less than our standard of living and our quality of life. I saw the role of education in advancing development, in preventing conflict, and in building durable societies. (Allan Rock, 2008, Ottawa)

We need to learn from Kim Schonert-Reichl’s work on moral development and social education, from the studies of Martin Brokenleg on kids at risk, and from Bill Rees’ ground-breaking research on our ecological footprint. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

[Linking the] promotion of global citizenship to the commitment to build a civil and sustainable society, we can see that a global university can only exist as a sustainable university, environmentally and socially. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

Research from UBC tells us that Canadian cities still have a way to go before we can claim to be truly inclusive societies and sustainable communities. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

Just as ‘education as integrity’ presupposes collegiality, honesty and fairness within our university community, so it also commits us as an institution to work for the enrichment and development of a healthy, just and prosperous community around us. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

Integrity in education meant that international standing bought by betraying local interest was unacceptable; advancement of the university that directly or indirectly hobbled the community in its quest for prosperity, civility and justice was reprehensible. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

I invite you to think of...the obligation we in the university must acknowledge to work constantly towards the betterment of our immediate community and broader society. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

Universities must work to regain their distinction as the moral, social and intellectual centres of society by promoting liberal education and encouraging community awareness of social issues. (Alastair Summerlee, 2003, Guelph)

Universities and colleges have a vital role to play in the health and welfare of society and in the care of the world. (Alastair Summerlee, 2003, Guelph)
Universities have traditionally been the places in democratic society where there is most freedom for the expression of radical views, and we should continue to serve that role, even when it is not comfortable. (David Barnard, 2008, Manitoba)

In a world that faces food shortages, environmental crises, economic uncertainty, inequity of opportunity, disparities in health outcomes and the quality of life, poverty, religiously motivated strife and too great a readiness to address differences through armed conflict, there is a pressing need for us to be even more engaged with the realities that face this province, this country and the world. (David Barnard, 2008, Manitoba)

Education, more than any other force, has the capacity to lift the human condition – to improve any individual and to advance every organization. Education prepares us to make a better job of our own lives, and to enrich the lives of those around us. In building our own capacity, we become better able to improve our workplace, our neighbourhood, our community – indeed the whole world. (Andrew Petter, 2010, Simon Fraser)

Universities endure because they respond to society’s needs and they help drive change. Throughout history, great universities have helped society argue, articulate, define and achieve the next stage of progress. Now more than ever, universities are global institutions. We have a role to play in addressing the challenges facing the world today, challenges like pandemics, climate change, poverty, racism and extremism to name a few. (Mamdouh Shoukri, 2007, York)

I ask for your support because we together recognize the enduring alchemy of higher education, and its transformative potential in the lives of our students and our society. (David Naylor, 2005, Toronto)

In summary, there were 23 references across four themes concerning the role of universities in relation to diversity and equity issues. The most frequently cited theme, referenced by 8 different Presidents, was the role of the university in contributing to social responsibility. The next most frequently cited theme, referenced by 5 different Presidents, was the university’s role in addressing systemic social inequities. Three Presidents spoke of the role of the university in engaging students in critical thinking and 2 Presidents cited the role of the university in helping to create inclusive societies. The number of different Presidents, among the sample of 15, who spoke to each of the four thematic areas, and the frequency with which they made references to the themes are summarized in Table 11.
### Table 11
*Themes Related to Whether Educational Equity is an Issue: Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing social responsibility and strengthening communities</td>
<td>“our responsibility”</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“moral development and social education”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“building civil and sustainable society”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“developing prosperity, civility and justice”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“understanding and appreciating…consequences of decisions we make”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“education as integrity”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“moral, social and intellectual centres of society”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“stronger community”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“betterment of society”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“advancing development, preventing conflict, building durable societies”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“sustainable communities”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“enrichment and development of…just..community”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“vital role to play in the health and welfare of society and…the world”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing systemic social disadvantages and inequities</td>
<td>“addressing systemic disadvantages by empowering…youth”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“engage with the realities that face [us in] the world”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“capacity to lift the human condition”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“respond to society’s need and…help drive change”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“addressing the challenges facing the world…poverty, racism…to name a few”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“transformative potential in the lives of our students and society”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging students in critical social analysis</td>
<td>“understanding and appreciating complexities of life”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“encouraging community awareness of social issues”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“freedom for the expression of radical views”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating inclusive spaces and societies</td>
<td>“inclusive…community”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a gathering place…transcend [identity]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“inclusive societies”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analyzing installation speeches for signs of which educational equity issues Presidents may be most mindful or passionate about, I found themes across the four domains of educational equity set out in this study. The themes are summarized under headings representing each of the four educational equity domains: (i) improving access for historically under-represented students, (ii) establishing inclusive campus climates, (iii) developing globally inclusive curricula, and (iv) recruiting and retaining equity-seeking faculty and staff.
(i) **Access for Historically Under-represented Students**

In the first educational-equity domain, improving access for historically under-represented students, Presidents referred to three distinct student populations: Aboriginal learners, students with no or low financial resources, and first generation students. There were 12 references related to this domain, the second highest number of references across the four domains. The three themes uncovered, in order of most to least frequently cited, are the need to improve access and support for students from low-income households, first generation university students, and Aboriginal students. Below are relevant excerpts from speeches, followed by a discussion of the themes.

We must, for First Nations and Metis students as well as others, appreciate the difficulties of being the first generation in a family to attend university and we must provide support for students and their families. And we must do this while recognizing and valuing cultural differences, and being guided by the principle of self-determination. (Ilene Busch-Vishniac, 2012, Saskatchewan)

First Nations and Metis peoples are the fastest growing population in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, they are also underrepresented in our colleges and universities, and their degree completion rates are well below those of non-Aboriginal students. Michael Adam’s extensive Urban Aboriginal Peoples study found that the desires of First Nations, Metis and Inuit people are no different from those of other Canadians: health, prosperity, and happiness in life. The Adams study also found education to be the top desire among Aboriginal people. Thus, the difference in degree completion cannot be seen as merely a reflection of cultural norms. (Ilene Busch-Vishniac, 2012, Saskatchewan)

We must articulate and understand the challenges of leaving a largely First Nations and Metis community for a campus on which traditional practices and beliefs are mostly hidden rather than in plain sight. (Ilene Busch-Vishniac, 2012, Saskatchewan)

Universities are agents for transformation for those who come as students, opening up possibilities to them and preparing them for a rich experience of cultural, social and economic life. (David Barnard, 2008, Manitoba)
Our continuing primary responsibilities will be to educate the future leaders of this province, and to make this institution available to all qualified British Columbians. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

The key to our success is to involve every citizen in higher education, not once but frequently – Canadians by birth and by choice, aboriginal and immigrant, rural and urban, rich and poor, young and old. Our obligation is to endow all citizens with the ability to realize their potential for greatness. Only then will the next century be unquestionably brighter for our children. (Indira Samarasekera, 2005, Alberta)

I will be a tireless advocate of accessible and affordable public education…[and] work to ensure that every intellectually-capable student who can benefit from a University of Guelph degree will be able to do so. (Alastair Summerlee, 2003, Guelph)

First, the Canadian dream – the dream that reconciles excellence with equality of opportunity – hinges on the principle that every student who deserves to be here actually finds a seat here. (David Naylor, 2005, Toronto)

Our students…encounter and are often challenged by new ideas, new ways of thinking, a new global perspective. Our responsibility is to…[support] exchange and study-abroad opportunities…and working…to increase access to higher education. (Richard Florizone, 2013, Dalhousie)

Several remarks made by Presidents touched on the need to take proactive steps to recruit Aboriginal learners who experience significant barriers to accessing higher education. These access issues were discussed in the context of a colonial legacy still impacting Aboriginal communities and prospective learners. One President expressed a sense of urgency for institutions to recruit increasing numbers of Aboriginal youth, specifically pointing to the educational attainment gap experienced by Aboriginal peoples. This President cautioned against believing the myth that Aboriginal peoples devalue education or lack aspirations for higher learning. She asserted that the educational gap is not inherent to Aboriginal identity or culture. The other distinct groups highlighted when discussing access were students with no or little income support from their families as well as first generation students, who are the first in their families to attend a post-secondary institution. Presidents expressed a sense of obligation to make
higher education affordable and accessible to interested students, with the prerequisite that they be qualified and intellectually capable. The need to ensure access to higher education for students from low-income families was referenced most frequently, five times by five different Presidents. Two references related to first generation students and were made by two Presidents. One President referenced Aboriginal students six different times. The number of different Presidents, among the sample of 15, who spoke to thematic areas and the frequency, with which they spoke to those themes, are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12
Themes Related to Access for Historically Under-represented Students: Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income students</td>
<td>“primary responsibility...to make this institution available to all qualified”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“key to success is to involve every citizen in higher education”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“advocate of accessible and affordable public education”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“increase access to higher education”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“every student who deserves to be here [should find] a seat here”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation students</td>
<td>“appreciate the difficulties of being the first generation in a family to attend university”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[transforming and] opening up possibilities to [students]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal students</td>
<td>“Aboriginal and Metis…fastest growing population”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“underrepresented in our colleges and universities”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“degree completion rates are well below those of non-Aboriginal students”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“challenges [for] First Nations and Metis [leaving for] a campus on which traditional practices and beliefs are mostly hidden”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we must…[recognize and value] cultural differences…and [be] guided by the principle of self-determination”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) Inclusive Campus Climates

In the second educational equity domain, the establishment of inclusive campus climates, Presidents made indirectly related references. Very few Presidents made these references and the domain was the least frequently referenced among the four domains. Given the infrequency of references, I will speak about issues raised rather than themes. Two relevant issues were asserted: that a diversity of learners and scholars enriches the academy, and that a shared humanity exists across diversity. Below are relevant excerpts from speeches followed by a summary and discussion of the two key issues drawn out.

Fifty percent of our undergraduates report a total family income of less than $50,000. 1,400 students with special needs are registered with our accessibility services. Fifty percent of our undergraduates self-identify as belonging to a visible minority. And, fifty percent now speak a language other than English at home. This diversity marks us as more than just another university. It tells the world that U of T is our nation’s most powerful springboard to great accomplishments for Canadians from every walk of life… And this university’s increasingly international and multicultural student population is an enormous asset for Canada in today’s borderless world. (David Naylor, 2005, Toronto)

We share these qualities [imagination, inspiration, leadership] which make us uniquely human, across gender, ethnicity, and place. (Indira Samarasekera, 2005, Alberta)

One President pointed out the diversity of the campus environment by sharing statistics on the representation of students from low-income families, students registered for accessibility services, students who identify as racialized, and students whose speak languages in addition to English. He went on to assert the value of a diverse, international, and multicultural student population as a hallmark for a powerful and accomplished university environment. The other President urged the appreciation of universal human qualities across differences in identity. The number of different Presidents, who referred to the two issues discussed above, and the frequency, with which they made these references, are summarized in Table 13.
Table 13
Themes Related to Inclusive Campus Climates:
Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity an Asset</td>
<td>“diversity...tells the world that [the university is a] powerful springboard to great accomplishments”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“increasingly international and multicultural student population is an enormous asset”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Humanity</td>
<td>“share qualities…which make us human across [identity]”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Globally Inclusive Curricula

In the third educational equity domain, developing globally inclusive curricula, three themes emerged from Presidents’ installation speeches. There were 14 references to this domain, making it the most frequently referenced domain in the speeches. The themes in the references, in order of most to least frequently cited, were the need to integrate learning with social responsibility and citizenship goals, the need to enhance teaching programs, and the need to internationalize the curriculum. Below are relevant excerpts from speeches.

Fundamental to the goal of connecting Canada to the world is to attract bright minds from around the globe. (Indira Samarasekera, 2005, Alberta)

Excellent students from other countries bring diverse cultural perspectives to our classrooms. (Indira Samarasekera, 2005, Alberta)

Our vision must inspire students to achieve their potential for great achievements through learning, discovery, and citizenship…By integrating learning, discovery, and citizenship we can foster social and moral responsibility, political literacy, and community service…Our faculty must play their role as public intellectuals and citizens, as critics and conscience of modern society. (Indira Samarasekera, 2005, Alberta)
Our students need real-life opportunities to be exposed to a diversity of views and cultures in Canada and around the world. (Amit Chakma, 2009, Western)

In addition to educating future citizens and leaders, we also have a responsibility to seek solutions for complex challenges facing our society. (Amit Chakma, 2009, Western)

It is time now for Western to have global aspirations. It is time for Western to educate ‘Global Citizens’ and our future leaders. Let us have the courage to review our curriculum to ensure that we can meet the needs of our future citizens. (Amit Chakma, 2009, Western)

How can we encourage and motivate more well-rounded, global citizens? I believe that what attracted me to the University of Waterloo is exactly what attracted you…a chance to make a difference. To connect your areas of interest to real solutions that have an impact in the world outside the campus. (Feridun Hamdullahpur, 2011, Waterloo)

If Canada is to reclaim its place on the planet as a trusted interlocutor between the old order and the new superpowers, we need additional skills and perspectives. We need to teach our students to speak Mandarin and Cantonese, Hindi, and other languages. We need to teach our students about history and the vocabulary of culture and politics in the most populous countries on the planet. (David Naylor, 2005, Toronto)

International graduate students additionally bring fresh insights, skills and international networks into Canada; in the long term they bring important political connections and market opportunities. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

For students, the community work is often integrated into academic course work – an approach called Community Service-Learning pioneered in Canada by Margot Fryer, UBC’s Learning Exchange Director. I will encourage UBC to extend the community-service learning concept pioneered in the Learning Exchange to our international partnerships with other universities and with civil society in the developing world. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

Many of our programs have a community service component that provides opportunities for our students to make a real difference in the community even before they graduate. (Elizabeth Cannon, 2010, Calgary)

I propose that we build on [program that enable our students to serve the community]. So that service becomes our signature. The creation of a Service Office and the development of an ethic of service would reflect the principle that universities are there not only to educate, but also to inspire; not just to graduate scholars, but also to create citizens of the world, to provide the means to turn idealism into action. By creating an ethic of service on campus dedicated to academic excellence, we would become a place at once of scholarship and of social purpose. (Allan Rock, 2008, Ottawa)
Our University’s global vision should also be reflected in our curriculum, and we must see that it does. (Allan Rock, 2008, Ottawa)

To assert that global citizenship cannot be learned in a local context is simply wrong. Poverty on our doorsteps is like poverty four thousand miles away: while the cultural and socio-economic determinants may differ, the nature of the human experience is similar, and it is possible to extrapolate from analysis of the local to shed light on problematic areas of the global. This is the gathering-in and interconnecting function of education as integrity. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

We must further grow our internationally-respected cross-disciplinary research and teaching programs while preserving a deep strength in core disciplines in the social sciences, the humanities, the life sciences and the physical sciences and engineering. (Heather Munroe-Blum, 2003, McGill)

Many Presidents spoke about the role of the academy in improving social conditions and doing so through the provision of a transformative social education and experience for post-secondary students. They emphasized the importance of developing socially conscious and responsible citizens who would contribute to solving the complexity of social issues facing the globe today. This viewpoint suggests social justice and citizenship should be outcomes of student learning considered either through curricular or co-curricular programs. Community service learning was also often mentioned as one pedagogical approach for achieving social justice and citizenship learning outcomes. International students and internationalization were common topics broached in speeches. One President specifically emphasized the need for students to learn additional languages, with Mandarin, Cantonese and Hindi mentioned, at the top of the list, to be able to interact on a global stage with the most populated and globally influential nations in the world today. There is likely an economic motivation for this. Globalization and neoliberalism drive an interest in developing global capital through things like acquiring language skills to work with and among those countries that are or will be significant players in the global economy, China and India being among those countries. Interdisciplinary partnerships were also
promoted in tandem with internationalization. Both were promoted as means to enhance the calibre of learners and scholars in the academy, thereby positively impacting measures of quality and excellence in teaching, learning, and research. The need to integrate learning with social responsibility and citizenship goals was referenced most frequently, nine times by seven different Presidents. The need to generally enhance teaching programs was referenced five times by five different Presidents and two Presidents cited the importance of recruiting international students. The number and frequency of references to the themes in this domain are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14
Themes Related to Globally Inclusive Curricula: Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrate learning and citizenship | “integrating learning, discovery, and citizenship we can foster social and moral responsibility”  
”encourage and motivate more well-rounded global citizens”  
”connect…areas of interest to real solutions that have an impact in the world”  
”educating future citizens”  
”need real-life opportunities to be exposed to diversity”  
”global citizenship [can] be learned in a local context”  
”community work often integrated into academic course work…community service-learning”  
”programs have a community service component”  
”creating an ethic of service on campus dedicated to academic excellence…a place…of scholarship and of social purpose.”                                                                 | 7                              | 9                      |
| Enhance teaching programs      | “teach our students to speak Mandarin and Cantonese, Hindi, …about history and the vocabulary of culture and politics”  
“grow our internationally-respected cross-disciplinary research and teaching programs”  
“university’s global vision should also be reflected in our curriculum”  
“have the courage to review our curriculum”  
“faculty must play their role…as critics and conscience”                                                                                                                                 | 5                              | 5                      |
| International students         | “students from other countries bring diverse cultural perspectives”  
“international students…bring fresh insights, skills and international networks”                                                                                                                                                                      | 2                              | 2                      |
(iv) Equity-Seeking Faculty and Staff

With respect to the fourth educational equity domain, recruitment and retention of equity-seeking faculty and staff in the academy, four different issues arose from a few references made by a couple of Presidents. This was the second least frequently referenced domain with only five references made by two Presidents. The issues emerging from Presidential remarks relate to the need for the university to provide appropriate career opportunities, to practice fair organizational processes, to foster an engaging work environment, and to articulate equitable institutional values for its employees. Below are relevant excerpts from speeches.

Universities can also be agents of transformation for those who work as faculty or as staff members. We should use processes that are inclusive and consultative – but we should not be satisfied with that bare minimum. We should also strive to be an outstandingly attractive place to work, a place where each person is treated with respect and dignity, and given the largest possible opportunity to make a rewarding contribution. (David Barnard, 2008, Manitoba)

We are blessed with students who come from every culture, who speak every language. We are connected to the world because we come from every part of it. York has strong values rooted in a culture that reflects the new Canada – diversity, social justice, accessibility and fairness. These values were a very important factor in my decision to come to York. (Mamdouh Shoukri, 2007, York)

From an early age, my parents instilled in me the value and importance of education, of exposure to diversity in culture and learning. And while I never dreamed that I’d someday be the president of a university, I knew from a very young age that I would someday attend a university. (Mamdouh Shoukri, 2007, York)

A couple of Presidents spoke to this educational equity domain, asserting the importance of organizational values that enhance inclusive organizational processes, respectful workplace environments, opportunities for diverse faculty and staff to contribute and excel in the academy, and commitments to attracting diverse faculty and staff. One President identified these values as
being important to their own professional career opportunities. The number and frequency of references to the areas discussed are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15
Themes Related to Equity-Seeking Faculty and Staff: Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Opportunities</td>
<td>“given the largest possible opportunity to make a rewarding contribution”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I never dreamt that I’d someday be the president of a university”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Processes</td>
<td>“use processes that are inclusive and consultative”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Climate</td>
<td>“a place where each person is treated with respect and dignity”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Values</td>
<td>“diversity, social justice, accessibility and fairness. These values were a very important factor in my decision to come”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section discusses analysis of themes in Presidential installation speeches that relate to perceptions of the barriers and enablers to advancing educational equity in the academy. This discussion is set up to align with responses to the prompting questions posed to senior administrators as part of the first question in the interview phase of this study, which are discussed in Chapter Eight.
(b) Analysis of Barriers and Enablers to Educational Equity

Themes Aligned with Interview Questions 1 Prompts:

In what ways do you think your university is meeting educational equity goals?
If there are challenges, what do you think might be impeding equity policy effectiveness, and what strategies may improve effectiveness?
If there are successes, what strategies are working and how do you know?

Analyzing Presidential speeches for signs of barriers and enablers to advancing educational equity in the academy, two themes emerged in relation to barriers and two in relation to enablers. With respect to barriers, the two themes suggested in speeches are: (i) neoliberal market forces and discourse, and (ii) economic constraints. Regarding enablers, the two themes that emerged are: (i) university financial investments, and (ii) leaders as change agents. Below are relevant excerpts from speeches, followed by a discussion of barriers and enablers.

Barrier (i) – Neoliberal Market Forces and Discourse

A few Presidents cautioned against uncritically embracing current neoliberal market-driven ideas and discourses surrounding globalization or submitting to the notion that it is futile or out of our control to defend the historical social missions of universities as well as contemporary educational equity goals. One President commented on the need to avoid divisiveness fuelled by rhetoric of provincialism, nationalism, and globalization.

In speaking of global citizenship and a global role for the university, we must not be constrained by the rhetoric of globalization. Yes, global market opportunities are greater than ever, as is global economic competition. Scholars…are working hard to make sense of this new hyper-competitive world…Let UBC be a provincial university without petty provincialism; a national university without crass nationalism; and a global university without thoughtless deference to the rhetoric of globalization. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)
Over the last decade universities, especially in the English-speaking world, have participated increasingly in a bloodless marketing discourse, focused on “global citizenship” as the goal towards which they and their students should aspire. But for all this time they have failed effectively to re-negotiate the relationship upon which such aspirations might successfully be built, the link between institutions of higher education and the world, which purportedly they seek to serve. What kind of education assumes that ‘the world’ begins – or at least demands to be reckoned with – only once you leave our national borders? And what kind of education leads students to believe that the world exists to provide an arena and a resource for their personal improvement. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

What we offer society is a longer-term view, with a mode of inquiry that seeks to solve today’s problems while also building the knowledge and capacity for an uncertain future. A vivid example of this is to think back to September 11, 2001. The field of Middle Eastern studies suddenly became very important that day. What may have looked like an obscure or less relevant field the day before was now there for society to draw on, having been nurtured over decades within our universities. Focusing on the long term created the capacity to respond to the short term. This focus on the long term can make universities slower to adapt and respond to society’s current needs. Overall I do believe that universities can benefit from being more responsive and more market influenced. But we must not become entirely market driven, or else society will lose an essential capacity – the capacity to nurture and develop the kind of long-term knowledge that is required to address unforeseen events, and to seize opportunities not yet imagined. (Richard Florizone, 2013, Dalhousie)

I would like to believe, however, that Universities have been supported for reasons that have to do with the workings of our minds and souls, and not just our markets. And I hope that both Ministers would agree with Northrop Frye who said, “the fundamental job of the imagination in ordinary life is to produce, out of the society we have to live in, a vision of the society we want to live in. (David Naylor, 2005, Toronto)

Barrier (ii) – Economic Constraints

A couple of Presidents remarked on the status of current revenue sources for and financial constraints facing universities in the context of increasing demand for higher education. Using economic terminology of supply and demand and references to scarcity of resources and competition, these Presidents asserted that, in such a context of economic constraint, a university
could not possibly meet all demands or interests. One also problematized the lack of control public universities have over allocating key sources of funds.

It should come as no surprise that with an exponential increase in the demand for post-secondary education should come increasing options and competition. It is simply an example of the law of supply and demand. (Ilene Busch-Vishniac, 2012, Saskatchewan)

No university can do everything well. That is especially true of publicly-funded universities that do not have discretion over key sources of revenue. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

The two thematic barriers, in order of most to least frequently referenced, were the need to be critical of the rhetoric of globalization and market-oriented neoliberal agendas as well as the need to come to terms with economic pressures that are placing financial constraints on public institutions. The former theme was referenced six times by four different Presidents and the latter theme referenced twice by two different Presidents. No President, among the 15 sampled, mentioned the need for the university sector, through its senior leadership, to lobby democratically elected governments for increased public support of higher education. While they highlight the challenge of economic constraints and a market-driven ideologies in their speeches, they do not in those speeches venture to suggest ways to challenge and counteract public and private sector policies and practices that may be undermining some key higher educational goals, including educational equity. The number of different Presidents, among the sample 15, who spoke to thematic barriers and the frequency with which they made such references are summarized in Table 16.
Table 16
Themes in Barriers to Educational Equity:
Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Forces (marketization, consumerism, globalization)</td>
<td>“universities have been supported for reasons that have to do with...minds and souls, and not just our markets”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we must not be constrained by the rhetoric of globalization”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“be a...global university without thoughtless deference to the rhetoric of globalization”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“universities...have participated increasingly in a...marketing discourse”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we must not become entirely market driven”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“what kind of education leads students to believe...”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Constraints</td>
<td>“the world exists [as a] resource for their personal improvement”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“law of supply and demand” “publicly-funded universities...do not have discretion over key sources of revenue”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enabler (i) – Financial Investments

Turning to enablers referenced in installation speeches, several Presidents discussed the need to invest in innovative initiatives to support specific educational equity goals and they used the occasion of delivering their installation speeches to announce new funding allocations for such initiatives.

We now spend $150M in University-derived funds each year on student stipends, bursaries and scholarships, and other forms of financial aid. As a result, we have made real progress in opening U of T to the least advantaged students, without compromising access for those from middle-income families. (David Naylor, 2005, Toronto)

As a clear signal of the importance of UBC’s relationship with First Nations, I am announcing today the creation of a new position at the heart of university governance. UBC will soon have its first Special Advisor to the President on Aboriginal Affairs. (Stephen Toope, 2006, British Columbia)

This fund [to support the social sciences, humanities, and the fine arts] is our commitment to excellence in these vitally important fields, and this investment will help provide knowledge to address many of then twenty-first century’s most challenging social problems while helping to strengthen our cultural heritage. (Indira Samarasekera, 2005, Alberta)
Several Presidents commented on the responsibility they have in leading their institutions to achieve their varying missions in keeping with the values and principles they outlined in their speeches. These Presidents went on to say that leadership does not simply come from a position or title but rather a set of qualities, attitudes, and competencies that must be demonstrated. Many Presidents also identified that the university will have succeeded on one level if it is able to boast graduating humans and citizens who are self-reflective, considerate, open-minded, and action-oriented. This, they infer, will prime graduates to address the complex social and global challenges of our time. It is reasonable to assume these qualities, that Presidents urge in their students and graduates, should then also be expected and encouraged among academic and administrative leaders who reinforce attitudinal and behavioural norms and from whom students learn and model their behaviours as scholars and future academics and professionals.

I know that leadership doesn’t come from a title; it comes from an attitude. (Elizabeth Cannon, 2010, Calgary)

Ensuring our students leave university with the knowledge and the open-mindedness they need to push the outer limits of human thought while being considerate of the world around them. (Alastair Summerlee, 2003, Guelph)

Because the university derives its authority from higher human values and a committed civility, it furthermore goes without saying that the day-to-day activities of the institution need to reflect that commitment. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

Although we do not find ourselves in immediate danger from teargas and other cruder forms of interference and intimidation, the drift of the university sector is nonetheless not entirely within our control. For that reason education as integrity remains worthy of our vigorous advocacy and defense – how urgently you would only understand if you have seen it under threat. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

I wish you [graduands] well and commend to you a life of reflection, sound action, and integrity. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)
Universities promote the free exchange of ideas and encourage open and meaningful debate. (Heather Munroe-Blum, 2003, McGill)

As you, our newest graduates, head out into a world that today faces complex challenges and sudden change, you have acquired habits of mind and breadth of perspective that will equip you well to cope and to thrive. (Allan Rock, 2008, Ottawa)

Our success in breeding innovation and creativity will be measured by our openness to students who find it hardest to get here, who have felt stigmatized, excluded, or unwelcome. (David Naylor, 2005, Toronto)

Dalhousie’s…strength has been…in the number of outreach activities and community-based projects that take the knowledge generated inside these walls and connect it with the people throughout the world who need it most. (Richard Florizone, 2013, Dalhousie)

We are looking both to preserve tradition and to make progress, to find in ourselves – and to instil in our students – dignity and wisdom, and thus to shape destiny. (David Barnard, 2008, Manitoba)

It is easy to speak of the university as an abstraction, but the concrete reality is found in people. You need to take what you have learned, both in formal settings and in the interactions with friends and colleagues, and use that knowledge and wisdom to become agents of transformation in your family, in your circle of friends, in your working environment and in the larger community. (David Barnard, 2008, Manitoba)

We must never forget that the purpose of education is to expand our ability to help others…to contribute to the construction of a healthier, stronger and more just society. (Andrew Petter, 2010, Simon Fraser)

The two thematic enablers, in order of most to least frequently referenced, were the importance of modelling leadership attitudes and behaviours for social change as well as the importance of making financial investments to achieve social diversity and equity goals. The former theme was referenced 12 times by 7 different Presidents, and the latter theme was referenced 3 times by 3 Presidents. The number of different Presidents, among the sample 15, who spoke to thematic enablers and the frequency with which they made these references are summarized in Table 17.
Table 17
Themes in Enablers to Educational Equity:
Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leadership attitudes and skills | “leadership…comes from an attitude”  
“ensuring our students leave…with open-mindednes”  
“university derives authority from higher human values and a commitment to civility”  
“the drift of the university sector is…not entirely out of our control”  
“wish [graduands]…a life of reflection, sound action and integrity”  
“encourage open and meaningful debate”  
“graduates…have acquired habits of mind and breadth of perspective”  
“success…measured by our openness to students who find it hardest to get here”  
“strength…in number of outreach activities…[to] people throughout the world who need it most.”  
“find in ourselves – and instil in our students – dignity and wisdom”  
“take what you have learned…become agents of transformation”  
“purpose of education…to contribute to…just society” | 7 | 12 |
| University Investment         | “we spend…funds each year on…financial aid. As a result we have made real progress in opening [the university] to the least advantaged students”  
“creation of anew position at heart of university governance”  
“[a new] fund [to support the social sciences, humanities, and the fine arts]” | 3 | 3 |

The next section analyzes and discusses themes in Presidential installation speeches that are aligned with responses to the second interview question, which explores the relationship between self-identified social identity and advancing educational equity in the academy. Senior administrative responses to the second interview question are examined in Chapter Nine.
(c) Analysis Social Identity in Relation to Educational Equity

Themes Aligned with Interview Question 2:
*If you are comfortable, please comment on whether and how you think your gender and racial identities factor into your perceptions, experiences, understanding, and actions around educational equity in the academy. So as not to make any assumptions, if you choose to answer this question, please first tell me how you identify your gender and race or ethnicity.*

The final section in this chapter analyzed and discusses the themes in Presidential installation speeches that are aligned with interview question two related to identity. Six different Presidents shared personal stories and related their social identities and cultural experiences to their educational journeys and administrative roles in advancing educational equity. Below are relevant excerpts from speeches, followed by a discussion of the themes.

I’m tremendously proud of my heritage and where I come from, but I am even more proud of Canada and all that it stands for, not least of which is its incredible diversity. (Mamdouh Shoukri, 2007, York)

I have been told that my appointment symbolizes hope and possibility for future generations, regardless of their socio-economic, ethnic or cultural backgrounds. Who would have thought that a boy from a tribe in the hills of South Eastern Bangladesh, facing challenges brought about by war and political conflict, would stand here before you, as the President of a century-old Canadian institution? Neither I nor my parents would have ever dreamt of this happening. (Amit Chakma, 2009, Western)

I did not imagine growing up in Jaffna, a city at the northern tip of Sri Lanka...that life’s journey would take me to Edmonton and Northern Alberta. No two places could be more different, and yet the people of these regions share common values rooted in climate, tradition, and aspirations. (Indira Samarasekera, 2005, Alberta)

I was brought up in a home that valued education more than almost anything else. My father was born in the Ottawa valley. He left school after Grade 3 to work on the failing family farm. When it was lost, he pumped gas, delivered parcels and caddied for coins at the Royal Ottawa Golf Club. My mother was born in Dublin, Ireland. She too left primary school and entered the work force to help put food on the table for her 8 siblings. Given their life experience, nothing was as important to them as our education. They saw it as the way to ensure that we would never have to face the hardships they had overcome. (Allan Rock, 2008, Ottawa)
Universities are agents of transformation: this has certainly been true in my life. I was the first person in my family to attend university. (David Barnard, 2008, Manitoba)

In 1975 I was an undergraduate at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg [South Africa]. To a young White man from the English-speaking minority…the campus environment…was exciting but also confusing. Confusion arose because the University, being government-funded and owing its existence to parliamentary statute, was in important ways inseparable from (one sometimes thought complicit in) the established order against which many in the student body felt compelled to protest…Here was the leader of the institution, dressed in a manner that asserted his leadership and appeared to confirm his allegiance with the status quo, joining with students in protest against policies propagated by what we thought to be the very source of his own authority, the government. (Patrick Deane, 2010, McMaster)

In the installation speeches analyzed, six Presidents discussed their social and cultural identities in the context of their formative social and cultural experiences growing up and the values they developed, as a consequence of these experiences, in relation to higher education. Three of the six Presidents identified as racialized individuals, sharing stories of their own imaginations and ambitions of attending university, inferring that racialized students not only can and should attend university but can and should imagine themselves as capable of holding the highest position in the academy. Two Presidents identified being first in their family to attend university and, therefore, their personal commitment to access for first-generation students. One of these two Presidents shared they also grew up in a family that felt financial hardship and they linked their story to the need to ensure financial accessibility for students. One President identified his White privilege growing up in a racially segregated environment and related this to his own early development of a sense of responsibility to work towards social change. All of these Presidents used self-disclosure of their own marginalized or privileged identities to bring to light the importance of attending to inequities society and in higher education. The number of different Presidents, among the sample 15, who spoke to the themes related to identity and the frequency with which they made these references are summarized in Table 18.
Table 18
Themes Related to Social Identity and Educational Equity: Direct Quotes from Presidential Installation Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Presidents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity and Opportunity</td>
<td>“I did not imagine growing up in…Sri Lanka…that life’s journey would take me to Edmonton and Northern Alberta.”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Who would have thought a boy from a tribe in the hills of South Eastern Bangladesh…would stand here before you”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m…proud of my heritage and where I am from”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation Experience</td>
<td>“I was the first person in my family to attend university.”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Given [my parents’] life experiences, nothing was as important to them as our education”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Privilege and Responsibility</td>
<td>“To a young White man from the English-speaking minority [in South Africa]…[I was among] many in the student body [who] felt compelled to protest”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter Summary

This chapter has detailed the findings from analyzing the discourse in Presidential installation speeches, which I refer to as the political domain of analysis in this study. Reviewing the installation speeches of the Presidents across the 15 universities in the sample uncovered several themes that can be mapped to the questions posed to senior administrators in the narrative interview portion of the study. The chapter organized the findings into themes under the following headings: (a) whether and how educational equity is a policy issue, (b) barriers and enablers to educational equity, and (c) identity as it influences educational equity. Related to the question of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue, subthemes aligned with the four educational equity domains were discussed.

In Installation Speeches, neoliberal discourses of denial and universalism, associated with a minimization mindset, surfaced in relation to the question of how to create an inclusive campus climate. First, not only were there very few references to this area of educational equity, but the
responses were quite superficial. There was not a systemic analysis of what might be contributing to environments that are not inclusive and strategies to remedy that condition. Instead, the Presidents who touched on this area implied that representational diversity necessarily creates an inclusive environment and, because we all share similar human values and qualities, respect and inclusion may not be difficult to achieve. Also, a minimization orientation was evident in speeches that approached a neoliberal discourse of equal opportunity. In relation to issues of access for equity-seeking faculty and staff as well as the identities of Presidents, some Presidents reflected that they never imagined being the titular heads of academic institutions given who they are. They followed these comments with recognition of their own values, pride, and perseverance. In the absence of an analysis of power and privilege, access to higher education and opportunities to advance within institutions may seem possible to anyone if they simply value education, have pride in themselves, and persevere in the face of adversity. The implications of this equal opportunity discourse can mask the systemic and structural barriers that exist for a vast majority of marginalized prospective learners as well as marginalized students, faculty, and staff currently in the academy. Where speeches remarked on challenges and opportunities facing universities, from the perspective of Presidents, neoliberal market-oriented discourses emerged. A few Presidents were cautious about being driven entirely by global economic competition; however, other Presidents resigned themselves to the perceived need to respond to market forces, economic constraints, and laws of supply and demand.

Chapter Seven will analyze and discuss the discourse manifested in the narrative stories of interviewed senior administrators, which I refer to as the private domain of analysis in this study. Specifically, the next chapter will focus on themes aligned with the question of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue in academe.
CHAPTER SEVEN

FINDING FROM INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

PART A: WHETHER AND HOW EDUCATIONAL EQUITY IS A POLICY ISSUE

Introduction

This chapter is the first of three sequential chapters examining the stories narrated by senior university administrators who agreed to be interviewed for the purpose of this study. Open-ended interview questions were chosen to provide a setting that would allow for less edited or scripted communication. Interviews were conducted with Presidents, Provosts, Vice- and Associate Presidents, as well as Vice- and Associate Provosts from nine Canadian institutions ranked among the top universities nationally and globally. Narrative responses to questions about educational equity were examined to reveal any manifestations of discourses of diversity. Thus, these interviews represent the private domain of discourse analysis in my research.

This chapter is subtitled Part A and documents responses to the first interview question, which sought to ascertain senior administrator perspectives on whether and how educational equity is a policy issue for Canadian universities. After a general discussion of themes related to the broad question of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue, subthemes from narrative interviews are discussed under headings representing each of the four educational equity domains: (i) access for historically under-represented students, (ii) inclusive campus climates, (iii) globally inclusive curricula, and (iv) equity-seeking faculty and staff. Before discussing the themes, I will first detail the self-reported racial and gender identities of the senior administrators interviewed.
Self-Reported Racial and Gender Identities

The sensitive nature of the question exploring perceptions of personal identity and its relationship to the advancement of educational equity was clear to me at the point that I included it in the methodology; however, I was uncertain how the question would be received. It was very interesting that all participants agreed to answer the question. One administrator was slightly hesitant citing uncertainty about how to respond but they responded, nonetheless, and all provided personal accounts and examples of the experiences leading to their perspectives on educational equity. Several participants remarked at the outset that the question about identity was a good question, and several remarked that they had either not considered it before or considered it but perhaps not had the opportunity to synthesize and articulate their thoughts on the topic. It is important to note that these participants, with whom I did not have a personal relationship, volunteered or agreed to share personal information and experiences on the subject of their social identities. This is particularly noteworthy as, in Western society and particularly in the Canadian social context, it is generally thought impolite, intrusive, or inappropriate to ask personal questions about social identity, and especially about racial identity. That being said, the fact that these personal questions were asked in the context of an intentional research project with transparent goals, rather than in the context of a social or professional setting without a particular aim, may have contributed to the seeming comfort and candour of the interviewees.

A number of themes emerged from discussions of whether and how participants perceive their own social identity to influence the advancement of educational equity goals. These themes are discussed in detail later in this chapter. For the purpose of contextualizing responses to all the interview questions, I will name the identities disclosed at this time. All participants identified as
“White”. Many elaborated to indicate their Western or Northern European ancestry, and some shared having grown up or spent formative years in “Southern” areas of the world that were at the time under European imperial colonial occupation. Some referred to themselves as “Anglo”. Each participant has been assigned a pseudonym that attempts to accurately signal the racial and gender identity of the respondent. The seven self-identified men are referred to as Gordon, Sebastian, Arthur, Phillip, Vince, Greg, and Fred. The three self-identified women are referred to as Arlene, Teresa, and Karen. Attributing the correct racial and gender identity to respondent stories is an important part of critically examining whether and how discourse may be differentially raced and gendered depending on social identity, social location, and social status. Table 19 summarizes the racial and gender identities self-identified by participants.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Non-Racialized Person*</th>
<th>Racialized Person of Colour</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female-identified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-identified</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(all participants self-disclosed Western or Northern European ancestry)*

I will now turn to discussing the themes emerging from narrative interviews. Themes are discussed under the general heading of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue, followed by more specific headings aligned with each of the four educational equity domains: (i) access for historically under-represented students, (ii) inclusive campus climates, (iii) globally inclusive curricula, and (iv) equity-seeking faculty and staff.
Analysis of Whether and How Educational Equity is a Policy issue

This section discusses the analysis of themes in narrative interviews with senior administrators, with a focus on the question of whether and how administrators think educational equity is an issue for Canadian universities. Unanimously, in interviews, administrators commented that educational equity was indeed an issue requiring policy intervention. Consistently participants maintained that universities have done some good work in many areas but that there is much more to be accomplished. The differences in responses related to individual participant perceptions of the basis for, the extent of, the priorities, and the urgency with which they believe educational equity issues exist, either at their institution or in Canadian academe generally. Below, I list and elaborate on some of the interview segments that highlight this range of thinking.

[Equity] is bound to be an issue anywhere...perhaps less of an issue in Canada than other parts of the world. ~ Phillip

Are we always successful, no of course not; could we do more, absolutely. ~ Teresa

Could we be doing better? Yes. ~ Gordon

On one end of the spectrum of responses is the declaration by Phillip that inequities in higher education are certain to exist across the globe. Phillip suggested that Canada is no exception but perhaps a nation that has relatively fewer equity issues to contend with relative to other places. Indeed, one can look at a number of measures of equity, like those quantified in things like global gender equity and human rights indexes, and draw the conclusion that Canada
is doing quite well relative to other nations around the globe in this regard. That being said, leading an answer to a question about our record on equity with an affirmation that we are doing well relative to others can sound like a defense against or minimization of any critique about the extent to which Canada and Canadian universities have made progress on equity issues.

While benchmarking our progress against that of others is a very useful exercise for contextual reasons, when we may appear to be doing better than others it may mask all the ways that we may still need to improve. Focusing on the ways we are similar or better than others in regard to achieving equity can mask the ways that we may have unique and still unanswered issues, which require recognition, acknowledgement, and attention. A “wilful or negligent lack of recognition that difference, and therefore, challenges and opportunities” (Henry & Tator, 2010, p. 225) exist is a hallmark of a state of denial, one of the discursive barriers to achieving educational equity. Sometimes, denial can manifest as minimization rather than defensiveness. For example, noting and acknowledging what has been done well and achievements to date is critically important. However, emphasizing our accomplishments at the expense of or to minimize real challenges ahead is also a form of denial and, therefore, a discursive barrier to equity. The following excerpts from interviews with Gordon and Greg demonstrate how this minimization may manifest, even though both acknowledge that equity is an issue to be considered.

It is an issue. I find it encouraging that students and student leaders are aware of and sensitive to it. So are staff and faculty. Some people will not have progressive thinking about equity matters. It is an issue at a societal level. ~ Gordon

Gordon qualified that equity issues exist in society. Here, like Phillip, he may be pointing out that universities are no different from society in regard to progress. Gordon expressed a sense
of encouragement with his perception that generally students, staff, and faculty are cognizant of equity issues, despite a few who, in his words “will not have progressive thinking”. It is unclear what the basis for and definition of this perception of progressive thinking is for Gordon.

Further, even if it is true that the majority of the individuals within the institution think progressively about equity issues, whatever that might mean to Gordon, it is not clear exactly how that manifests behaviourally with respect to advancing equity goals. Advancing equity goals requires changes in the ways people feel and act, as well as the ways they think (J.M. Bennett, 1993).

Having chaired an equity committee, I understand where the activists are coming from. I don’t necessarily subscribe completely to their views. I do feel that universities have come a very long way, but there’s still quite a way to go. I am encouraged when I see a number of senior administrators who are from visible minorities and there is a reasonable gender balance. I point out that when you have a President [in a Canadian university] who comes from a visible minority, and is a woman and from engineering it does stand for something. ~ Greg

Greg also expressed encouragement with his perception of progress on the equity front. He specifically cited the numbers of racialized individuals among the ranks of senior administrators as well as being able to point to one racialized woman President of a Canadian university as a sign of encouragement. Greg has led committees tasked with addressing equity in the academy. It is interesting to note that he has labelled some individuals on this committee as “the activists” and he used this term within the context of his statements to suggest that these individuals perhaps do not share his feelings and sense of encouragement with where the university is in regard to its record on equity. This may or may not point to the different worldviews held by Greg and those individuals he views as “the activists”, which would define different sets of measures and outcomes to signal progress. Also, by focusing on the existence of
some racialized administrators and specifically one racialized female head of an institution as signs of progress, Greg may in fact be de-contextualizing these observations. Both the number of racialized administrators as well as the existence of one racialized female President must be looked at across the higher educational system and in the context of available and proportionate pools of employable racialized and female faculty and professionals. Statements that de-contextualize events are also highlighted by Henry & Tator (2010) as discursive barriers to educational equity. The opportunities for Gordon and Greg may be to more deeply recognize the effects of inequities on those who may not share in their sense of encouragement about the status of equity in the academy and society. Further, contextualizing events and observations within a broader systemic framework will help identify deeper signs of progress in the institution and across the sector.

Moving along the continuum of perspectives articulated in response to the first question, Karen, like Gordon and Greg, expressed her feeling that, while universities have made progress, there is still some way to go. In contrast to Gordon and Greg, Karen made this remark in specific reference to one aspect of educational equity, that is, gender equity among faculty and administrators. Gordon and Greg referred to progress on equity issues generally. Another difference is that Karen provided some statistics as evidence for her remarks and analyzed the issues a bit more, demonstrating a nuanced understanding of complex influencing factors.

I would first talk at a high level about gender equity. We’ve come a long way, but there’s still a really long way to go. Gender equity is a big one, I would say, not only in terms of the attraction of students, in terms of attraction of talented females to the professoriate, to chair positions and to leadership positions across the academy. We see about 25 – 30% of department chairs are females; deans are about 25%; presidents at about 16%. We’ve seen some really great hires in larger institutions where women are taking the lead. There is still a gap in hiring and a gender gap in how long those people have positions and how long they stay. ~ Karen
At the other end of the spectrum of responses were assertions that educational equity is a core value on which public Canadian universities are founded and, thereby, requires ongoing and appropriate attention. Fred, Vince, and Sebastian asserted the need for institutions to place a high level of import on addressing equity issues.

I think that there are ongoing efforts that need to be made in this area. I think in particular of a number of underrepresented groups. ~ Fred

It’s one of the core values that I think public universities are built on. In that sense, if it’s properly enacted it permeates every aspect of the university. It’s a huge area. ~ Vince

It is really important for us as a multicultural society to have [diversity] not only reflected in academia – among the student body, staff and faculty – but to be proactive in using that mix of individuals to help us formulate appropriate public policy across all disciplines…[it’s] absolutely essential. ~ Sebastian

Fred recognized numerous affected groups and he was particularly mindful of inequities experienced by Aboriginal students to accessing, persisting, and succeeding in university. He cited literature to back up his claims, indicating that a sense of belonging in the academy is as much a factor in retention and attrition as are academic challenges. Fred used evidence to point out the responsibility and opportunity institutions have to help Aboriginal students develop a sense of place, belonging, and connectedness within the university experience. Vince argued that equity must be an underpinning principle for university and that there is a proper way of implementing equity such that it permeates all aspects of the university. Sebastian, like Vince, spoke to process issues. Citing multiculturalism as part of the fabric of Canadian society, enshrined in social values and policy, Sebastian highlighted the need for educational equity to help universities, not only reflect diversity, but also engage diverse individuals to design relevant and responsive public policy. He articulated the importance of making proactive and substantive commitments to equity by meaningfully involving diverse individuals in the life and work of the
university rather than tokenizing and settling for structural diversity, that is, simply increasing numbers of diverse persons in academia. He argued that a diverse representation of individuals within the academy is necessary to develop and implement appropriate and equitable institutional policies across disciplines.

Karen and Gordon also spoke about the need to consider equity in the context of shifting campus demographics. In contrast to Sebastian’s focus on reflecting and being responsive to the cultural diversity among our domestic population, Karen and Gordon referenced changes in global educational interests and the influx of international students as responsible for the shift in campus demographics that requires universities to attend to equity issues.

I think Canada has to be concerned with international students. We’ve learned more that Canada will have a severe shortage of skilled labour in the next 5–10 years and as we look outward to attract people to come in, I think there are probably going to be, within our international cohorts, student that are not treated as equitably as they might be and this is something…that we’re going to have to be very aware of. ~ Karen

There is increasingly growing representation of international visa students, and an increasingly diverse campus. ~ Gordon

In interviews with senior administrators, their responses to the question of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue covered several themes, some overlapping with themes from installation speeches and others representing new themes. Themes, in order of most to least frequently cited, included an acknowledgement that equity is an issue that needs more attention and ongoing effort, the recognition that internationalization goals create a need to attend to equity, the observation that all societies must attend to equity, the assertion that attending to issues of equity is among the core values of the academy, and the opinion that our multicultural society specifically calls for attention to equity. The most frequently and second most frequently referenced themes were from five and two different senior administrators, respectively. The
number of administrators who referenced themes related to whether and how educational equity is a policy issue in academe, and the frequency with which they made references to the themes are summarized in Table 20.

Table 20
Themes Related to Whether Educational Equity is a Policy Issue:
Direct Quotes from Administrative Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Work to be Done</td>
<td>“universities have come a…long way, but there’s still...a way to go”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“could we do more, absolutely”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“could we be doing better, yes”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we’ve come a long way, but there’s still a…way to go”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“still a [gender] gap in hiring”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ongoing efforts…need to be made”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“in particular…underrepresented groups”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“accesss…and making sure…success rates and persistence”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a sense of alienation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Goals</td>
<td>“Canada has to be concerned with international students”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Canada will have a severe shortage of skilled labour”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“increasingly growing representation of international…students”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Issue Anywhere</td>
<td>“bound to be an issue anywhere”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it is an issue at a societal level”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Value of Academy</td>
<td>“core values…public universities build on”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Principles</td>
<td>“important for us as a multicultural society”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion so far has focused on excerpts of responses by administrators that address the question of whether educational equity is a policy issue for academe. Some of the responses documented ventured into answering the question of how educational equity is a policy issue. Below are more detailed accounts of responses to the question of how they perceive educational equity to be a policy issue. Responses are discussed below under thematic headings aligned with the four areas highlighted for interviewees when defining educational equity for the purpose of this study: (i) access for historically under-represented students, (ii) inclusive campus climates, (iii) globally inclusive curricula, and (iv) equity-seeking faculty and staff.
(i) Access for Historically Under-represented Students

Several respondents underscored the significance of educational equity from the perspective of improving access and outcomes for prospective Aboriginal students. Administrators consistently cited the importance of engaging with Aboriginal communities to enhance the capacity of the university to develop programs specific to community needs. Many respondents discussed the need for early intervention and outreach to Aboriginal communities to repair the deleterious impacts of systemic institutional and social inequities on the psyche, and consequent expectations, of individuals and communities in relation to valuing, let alone aspiring to, higher learning. In the interview excerpt below, Fred used the term Indigenous in the North American, if not strictly Canadian, context. He shared statistics to demonstrate the progress made on the retention of Aboriginal students at his institution.

I think of indigenous students and I think they certainly are underrepresented in the university scene in particular. I think more can be done in that areas to ensure that success, both on the access side and making sure that the success rates and persistence is supported. I think overall we are seeing good results. We have nearly 400 Indigenous students...who self-identify and who carry a status card. The retention rates are in the high 80% when we go from year 1 to year 2. There is more that can be done, but by various measure that’s actually a good outcome. As part of all of this, we have in different faculties, different programs... setting aside places for Indigenous students, some in health sciences, engineering, some in various social science programs, medicine, and law. I think that there’s just a lot more we can do in terms of reaching out to or connecting with the Indigenous community. It seems to me that on the challenge side, if you think about our Indigenous students, I think it’s finding a way to ensure that we help Indigenous students find a way to university, which can be somewhat challenging. So there’s an important outreach component. And, then making sure when Indigenous students arrive, particularly in a large university, making sure there is a way for the student to have a sense of connection with a community within the university one way or another. We continually need to be looking for culturally appropriate ways of enabling that kind of community building. ~ Fred
Fred suggested that improving access to university for Aboriginal students is linked to improving retention, engagement, and success once they enter. He also reiterated the need for students to feel a sense of connectedness to the university in order to consider and succeed in higher education. Sebastian also spoke, to some extent, about a sense of place for Aboriginal students. He gave an example of how his university administration did not allow government funding shortfalls to dictate their ability to commit to improving Aboriginal student recruitment and retention. He acknowledged the backlash from some individuals in the university. Not only did Sebastian report quantitative increases in the numbers of Aboriginal students recruited and retained at his institution but he also spoke of the importance of investing in efforts that have the effect of empowering Aboriginal communities and providing a safe space to enhance the learning experience for Aboriginal students.

In the recruitment of Aboriginal students, we had a very low level of Aboriginal participation and recruitment. We, for some reason, were one of a very small number of universities not given special funds to engage in improving Aboriginal participation. [Our] response had been to say we’re not getting any money and we don’t have any resources and we can’t devote them to Aboriginal recruitment. But institutionally we took the decision that this was, whether we got the money or not, this was a priority. Expanding the diversity of our undergraduate population was critical, that it was absolutely essential for us to have representation from Aboriginal communities and so we made the decision that we would put in a very significant effort in Aboriginal recruitment through an Aboriginal resource centre that we developed and supported. There was lots of push back from the institution: “Why are you spending the money here? We could be spending the money elsewhere. We have seen a phenomenal increase in the number of Aboriginal students, we’ve provided them with a resource centre they can use as a safe place [and] to enhance the support for Aboriginal students on campus. We’ve been able to deal with recruitment and retention as a result of empowering the Aboriginal community on campus to believe that we truly care and want to increase Aboriginal representation. ~ Sebastian

Another administrator, Gordon, touched on the work the university is doing to address barriers experienced by Aboriginal students in high school. Gordon described efforts made by his
university to tackle barriers that affect Aboriginal learners earlier in their lives. Phillip also referenced efforts by the government to simultaneously improve secondary and post-secondary participation rates by Aboriginal students.

We focus on Northern Ontario…encourage children and adolescents to finish high school. The message is don’t drop out of school. This is a bigger societal issue. Aboriginal secondary students are indirect beneficiaries of our program, but it’s not our primary motive [to recruit specifically to our institution]. We work with faculties and employers. Someone from a remote community may have more challenges. ~ Gordon

Aboriginal students are a priority for many [institutions]. The…government is focused on ways to improve participation rates of Aboriginal youth in K-12 and more recently is focusing on [improving participation rates] in post-secondary [institutions]. I’m sure there are many more communities that are under-represented by virtue of social conditions that exist in those communities. ~ Phillip

While Fred, Sebastian, Gordon, and Philip identify increasing access, retention, engagement, and success of Aboriginal students as important areas for universities to address, they do not explicitly comment on the reasons why. They also did not explain any distinct experiences of social inequities facing Aboriginal populations. Vince, while making the point that inequities exist for both Aboriginal populations and some non-Aboriginal marginalized social groups, implies that the issues may be the same.

In Aboriginal terms, in the community, they would speak about their rights as entitlements from an equity perspective, but many other issues that the community faces are the same issues that many other marginalized communities face, so there is a huge equity commitment. ~ Vince

The particular comment made by Vince, about the “same issues” experienced by many marginalized communities, was not further explored, but it does warrant a reminder that understanding the distinct histories and nuanced experiences of different marginalized populations will help administrators to develop and implement relevant targeted interventions.
Though not specifically referenced by administrators during interviews, it is important to note that understanding and naming the legacy of systemic social inequities faced by populations is an effective way to counter discursive barriers to educational equity in the institution. Linking the need for policies to redress contemporary inequities to the effects of legacies of historic social discrimination and oppression of populations counters tendencies to de-contextualize experiences of inequity and to defend equal opportunity arguments. Both of these tactics refute the presence of systemic inequities and render experiences as isolated incidents. These tactics can also lead to victim-blaming (van Dijk, 1992; Henry & Tator, 2010) if, in the absence of acknowledging effects of systemic discrimination, social conditions such as poverty, unemployment, and substance abuse are seen as individual responsibilities or failings. The point I would like to make here is that naming, as often as possible, the systemic nature of inequities cannot be overstated as a tool to lead change.

Philip and Vince referenced non-Aboriginal marginalized student populations that may experience inequities, although they did not venture to discuss specific populations or any of the equity issues they may uniquely be experiencing in higher education. In contrast, another administrator, Greg commented that he did not see discrimination directed at any ethnic or racialized students at his institution with the exception of inequities of access facing Aboriginal students. It is surprising to me that Greg did not have any awareness of inequities facing racialized students, apart from Aboriginal students, as there are many examples of both covert and overt incidents of individual and systemic racial inequities in higher education. Many of these incidents have been openly and consistently discussed and documented through venues like student newspapers, campus equity task force reports, and national media outlets to name a few. Greg asserted that the diversity within his university mirrored the diversification of the local and
national population through waves of immigrants coming from different national and ethnic backgrounds. He perceived, from his experience, that students of new immigrant populations of various nationalities and ethnicities appeared to strongly promote education to their children through a variety of mechanisms, thereby accounting for the lack of a perceived education gap.

I don’t see it [equity] as an issue at the education level at the undergraduate and post graduate; I do not see ethnicity or inclusivity [issues] with the exception of Aboriginal students being a major concern. I have not seen discrimination on the basis of their background. The challenge with students of Aboriginal background is having students who…have the access to education in elementary and secondary areas before they get into post-secondary education. We agreed upon a plan which involved setting a number of positions over quota exclusively for Aboriginal students. They still had to meet the minimum criteria but they didn’t have to compete directly against the general applicant pool. [We have] appointed a special advisor to the Provost, to look at how to improve recruitment of Aboriginal students to the institution, and what are the barriers, how can we make the institution more welcoming to that particular group? Other ethnic groups, personally I don’t see that as nearly as much of a problem. The history at the institution suggests that immigrant populations focus incredibly strongly on promoting the education of their children through a variety of mechanisms. It means what we see is/are [sic] waves of different ethnic groups coming through the university as a consequence of waves of immigration. I haven’t seen significant barriers to access post-secondary education for most of the different cultural and ethnic groups that live within [the city]. ~ Greg

It is not clear whether Greg was basing his comments related to non-Aboriginal ethnic populations on his own observations or on reports and studies of the actual experiences of these various populations. It does seem that he was limiting his comments to the context of his institution and the city in which it is located. Further, he did qualify that his comments relate to the issue of access; he did not elaborate whether he held the same view with respect to inequities experienced by ethnically diverse students with respect to retention, engagement, and success at university. In fact, no respondents discussed educational equity challenges or issues for non-Aboriginal students who may be historically underrepresented or underserved in university, other than referencing, in a cursory fashion, the possible existence of issues. For example, none
specifically problematized any aspect of racialized domestic student access, retention, engagement, or success in their institutions. Where there were references to domestic racialized students by administrators interviewed, they were in the form of affirming comments about the presence of diverse students adding representational or structural diversity to the institution (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002).

A focus on structural diversity or statistical representation of diversity could be viewed as an expression of denial in regard to inequities faced by diverse students once they arrive on campus. We know that certain populations of racialized domestic students, either Canadian born, settled immigrants, or permanent residents, do experience inequities to accessing and persisting in Canadian universities. Dei (1997) is one of the Canadian scholars who has, in the last couple of decades, studied and contributed to our understanding of educational inequities experienced by African Canadian and Black youth. He has uncovered differential treatment and experiences of African Canadian youth in the Canadian elementary and secondary systems. The danger in Greg’s remarks is the implication that if a thing has not been observed by him, then he can conclude that thing does not exist, is not a problem, or is less of a problem than other things visible to him. This kind of logic is characteristic of denial and de-contextualization as discursive barriers to educational equity.

Greg’s comments also approach victim-blaming discourse. He comments that the immigrant populations coming to his city and, seemingly with ease, entering his institution succeed in accessing higher education because their families place an incredible emphasis on promoting education to their children. This comment may imply that Aboriginal families do not place the same emphasis or value on education, as do immigrant families. The comment also takes the focus away from complex systemic determinants of educational outcomes to individual
and community values. It thereby implies that there may be a cultural deficit with respect to Aboriginal values when it comes to education. Furthermore, there is an assumption that the cultures and experiences of non-Aboriginal ethnic populations can be aggregated when generalized statements like this are made.

When administrators mentioned the need for representation of racially diverse students across disciplines, the discussions and remedies uniformly involved suggestions for ways to improve recruitment of international students. This raises the question of whether administrators narrowly associate the term diversity with international students, focusing on international cultural differences and perhaps missing domestic cultural differences. In this way, the equity issues faced by our domestic student populations may be overlooked. Also, there was no reference to the possibility that some racialized new immigrants, either new Canadian citizens or permanent residents, may not be the first in their family to go to university but rather children of highly educated parents unable to find work in their fields due, for instance, to implicit bias, accent discrimination, and systemic barriers to employment faced by many racialized new immigrants. These barriers parallel many of the barriers experienced by international visa-holding students.

One administrator, Teresa, highlighted socio-economic status and financial means as barriers, which she said educational equity policies must strive to alleviate.

We were one of the first institutions to make a commitment at the undergraduate level that no undergraduate student would have to turn down the ability to come...because of financial issues. We have put enormous efforts into enhancing the funds we have available to support students, whether that’s through operating funds or fundraising in support of students. So that’s our commitment that socioeconomic issues should not be barriers. ~ Teresa
In the domain of improving access to under-represented students senior administrators referenced, in order of most to least frequently cited, the need to improve access and support for Aboriginal students, non-Aboriginal marginalized students, and students from low-income households. The need to improve access to higher education for Aboriginal students was referenced 13 times by six different Presidents, perhaps suggesting a heightened awareness and interest in educational equity for Aboriginal students. The number of different senior administrators, who referenced themes related to improving access for historically under-represented students, and the frequency with which they made these references are summarized in Table 21.

Table 21
Themes Related to Access for Historically Under-represented Students: Direct Quotes from Administrative Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aboriginal students            | “indigenous students…certainly are underrepresented”  
“setting aside place for Indigenous students”  
“help Indigenous students find a way to university”  
“a way for the [Indigenous] student to have a sense of connection”  
“need to be looking for culturally appropriate ways of enabling…community building”  
“very low level of Aboriginal participation and recruitment”  
“institutionally we took the decision that [Aboriginal recruitment]…was a priority [for funding]”  
“a resource centre…as a safe place…for Aboriginal students”  
“empowering Aboriginal community on campus”  
“we focus on…encouraging Aboriginal secondary students”  
“Aboriginal students are a priority”  
“Aboriginal…rights as entitlements from an equity perspective”  
“challenge with students of Aboriginal backgrounds is...access”  
“a number of positions over quota…for Aboriginal students” | 6 | 14 |
| Non-Aboriginal marginalized students | “many more communities that are under-represented “  
“same issues that many other marginalized communities face”  
“other ethnic groups…I don’t see…nearly as much of a problem” | 3 | 3 |
| Low-income students            | “no undergraduate student would have to turn down the ability to come…because of financial issues.”                                                                                                                                                    | 1 | 1 |
(ii) **Inclusive Campus Climates**

Only a few administrators spoke to the issues of values, commitments, and actions to foster diverse and inclusive campus environments. With respect to the ethos or climate on campus, recall that both Sebastian and Fred highlighted the importance of creating a sense of place as well as safe spaces for Aboriginal students.

I think the enablers of course in that case is that there are a lot of neat programs and a sense of place that institutions can develop, the kind of programs that help to facilitate those connections and a sense of belonging within the community, both within the Indigenous community as it is represented on campus as well as the broader community of scholars. ~ Fred

A number of studies have shown that really there are two primary reasons why students leave or stop out of the university experience. Roughly half of the students do so because they’re challenged on the academic side, maybe it’s an academic preparation question or something along that line. But, the other half leave because of a sense of alienation, not really being able to connect, feel a sense of connection to the university community. It’s really important to try to build those points of connection as I’m thinking now of the Indigenous students. Help them to build community. I think the enablers of course in that case is that there are lots of neat programs and a sense of place that institutions can develop, the kind of programs that help to facilitate those connections and a sense of belonging within the community, both within the Indigenous community as it is represented on campus as well as the broader community of scholars. ~ Fred

We have seen a phenomenal increase in the number of Aboriginal students, we’ve provided them with a resource centre they can use as a safe place [and] to enhance the support for Aboriginal students on campus. We’ve been able to deal with recruitment and retention as a result of empowering the Aboriginal community on campus to believe that we truly care and want to increase Aboriginal representation. ~ Sebastian

Fred and Sebastian spoke about programs targeting Aboriginal students as plausible strategies to support a sense of belonging on campus and in the academic community. They did not comment on strategies to target non-Aboriginal community members and their potential role in creating a climate that conveys respect and support for Aboriginal learners and ways of learning.
Godlewska, Moore & Bednasek (2010) suggest that Canada’s long history of denial and misinformation about the lives and experiences of Aboriginal Peoples has cultivated a sense of ignorance and complacency among non-Aboriginal citizens, which hinders the promotion of inclusive attitudes and behaviours in relation to Aboriginal People.

In addition to a focus on supporting Aboriginal students, discussions on making the campus more inclusive focused on responding to incoming international students. Recall that Karen and Gordon spoke about shifting campus demographics as a result of incoming international students.

There is increasingly growing representation of international visa students, and an increasingly diverse campus. ~ Gordon

I think Canada has to be concerned with international students. We’ve learned more that Canada will have a severe shortage of skilled labour in the next 5 – 10 years and as we look outward to attract people to come in, I think there are probably going to be within our international cohorts student that are not treated as equitably as they might be and this is something...that we’re going to have to be very aware of. ~ Karen

Karen highlighted the need to consider equity and climate issues for various cultural groups across gender, sexual orientation, faith, political ideology, race, and ethnicity. She made the point that international students may be coming to Canada with values that may conflict with the equity and inclusivity principles espoused by Canadian society.

I would say there’s another possibility when we’re talking about international issues. International students coming to Canada come to a country where we are typically accepting of individual difference – this is not always the case in their home country and this can create a different set of challenges. Whether you’re talking about South African apartheid for example or you’re talking about the Israeli-Arab conflict, we see those play out in a variety of different ways on campuses where you wouldn’t have thought it would have been the Canadian way. These are issues that we struggle with in terms of not wanting to homogenize everybody but respect difference and respecting why cultural difference is important and the value of it. ~ Karen
In her comments, Karen inferred that incoming international students bring with them cultural norms from their countries of origin. I read her remarks to suggest there is a need to ensure that different cultural groups understand institutional and societal expectations with respect to inclusivity, equity, and human rights. For instance, Canadian norms with respect to the inclusion and rights of LGBTQ-identified members, in regard to gender equity and sexual harassment in the workplace, in relation to the expression of different political and religious values and positions, and so forth, must be conveyed to international learners and scholars coming to Canada. In other words, institutions must expect both domestic and international members of the campus community to contribute to creating the kind of ethos and climate that is respectful, equitable, and safe for all. While I interpreted Karen’s use of the phrase “the Canadian way” in the context I just described, the generality of the phrase could be interpreted as ethnocentric. A more elaborate description of what is meant would be helpful. For instance, there may be a difference between those Canadian values and worldviews that are among a diversity of cultural perspectives that may be expressed in Canada, and those Canadian values and worldviews that have been entrenched in laws fundamental to the human rights we enjoy as Canadian citizens, and which are less negotiable among the citizenry (e.g., legislation governing gay marriage, anti-harassment, freedom of speech and association, hate speech, disability and accommodations).

In the domain of establishing inclusive campus climates, in order of most to least frequently cited, were the need to build inclusive campus environments for greater numbers of international students on campuses as well as the need to create a sense of place for Aboriginal students. The number of different senior administrators, who referenced themes related to establishing inclusive campus climates, and the frequency with which they made references to the themes are summarized in Table 22.
### Table 22

**Themes Related to Inclusive Campus Climates: Direct Quotes from Administrative Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equitable treatment of international students</td>
<td>“our international cohorts of students…are not treated as equitably as they might be”  “growing representation of international visa students”  “not wanting to homogenize everybody but respect difference”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of place for Aboriginal students</td>
<td>“programs that help to facilitate those connections and a sense of belonging..within the Indigenous community”  “resource centre…as a safe place…to enhance the support for Aboriginal students”  “build…points of connection…[for] Aboriginal students”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iii) Globally Inclusive Curricula

On the subject of globally inclusive curricula, some administrators commented that the learning environment and experience is enriched through the mere presence of diverse learners and scholars. Vince spoke to the demand, by students, for a diverse learning experience and Gordon spoke to increasing quality and competitiveness with greater diversity on campus.

[In the area of] international engagement, one of the things we’re trying to do is build a more diverse student body because we believe a diverse student body is a better learning environment and students want to be in diverse learning environments, that’s what they tell us. So that commitment also has equity. ~ Vince.

Chinese students are the single largest group of international students. These students are bright and disciplined. The programs they are interested in are high quality. The bar is high, pushed up by the international diversity of our students. ~ Gordon

Gordon also talked about imbedding or requiring intercultural learning, for credit or as additional professional development, to complement students’ disciplinary programs.
[We] introduced intercultural awareness, explicitly recognizing that diversity is increasing in this environment. We offer courses for students. We consulted with employers on the soft skills they thought students needed in the workplace. We focus on communication, building up sensitivity and awareness. Before and after surveys show there is significant acknowledgement of increased awareness and understanding of diversity issues. ~ Gordon

Karen also identified intercultural competence as a necessary skill set, and therefore learning outcomes, for students in the 21st century academy and labour marketplace where employers are increasingly demanding this skill set. She referenced the changing demographic profile of her campus necessitating consideration of how to respond to difference in the academy. Karen suggests a very concrete strategy to improve the campus climate and equitable treatment of students. She advocates for the development of cross-cultural competencies among faculty, staff and students in order to facilitate better intercultural and equitable outcomes on campus.

I would say that in hiring professors, we’re no longer looking at national races for talent, we’re looking for global races for talent. So, I think that brings with it the idea of improving cross-cultural competency across not only student groups but [also] faculty groups to ensure they are treating students the way they are meant to be treated, that they understand differences in cultures so we create global citizens when they graduate because the world is a much smaller place. In our international strategy, one of our main objectives is to increase cross-cultural competencies so we had that discussion as to whether it’s on the individual level or systemic level. I think we need to do both. At the institutional level, I think we can put in systems, offices, [and] ways of being that facilitate the development and understanding of difference. These are going to become increasingly important as more international students are admitted. [This city] is one of the most diverse cities in the country. It’s hard to tell when you’re in the classroom whether you’re dealing with international students or student that have actually come from [this city]. ~ Karen

Karen and Gordon discuss co-curricular opportunities to develop intercultural competence outside of the degree program, with the possibility of gaining credits for participation. Neither explicitly defines what they mean by intercultural competence or what specific attitudes, knowledge and skills contribute to a level of competence in this area. Karen
suggested the benefit to developing intercultural competence was in graduating global citizens while Gordon referenced the professional development benefits resulting in greater employability. Notwithstanding the fact that it is difficult to ascertain what individuals truly mean when they use terms like intercultural competence, global citizen, and sensitivity, it does seem like the motivation behind advocating for some kind of intercultural skill development relates to a business case that suggests graduate will be better able to enter and succeed in a global marketplace. Highlighting the economic benefits speaks to the influence of neoliberal values and principles on university goals and, perhaps, on the priorities of many current students in higher education. The personal, social, and community benefits are absent from the discourse on the motivation for developing intercultural skills and competencies.

None of these administrators – Vince, Gordon, and Karen – pointed specifically to the role of faculty in redesigning curriculum content and reconceptualising pedagogical approaches to globalize the teaching and learning experience, thereby, influencing students’ learning outcomes consistent with notions of global citizenship and social responsibility. One administrator, Phillip, suggested that area studies are the means to introduce globally diverse scholars to the institution and to deliver globally inclusive education. He listed Gender Studies, Black/African Studies, and Cultural Studies as examples of appropriate sites for diverse faculty to enter the academy and for students to receive globally relevant lessons. While sharing these remarks, he did not comment on the value of mainstreaming diverse scholarly voices and perspectives across disciplines. He went on to say that there are some disciplines for which he felt diversity issues were not relevant, necessitating what he referred to as neutral content. Phillip remarked that some professional undergraduate programs in disciplines like engineering are more structured and less flexible than liberal arts programs but could, nonetheless, be developed
in such a way that engineering students could take some liberal arts courses to bridge the gap in learning about globally relevant issues. He commented that where this was occurring, the majority of uptake on the liberal arts electives was mainly among women.

In engineering there are lots of places where inclusivity is relevant but a lot of it, the curriculum, is fairly neutral, in that sense. We have a…program…that allows engineering students to couple a [degree] program with liberal arts programming. This tends to be more popular with young women. It allows them to do things, look at more societal impact issues in addition to the analytical side of more traditional engineering. There are programs in women’s studies, etc. Whether we do as much as we can in those areas is a question, as is the question of what is the demand. ~ Phillip

The belief that inclusivity and equity are more or less appropriate and applicable in certain educational contexts is an illustration not only of denial and de-contextualization, but also of another discursive barrier referred by Henry and Tator (1010) as binary polarization. De-contextualization and denial have been described earlier. Binary polarization is a “way of viewing the world and people as a series of polar opposites in constant competition and mutually exclusive” (p. 226). Phillip perceives diversity and inclusivity as the sole or main purview of programs in area studies and the liberal arts but not primarily relevant to programs like engineering. He also perceives that, primarily, diverse scholars can enter the institution through areas studies and the liberal arts. These viewpoints beg the following questions. Does Phillip truly believe that women, racialized individuals, Aboriginal individuals, and other equity-seeking scholars and professionals can only contribute to disciplines within area studies? Does he truly believe that diversity and inclusivity issues cannot manifest in every aspect of life and therefore educational disciplines? It is also interesting that Phillip did not suggest there would be value in requiring engineering students to take a liberal arts course, given the commitments to develop critical social consciousness among students and to graduate socially responsible global citizens.
The choice and combination of words Phillip uses present a worldview that implies he may not have considered, or he does not provide space for, alternate possibilities. Again, there is not transformative thinking around curriculum change to achieve stated intercultural learning outcomes. None of the administrators suggested reworking the curriculum, such that program requirements across disciplines ensure students benefit from important courses that would help achieve those goals intentionally articulated in Presidential installation speeches. Recall that Presidential installation speeches repeatedly referenced the role of the university in developing social responsibility and encouraging critical thinking among its students, in order to address inequities in the world and to create strong and inclusive societies.

In the domain of developing globally inclusive curricula, the references in order of most to least frequently cited were the need to acknowledge that a diverse student body contributes to a richer learning experience, the need to impart cross-cultural competencies to students, and the need to promote the liberal arts. The number of different senior administrators who referenced themes related to developing globally inclusive curricula, and the frequency with which they made references to the themes are summarized in Table 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diverse students enrich learning</td>
<td>“a diverse student body is a better learning environment” “the bar is high, pushed up by the international diversity of our students”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural competency</td>
<td>“[We] introduced intercultural awareness…we offer…courses for students” “improving cross-cultural competency across not only student groups but [also] faculty”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts courses</td>
<td>“a…program..that allows engineering students to…[take] liberal arts programming”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity-Seeking Faculty and Staff

The most consistently articulated educational equity issue was that under the banner of inequitable recruitment and advancement of faculty and, specifically, perceptions of persisting gender inequities facing female identified scholars and faculty members. Some administrators were more certain and emphatic in their remarks that others. Fred and Karen’s comments exemplified the sentiment expressed by most administrators, that there is not gender parity in the recruitment and promotion of faculty.

I think another area, now I’m thinking more on the faculty side, in a number of disciplines, we still have some, a lack of balance with men and women in the professoriate. I think in a number of cases at [this institution] women, I don’t know the exact numbers, but I’m going to say make up a little over a third of the professoriate. I’m talking about regularly tenured full-time faculty members. That is obviously not where it needs to be. This will vary by discipline of course as well. ~ Fred

In some schools, we have a much higher proportion of female undergrads than males and we have more males typically at the full professor rank because those are the people that have been in the system the longest. But we don’t necessarily see women progressing perhaps with the rapidity that we might have predicted with the number of women that are in the system. And, we don’t have typically women staying in the system as long. One of the questions I would have, when we look at the way we run the university here, is whether we have created an environment that is female friendly, for professors at the associate and full level, where the expectations are higher. ~ Karen

[There is] only [one] all female President/Provost team in the U15. There are many all male President/Provost teams. It is interesting that it is still unusual today to have an all female team at the top. ~ Karen

Karen does not delve into commentary about systemic inequities that diminish, if not remove, opportunities for women in the academy. Further, her curiosity about whether or not the university environment is female friendly is interesting. First, she acknowledged her own complicity by using the words “whether we have created” the inequitable environment.
However, she expressed a more passive than active position by wondering, as a female administrator, rather than articulating the need to work to systematically examine the climate and enact policies and practices to transform the ethos. Karen may or may not be actively doing more on this front. Her choice of words suggests a passive approach, which on its own becomes a manifestation of complicity in perpetuating inequities or, said in another way, reproducing and reinforcing the conditions she suspects perpetuate inequities.

Greg referenced the Federal Contractors Program and comparative data obtained by his institution. It seems that institutional data has led him to believe his university is not far off from reflecting the participation rates of women and racialized faculty that would be expected given the available pools of employable individuals who identify as women and racialized faculty. He suggested that while some in the institution believe women are underrepresented, some disagree that women are indeed underrepresented depending on how they interpret the data.

Data from the Federal Contractors Program perspective provides us with data that enables us to look at comparators quite well. It looks at who is employable within certain categories. Then I’d say we’re doing pretty well. There is no question there are people in the institution who feel quite strongly that visible minorities are still underrepresented on faculty and that women are still underrepresented on faculty. I would agree with the visible minority issues; I’m less sure about the women. I think it has more to do with qualified individuals available for positions within academia. It’s a very difficult sell where you have a decentralized organization where individual faculties recruit their new faculty. To really push them to be seriously proactive, they are going to argue very strongly in favour of taking the best-qualified individual. We’ve just created a department of women and minority studies…so whether that will make a difference within that community we’ll have to wait and see. It’s very difficult to roll out in any university a policy that suggests that you need to hire within certain categories. Members of my committee would say, “Yes, we have underrepresentation in certain areas; we do recruit internationally and certain from that point of view from different ethnic backgrounds”. There’s a significant mix across the university. But again it’s a matter of endeavouring to recruit the best people, and obviously in academia when competing internationally the job markets are in a constant state of flux depending upon which countries are good for academics to work in and which ones are less so. ~ Greg
Greg’s comments raise many questions about the quality of the data as well as expertise in interpreting the data. Do the statistics change when faculty and staff are disaggregated in the data? What about the occupational levels? Does the data tell different stories for adjuncts, assistant, associate and full professors? What does the data tell the institution about representative individuals in frontline service levels positions, in middle management and in executive roles? Greg did not describe the source of disagreement between himself and some of the individuals to whom he refers. Could the omission of this analysis be an example of denial or de-contextualization with respect to educational equity?

Greg speculated that the under-representation of women in the academy might be related to the lack of qualified individuals available for positions in the academy. It is unclear if Greg was speaking about the number of women with doctoral degrees across Canada, although, there are statistics available that preclude the need to speculate about the subject. The bigger issue may be the criteria by which search committees decide an individual is qualified. Here, Greg may have been employing denial and de-contextualization to make sense of the matter. Greg continued his line of thought by expressing the challenges and resistance to equitable hiring practices in the faculties. He claimed that, as a decentralized organization, Faculties in the university have the authority to recruit their own faculty. He believed that the central administration was asserting as much authority as was appropriate to influence the faculties; however, one of his comments had me wondering if the central administration was not somewhat resistant to equity hiring practices as well. Greg said the Faculties will “argue very strongly in favour of taking the best qualified individuals.” It is not clear what would constitute the “best qualified” individual in Greg’s mind. By contrasting “best qualified” individuals with individuals from equity-seeking groups, suggests that diverse lived and professional experiences of
candidates and diversifying the professoriate and range of scholarship offered at his university, may not necessarily constitute the definition of “best qualified”, either in his mind or the collective mindset of the academic community at his university. Diversity and quality are not mutually exclusive. Equity hiring practices, if done correctly, should only ever consider the best-qualified candidates. In his remarks, Greg demonstrated an example of binary polarization, a perspective which places equity on one side and quality on the other side of an “‘us versus them” argument. The tension between equity and quality is a construct of neoliberalism.

Greg, like Phillip, referenced the creation of a Women and Minority Studies program as an opportune destination for women and racialized scholars, thereby providing the institution with a plausible avenue into which these underrepresented faculty might be recruited. This may be another example of the binary polarization discursive barrier or a form of balkanization or ghettoization of women and racialized scholars. In the absence of any critical analysis or contextualizing statements, Greg risks expressing a worldview, not unlike Phillip, that appears either not to consider or not have room for alternate realities. Equity census data taken across universities demonstrates that, there are in fact qualified women and racialized post-doctoral fellows and faculty that, with the removal of individual and systemic barriers to accessing certain disciplines, could and would be successful in open competitions for positions across a diversity of disciplines and positions in the academic. Finally, with respect to this topic, Greg made some remarks that are consistent with the victim blaming discursive barrier to recognizing and eliminating inequities. Blaming the victim places responsibility for social problems, in this case the lack of timely and rightfully awarded tenure and promotion as well as gender parity in salary, on the individual experiencing the issue, in this case female faculty. In his comments below,
Greg did not acknowledge the existence of systemic power differences and inequities that might be influencing the opportunities available for female faculty who utilize maternity leave policies.

I think there is a legitimate concern. One of the things we are doing, we have a centralized committee that looks at the ways that different faculty evaluation committees work. There are concerns about the trajectory for promotion and advance up through the ranks for women. We do believe there are some inequalities between faculties across campus. A committee is looking at reviewing that situation, actually looking at the data and will make recommendations next year as to how that situation might be improved. The impact of things like maternity leave is a concern and certainly need to be thought about. I suspect the enablers are around ensuring there are appropriate policies. We haven’t come up with a complete resolution about how we handle it but these is some data at our institution that suggests that maternity leave if not evaluated, if people’s performance is put on hold for a year, then obviously women’s advancement is going to slow down. So they’re going to end up on age basis or time spent at the university basis and will fall behind men. We need to find a solution for that. Some women don’t take the leaves in a way they should and it impact their career. It’s a legitimate concern and we have to find a way of dealing with this. ~ Greg

Of the majority of interviewees who believed that women in the academy experience inequities, both male and female identified senior administrators described an observable dearth or absence of female candidates for both Tier 1 and Tier 2 Canada Research Chairs, as well as other prestigious national and international awards. They also reported salary gaps between male and female faculty members, even after correcting for factors such as the length of service and experience. While they were seeing increases in the recruitment rates of female faculty members, rates of retention and promotion of women within the professoriate remain disproportionately low, and a dearth of women rise among the ranks of senior academic administrators.

Why aren’t we getting more names of women or other minority groups coming forward? We’re trying to encourage committees that consider nominations, we’re trying to encourage more nominations…trying to sensitize committees to kinds of things they should be looking at…There are a lot of distinguished junior professors who are female. ~ Arlene
With faculty and staff, we have had an ongoing concern for diversity. [In engineering], there has been a particular emphasis on gender balance. That was a major concern of mine. In the last few years we have doubled the number of women among faculty in engineering. This is an accomplishment but enabled in part because we had small numbers to begin with, so we have a ways to go. A recent report was published as a consequence of the fact that when the Canada Research Chair program was inaugurated a few years ago, none of the applicants in the final pool were female. This led to a bit of a crisis. As a consequence...a working group established [at this institution] looking into what are the barriers to career success for women faculty across the institution. The kinds of things that I’m continually sensitive to and work hard at addressing have to do with gender equity. That’s always something that comes to the fore in an engineering context because it is a discipline, which is traditionally under-represented in terms of women at the faculty and student level. The faculty has had a goal of increasing the proportion of women to 30% by 2030 in Canada. We’re not making a huge amount of progress despite effort. With engineering, ethnic diversity is perhaps less of an issue. 50% of our graduate students come from abroad. Among faculty there are large numbers of Asian and Middle Eastern ethnic groups represented. Many of the demographics are over-represented, not in the sense of too many, but rather above the average in that particular area. Black engineers are unusual so that’s an area where one may put emphasis, though I don’t think there has been a particularly strong focus on that across Canada. Across the rest of the institution, demographics are different. Humanities have higher representation of female faculty and students but less ethnic representation. ~ Philip

Most interesting in these comments was that administrators reported these discrepancies as though they were unsure why they existed. The existence of differential outcomes for women, such as gender parity in salaries, has been well researched and reported. There can be no doubt that the gender parity observed in salaries, tenure, and promotion of university faculty is in some large or small part influenced by systemic inequities in society and its institutions, including higher education. Some administrators presented the existence of gender parity without naming its connection to systemic inequities and, therefore, without discussing the important roles and responsibilities they may play to lead efforts to address and remove inequities. As a result, the ideologies, processes, and structures that act to perpetuate gender, and racial, inequities are not problematized, interrogated, or transformed. This way of thinking and talking about inequities, as
if they are curious discrepancies, is another manifestation of denial and de-contextualization as discursive barriers to educational equity efforts.

Some administrators ventured to speculate on potential contributing factors to the gender differences they were observing. Many wondered how the attitudes and behaviours of both male-identified and female-identified faculty members might be influencing the situation. For instance, a common sentiment, expressed by both male and female respondents, was that few male faculty members are putting forward or developing potentially qualified female candidates for both promotions and awards, and few female faculty members are putting their own names forward or pursuing nominations for promotions or awards. Respondents were unsure whether and how these attitudes and behaviours reflected socialized, or otherwise manifested, gender differences. Some respondents wondered if women were internalizing biased and stereotyped messages about themselves and whether, as a consequence of this internalized oppression, women were displaying conscious or unconscious fear of failure or self-doubt. These same respondents also wondered if, at the same time that women were internalizing oppressive messages, men were externalizing gender stereotypes and expressing internalized dominance by demonstrating implicit or explicit misjudgement of female faculty members’ academic and professional competence. The former could lead to women not putting themselves forward for promotion and other academic recognition, while the latter could lead to men’s failure to recognize and recommend qualified or promising female faculty members for promotion.

What we’re finding, from meetings with female faculty, is that they are not putting themselves forward for full professor, nor are they being encouraged by department chairs for promotion…and this could well end up as a retention issue…it is a concern of ours. There seems to be a sort of assumption that…they won’t make it – so aren’t putting themselves forward or being encouraged by their Chairs. ~ Arlene
Without more contextualization of the ideologies, processes, and structures that create the conditions that breed and perpetuate inequities, the comments by Arlene may sound like equal opportunity discourse, another discursive barrier to educational equity. The equal opportunity argument, according to Henry and Tat (2010), suggests that all individuals have been “given a blank slate from which to determine their own fates” (p. 226). The argument rejects the notion that systemic inequities exist and negatively affect access to equal opportunities for certain populations. On the subject of why women are not advancing up to senior academic leadership positions, there are undoubtedly individual and systemic contributing factors. That being said, it is almost impossible to disentangle individual reasons and choices from systemic influences. Acker (2010) suggests that the frequent reference to the pursuit of leadership positions in the academy as a “game” implies that “behind the façade of a meritocratic system based on excellence, there are inequities and irrationalities that require strategic action (agency) in order for the players to survive and prosper” (p. 144). In this environment and with these stakes, some, or even many, women may become physically and emotionally weary from the hurdles they consistently face while attempting to climb up among the senior ranks of the professoriate and academic administration, a task that is much easier for men. Acker reports on a study of 31 women faculty who held senior administrative positions in institutions across Canada, Australia, and Britain:

Participants in my study in all three countries did not admit to entering a leadership game with advantage in mind. In contrast, they often claimed they had taken up their positions because of some notion of obligation or altruism to their colleagues or the institution. If anything, they felt they were making a sacrifice, with many worried that there was not enough time available to pursue their own research careers adequately. Tangible rewards for administrative responsibilities appear to vary by country and institution and are not generally sufficient by themselves to motivate individuals who have hitherto invested in the academic ‘game’ to take a detour towards the managerial career. As we have see in the case studies, these positions can bring with them the possibility of conflict,
misunderstanding and disregard from colleagues and other administrators and even a spoiled career or a fall over the glass cliff. (p. 145)

The number of different administrators, who spoke to themes related to recruiting and retaining equity-seeking faculty and staff, and the frequency with which they made references to themes are summarized in Table 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Women                  | “agree with the visible minority issues…less sure about…women”  
“concerns about the trajectory for promotion…for women”  
“a lack of balance …women…make up a little over a third”  
“the impact of maternity leave is an issue”  
“we don’t…see women progressing”  
“we don’t have…women staying in the system as long”  
“when the CRC program was inaugurated…not of the applicants in the final pool were women”  
“looking into…the barriers to career success for women faculty”  
“humanities have a higher representation of female faculty and student…engineering…traditionally underrepresented”  
“only [one] all female President/Provost team in the U15”  
“female faculty….are not putting themselves forward….nor are they being encouraged by department chairs”  
“why aren’t we getting more names of women”  
“there are a lot of distinguished junior professors who are female.”  
“whether we have created an environment that is female friendly” | 5                          | 14                      |
| Racialized or Visible Minorities | “I would agree with the visible minority issues; I’m less sure about the women”  
“among faculty [engineering] there are large numbers of Asian and Middle Eastern ethnic groups….demographics are overrepresented”  
“Black engineers are unusual so that’s an area”  
“humanities have…less ethnic representation”  
“why aren’t we getting more names of…minority groups” | 4                          | 5                       |
| Committees             | “we have a centralized committee that looks at the ways that different faculty evaluation committees work”  
“working group established”  
“trying to encourage committees that consider nominations” | 3                          | 3                       |
| Federal Contractors Program | “data that enables us to look at comparators quite well”  
“actually looking at data and will make recommendations” | 2                          | 2                       |
In summary, the themes referenced in this educational equity domain were the need to bridge the gender-equity gap among the professoriate and senior ranks of administration, the need to address racial inequity in recruitment of faculty, the need to establish committees to identify and advance educational equity goals, and the need to leverage the Federal Contractors Program to collect data in support of educational equity policy implementation. The need to bridge the gender-equity gap in the professoriate and among the ranks of senior administration was referenced 14 times by 5 different senior administrators. The need to address racial inequities in faculty recruitment processes was cited 15 times by 4 different senior administrators.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter has detailed the findings from analyzing the narrative interviews provided by senior administrators, referred to in earlier chapters as the private domain of discourse analysis in this study. This chapter focused on themes aligned with the question of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue in academe. Interviews given by senior administrators were reviewed and themes were mapped to the interview question. Related to the question of whether and how educational equity is an issue in the academy, administrators expressed sentiments that were characteristic of discourses of denial, de-contextualization, equal opportunity, balkanization, victim blaming, and binary polarization. While student access as well as faculty
and staff recruitment were cited as important aspects of educational equity, there was very little
discussion about the climate and, therefore, retention, engagement, and progression of these
students, faculty, and staff once they enter the academy. Furthermore, there was an obvious and
disturbing void with respect to any recognition, let alone critical analysis, of the educational
equity challenges facing domestic non-Aboriginal racialized students as well as racialized faculty
and staff in higher education. This lack of understanding of the effects of racialization and racism
on the aspirations and opportunities available to students, faculty, and staff is in itself a
consequence of the neoliberal ideology. Neoliberalism promotes the idea that all individuals
have equal opportunities – it does not recognize systemic social inequities unique to varying
identities. Inequities experienced by Aboriginal students and women faculty members are salient
in the minds of senior administrators, perhaps due to decades of attention on Indigenous rights
and entitlements as well as pay equity legislation, for example. With current government funding
envelopes associated with compliance measures acting as incentives, administrators are
motivated to focus on these two equity-seeking populations which are most frequently cited in
the public discourse, and which arguably, may be the least contentious to deal with and defend.
While senior administrators consistently spoke about the need to redress inequities faced by
Aboriginal students and female faculty members, they universally were silent on inequities
facing non-Aboriginal racialized members of the academic community.

To further explore responses to the first interview question, respondents were asked about
their perceptions of the barriers and enablers to educational equity policy implementation.
Identified barriers and enablers to educational equity will be discussed and examined in the next
chapter, Chapter Eight.
CHAPTER EIGHT

FINDINGS FROM INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

PART B: BARRIERS AND ENABLERS TO EDUCATIONAL EQUITY IN ACADEME

Introduction

This chapter continues to examine the stories narrated by senior university administrators who agreed to be interviewed for the purpose of this study. It is the second of three sequential chapters examining the themes drawn from interviews with a total of 10 Presidents, Provosts, Vice- and Associate Presidents, as well as Vice- and Associate Provosts from nine Canadian institutions ranked among the top universities nationally and globally. The examination builds on the discussion in the last chapter based on participant responses to the open-ended question of whether and how educational equity is an issue in Canadian academe. This chapter is subtitled Part B and focuses on the barriers and enablers to educational equity policy implementation from the perspectives of the same interview participants.

Analysis of Barriers and Enablers to Educational Equity

Themes Aligned with Interview Questions 1 Prompts:

In what ways do you think your university is meeting educational equity goals?
If there are challenges, what do you think might be impeding equity policy effectiveness, and what strategies may improve effectiveness?
If there are successes, what strategies are working, and how do you know?

This section examines the themes in narrative interviews with senior administrators, with a focus on the question of what administrators think might be barriers impeding and strategies enabling educational equity policy effectiveness in Canadian universities. The discussion of
narrative responses is organized, in this chapter, under thematic headings grouped as either barriers or enablers to educational equity. The barriers identified will now be discussed under the following thematic headings: (i) individual attitudes and behaviours, (ii) systemic issues and organizational behaviour, (iii) polarized ideological debates, (iv) fiscal constraints and the commoditization of education, (v) homogenous governance and administrative bodies, (vi) decentralized environment and distributed authority, (vii) shifting governmental party politics and policies, and (viii) employment data collection and analysis.

**Barrier (i) – Individual Attitudes and Behaviours**

Remarks discussed under this theme suggest barriers at the micro-social level. Administrators commenting on this theme seemed to suggest inadequate individual competencies – attitudes, knowledge, and skills – required to advance educational equity commitments. Some senior administrators reported that one important barrier to educational equity is that some people in the academy do not acknowledge, or even believe, there is a problem of inequity. Others, they said, are willing and well intentioned, but perhaps simply unaware. On the subject of unawareness, antiracist scholars argue it is a form of denial. According to intercultural development theory, when individuals in denial are challenged they, at best, may move from a state of unawareness to a state of minimization; at worst, they may move to a state of polarization/defense or resistance (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009).

Arlene and Greg suggested that most individuals in their institutions are in a state of unawareness, the hallmark of denial. Neither administrator problematized the claim of unawareness. Arlene, herself, seemed to demonstrate a minimization mindset as she did not
assert that it is acceptable in the 21st century for individuals to claim they “just don’t think about” difference and equity. This begs the question why there are not expectations that all individuals, especially those in leadership positions, would in the very least have thought about, if not demonstrated success in, advancing educational equity. The lack of expectation for advancing educational equity would explain the lack of consequences for not overtly thinking and/or systematically doing anything in regard to educational equity.

My feeling is, with few exceptions, that most people…it’s not that they don’t want to do this or think it’s bad, they just don’t think about it. ~ Arlene

What we’re trying to do is get the leaders on side and get them to understand the issues. In many cases they’ve never thought about it. ~ Greg

Greg remarked that inequity is indeed an issue although he felt much of it takes place in very subtle ways. He commented that if and when issues are brought to the attention of certain faculty, and particularly if it is suggested that their own attitudes and behaviours may be contributing to inequities, these faculty express defensiveness and anger. Defensive and angry responses conflict with the kind of attitudes and behaviours that facilitate the advancement of equity. Later, excerpts from interviews show that administrators believe open-mindedness and self-reflection are individual qualities necessary for leaders to advance educational equity.

On the other hand, I had seen departments where it was very difficult for women even if they were highly qualified either to get a position or more importantly to be retained in that department. The subtle pressures exerted, which resulted in their leaving after a number of years because they felt the prejudices were too great, not necessarily from administration but often from colleagues. I would agree that it is still an issue in university and a lot of it is quite subtle. I think a lot of faculty would be quite upset if they were accused of that bias. ~ Greg
Barrier (ii) – Organizational Structure and Systemic Issues

Remarks discussed under this theme suggest barriers at the macro-social level. Administrators commenting on this theme seemed to suggest certain organizational structures and systemic institutional characteristics of universities hinder the advancement of educational equity commitments. Organizational culture was cited repeatedly as a barrier to change. Several administrators commented that institutions of higher learning generally are typically conservative in nature and slow to adapt, if they even view change as valuable. Imbedded in their remarks is the notion that they, as individuals, are somehow different from the institution. It is as if the institution somehow behaves, and its culture is produced and perpetuated, apart from the individuals that constitute it, not the least of which are senior administrators. Below, Arthur remarked that institutions are slow to adapt, not that the people running the institution are slow to adapt. Arturs spoke about the institution as if it were an entity independent of the people that populate them.

Because of processes we have for renewal and development and the career trajectory of faculty, institutions are strikingly slow to adapt to changing profile of the country. It takes a long time to complete a Ph.D. The market is over weighted towards those who are more privileged with respect to socioeconomic and ethnic diversity. There is then an inevitable lag. ~ Arthur

Sebastian took the personification of the institution further. He spoke of the university as having a conservative ideology and wanting to preserve the status quo. Sebastian did then talk about the people that he described more as being, rather than constituting, the institution. That being said, he did not overtly describe the role of senior administrators, as one group of people who are or who constitute the university, to “determine policy and manage evolution of policy”
for the purpose of achieving educational equity. In his comments, Sebastian described the discourse of traditionalism (Henry & Tator, 2010) in force within universities. How Sebastian described conservative individuals, who argue for the maintenance of the status quo in universities, is consistent with the discourse of traditionalism which positions difference “in direct opposition to what is believed to be the best of human knowledge that will produce cultural literacy and educational competence” (p. 226).

I think fundamentally the challenge is in institutional behaviour, that is, like any institution [there is] a tendency to conservatism, despite the fact that we’re supposed to be the bastions of moral and social thinking within our community. Actually we’re inherently quite conservative as institutions…”don’t rock the boat”…”why would we change”…be careful when we change not to “throw the baby out with the bath water”. This has nothing to do with educational equity and more to do with organizational behaviour in a large institution like a university or college. The fundamental barrier or challenge is being an institutional organization that has a tendency to want to preserve the status quo. That then gets manifested in the kind of structures we have, the kind of people who populate those structures that determine policy and manage evolution of policy over time. ~ Sebastian

It is questionable whether organizational lags in adapting to external and internal forces today are as pronounced as they may have been in the distant, or and not so distant, past. According to Tudiver (1999), “universities remained conservative and stable until market conditions of the 1960s forced them to change” (p. 29). However, while universities underwent significant change before and after World War II, few actually changed the social status quo (Tudiver, 1999). It is interesting that comments about the conservative nature of universities are being reflected from administrators working in universities established before or early in the 19th century as well as those established in the post-war period. Nonetheless, the discourse about the conservative nature of institutions as a primary barrier to equity policy implementation endures.
Barrier (iii) – Polarized Ideological Debates

Several administrators referenced intractable polarized ideological debates as barriers. Two such debates identified were the quality vs. equity debate and the equality vs. equity debate. These debates frame equity as mutually exclusive from academic excellence (or quality) and academic freedom (or equality). These binary debates turn out to be among the greatest manifestations of a polarization/defense mindset (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009), contributing to several discursive barriers hindering educational equity in the academy (Henry & Tator, 2010). Arthur described the intensity with which his academic community argues for quality and meritocracy. He expressed his thoughts that positioning meritocracy as incompatible with equity is misinformed and unhelpful; he felt the polarized mindset represents a barrier to achieving excellence, which, for him, necessarily includes educational equity.

This is a place where we do things differently. And the community is intensely proud of the place…[it’s] among the top schools in Canada. Sometimes this translates into a problematic counter-active debate between quality/excellence and equity. ~ Arthur

Greg talked about the need for culture change, which, he said, is a challenging proposition and takes time in a democratic organization. He asserted this opinion despite signs of other culture changes, regarding accepting new budget models, tuition frameworks, enrolment targets, and workload expectations, for instance, which have taken place in these same democratic organizations in a very short time frame. One might ask what it is about culture change with respect to educational equity that is particularly difficult in a democratic organization? Greg did not focus on the individual attitudes that need to shift or the knowledge and skills that individuals need to gain in order to enact the kinds of policies and practices...
needed for culture change. Greg did, however, acknowledge that individuals create an impasse by using the academic freedom argument to counter progress on educational equity. Although Greg believed these individuals, who use the academic freedom argument in this way, have a weak case, he, nonetheless, validated the legitimacy of the argument in a democratic environment. Here, we see another hallmark of neoliberalism. Discourses of democracy are used as a neoliberal tool to support equal opportunity and traditionalism arguments (Henry & Tator, 2010), which act as discursive barriers to equity. The neoliberal argument is that advancing equity will undermine democratic principles that already allow for individuals to equally determine their own fates and that maintain what is believed to be the best of human knowledge and culture.

The challenge with universities is then that people start talking about academic freedom; they will hide behind what they call academic freedom. I would challenge many of them as to whether that’s what they’re actually talking about. When you work in democratic organizations, making those changes becomes a challenging proposition. ~ Greg

The focus on academic freedom is really the academic freedom of the majority or privileged groups over the experience of the minority or marginalized groups. Recall that classical liberalism, upon which tenets of neoliberalism have been built, aims for equality of right or the equalization of political and legal rights through unfettered competition (Gibbins & Youngman, 1996). This is in contrast with equality of opportunity, which aims to redress inequities through intentional interventions and efforts to redistribute power. Those who support the classical liberal or neoliberal equality of right argument suggest that it supports meritocracy and, therefore, quality. The neoliberal position does not recognize historical and ongoing system inequities faced by minority and marginalized groups, which preclude their ability to access equal opportunity.
Barrier (iv) – Fiscal Constraints and Commodityization of Education

Several administrators cited fiscal challenges as barriers to achieving educational equity goals. One administrator indicated that commitments made are not operationalized when conservatively thinking individuals are faced with financial challenges. Others thought a balance could be achieved while paying mind to budget constraints; however, they focused on finding a balance that considered market principles, being mindful of where there is greatest demand and interest, where there is the greatest profit, as well as economies of scale. In the same breath, one administrator did caution against becoming driven purely by market demand and turning education entirely into a commodity.

Below, it is unclear what clues signal to Sebastian that there are masses of people in the academy interested in addressing “issues of representation” even if at the level of intent. He did preface his comments by considering whether he was overstating the interest in dealing with equity and whether his was a naïve or simplistic view.

If anything, and perhaps this is me wearing rose-coloured spectacles, I think there is an enormous appetite for dealing with issues of appropriate representation at one level, the cerebral [sic] level, where people can articulate this is important, they can explain why it is important, they inherently know its value. And, then how do you translate that into movement in this conservative institution which is at the same time being challenged by a whole host of features, not least of course for many nations in the developing world, is based in fiscal reality. So how do you push…bang one’s head against the wall…when everyone who is banging their heads on the wall want in spirit to create this kind of educational diversity. ~ Sebastian

This potential naivety is a quality of a minimization mindset (M.J. Bennett, 1993), which can manifest as idealism as opposed to realism, in part as a consequence of trivializing the real individual and systemic challenges to equity. Nonetheless, Sebastian went on to paint a picture
that depicts a complicated set of internal and external forces acting against the achievement of educational equity. While these complicating factors may be real, what is troubling is the tenor of futility or resignation in Sebastian’s remarks. The seemingly greatest hurdle to overcome is the fiscal reality. Sebastian did not clearly outline how equity programs and practices are more costly, both in the short and long run, than programs and practices that do not consider equity. That contextual financial challenges are referred to as a “fiscal reality” gives the impression that the reality cannot change, or that the choices within this condition are limited, if not non-existent. In summary, Sebastian felt that there was great will and intent, but no or limited options for change. This view begs the question of the sense of agency administrators believe they have or are willing to exercise to find creative solutions and to be agents of change.

Philip, like Sebastian, expressed concern with financial considerations. His view was that, within a limited budget, priorities must be identified and one of the ways to select priorities is to base them on student demand.

It is a balance, particularly these days when budgets are so tight. We can’t afford to offer programs that students won’t take. We’re also not in a position to tell students what to study. We can’t offer programs if there are only a few students who want to take that material, at least not in the traditional kind of format. This is true of any niche area such as feminist studies. There is lots of interest and demand for courses in that areas, but if it’s very narrow and focused on one member of the faculty, if faculty wants to teach in a very narrow area, they should be prepared to do that with a small group of students as an extra thing, but not as part of their normal workload. We’re not in a position to cater to every individual need and taste at the university because we just don’t have the funding to do that. On the other hand, we need to also at the same time fight against a pure commoditization of education. It’s easy as an administrator to say, “Well, let’s just offer all the courses that students will want to take and we’ll get economies of scale and the university can balance its books. We need to balance offering things that are popular and in a sense profitable versus important but somewhat smaller in overall demand. There needs to be a balance. We have to be able to pay for what we are doing. ~ Philip

Philip asserts that there are certain courses that students will not take, but he does not offer any information on research or data collected to provide evidence of what courses students are
interested in taking, considering various other factors that may affect students’ decisions. One might ask, if the courses in question were of great value to the university, would there be greater efforts to rigourously study the trends around student participation in these courses? Moreover, rather than relying on the demands of students to determine what courses may be offered, perhaps universities might consider requiring certain courses or course content in order to develop socially conscious and critically aware global citizens, goals repeatedly articulated in Presidential speeches. Furthermore, the comments made by Phillip suggest that incorporating issues of diversity and equity into the curriculum can only be done through certain types of courses rather than integrated approaches and content-delivery across disciplines. Would it not be beneficial to consider integrating, into curricula, relevant social issues and critical concepts across all program disciplines, rather than relegating social issues to the purview of certain programs, thereby ghettoizing said programs?

The proposition that the curricular agenda should be market-driven is aligned with principles of individualization, consumerism, and privatization – all hallmarks of the neoliberal ideology. Granted, Philip cautioned against taking the supply and demand economic approach so far as to render higher education as a pure commodity; he suggested finding a balance between accepting some economic aspects related to profit making and other aspects related to educational value. Unfortunately, left to individuals who look through socially conservative and economically neoliberal lenses, the balance will not tip towards the achievement of greater educational equity nor will it tip towards a richer and more complex educational experience for students. Literature has demonstrated, as have interviews with administrators in this study, that the predominant ideologies driving higher educational decision-making are social conservatism and economic neoliberalism. These ideologies focus on deficit reduction, decentralization,
downsizing, and deregulation (Gibbins & Youngman, 1996), and they have proven to produce
and reify barriers to achieving educational equity. Shifting the balance may then require different
political ideological foundations to adequately respond to matters of educational equity in
academe.

**Barrier (v) – Homogenous Governance and Administrative Bodies**

Arthur pointed to the lack of diversity, and specifically the type of homogeneity among
the identities of decision-makers in the academy as a barrier to educational equity. Arthur called
attention to the fact that governing and administrative bodies are dominated by White,
heterosexual, middle-aged men, who represent the most privileged groups in society. He
problematicized this lack of diversity and concentration of privilege among the most powerful
decision-making bodies, stating that diverse voices are necessary to enrich conversations and
mobilize institutional change.

In the early 60s there was a homogenous student population. As the national profile
changed, the student body changed dramatically. The power to shape the institution still
remains in a homogenous administration. The senior administration is dominated by
males, largely white males. There is faculty diversity in certain disciplines. Of
approximately 40 people on the Board, there are a number of people of colour, by
election. There is one Aboriginal individual, 3 identified people of colour. As for women
in senior positions, we do have two women Deans and others represented in legal
counsel, human resources, finance and the university secretariat. ~ Arthur.

Rowley et al. (2002) discuss how the homogenous character and behaviour of organizational
environments maintain the status quo through what is referred in the literature as “institutional
inertia” (p. 4). From an organizational behaviour perspective, Rowley et al. suggest diversity
“should be conceptualized and studied as a politically and socially defined construct with
inherently complex implications at numerous levels within higher education institutions as complex organizations” (p. 4). Tudiver (1999) remarked that, in the early 1960s, undemocratic methods of appointing board members, primarily from the business sector with fund-raising and financial management expertise, resulted in homogenous governing bodies “rarely in touch with the constituents they were supposed to govern” (p. 31). Given comments about the obvious homogeneity among governing and administrative bodies today, one wonders what needs to be done differently to alter the demographic as well as other dimensions of diversity among decision-making groups of institutional players. The explicit reference to homogenous administrative and governance bodies, and specifically an overrepresentation of White men, highlights the focus again by administrators on representational or structural diversity. Structural diversity, or the diverse composition of the campus community, is a necessary but insufficient precursor to educational equity (Gurin et. al, 2002).

**Barrier (vi) – The Decentralized Collegial Organization**

Administrators characterized the decentralized academic environment and collegial system as a hindrance to educational equity. While one administrator emphasized the important role of university policy in such a distributed model, several administrators cited such enormous differences across faculties in terms of equity record, representation of designated groups, departmental culture and norms, as well as individual attitudes. These administrators reported that autonomy within decentralized units can be a potential barrier as it is difficult to require faculties, schools, and departments to comply given the democratic and distributed leadership and management model of with the university.
In this scenario, one must question how the decentralized units derive their authority. Who exactly has ultimate authority at the level of the decentralized unit? Is it the Dean of a Faculty or School, who is also an administrator, or is it the Department Head? Is it the collective of faculty members within the department? Who or what dictates the parameters of authority and decision-making at the unit level? Do collective agreements legislate what can or cannot be done by placing limits on what can be asked or demanded of individual faculty members? These questions are asked because the comments of some senior administrators suggest they feel powerless to direct and lead change.

Some senior administrators feel that there is commitment at the uppermost administrative levels but that the policies breakdown at the implementation phase, which they often view to be the responsibility of those academic and non-academic administrators, directors, and managers beneath them. For example, Arlene implied implementation of educational equity policies is the purview of decentralized units without interference from administrators.

Administrators are committed, challenges happen at implementation of policy…at the higher levels there isn’t a problem, but at the actual level of implementation of any of our policies that’s where things go very slow or breakdown. ~ Arlene

It would be interesting to examine how administrators experience minimal difficulty demanding compliance with university-wide policies, like deficit reduction policies, while they struggle to direct units in the implementation of university-wide educational equity policies. If there are, in fact, issues where the centre can and does direct the decentralized units, then one would want to examine whether it is not in fact the decentralized organization, or perceptions of the decentralized culture, that is the root barrier. Perhaps there are underlying individual and systemic factors influencing senior administrators and faculty in decentralized institutions, which
are hindering the direction and management of people, let alone the implementation of policies, to achieve educational equity.

Fred articulated his belief that intervention by the central administration is necessary in a distributed leadership model like the university. While he acknowledged decisions made at the departmental level, he also suggested this decision-making should be guided by policies advanced by the centre. Fred also commented that he views faculty collective agreements as tools to advance educational equity, which should be leveraged by both faculty and administrators to achieve mutual goals.

The other thing that’s very important I think to university government, and certainly is the case here, is that we do adhere in many respects to a collegial governance model. That means that a lot of decisions are made in academic units. It is a kind of distributed responsibility and in that context it is of course policy that are going to help put some boundaries around or raise expectations or provide protocols for how decisions are to be taken, and certainly any decisions as they related to equity questions. That’s where it’s policy driven. When I think of the faculty side, I think it’s probably driven as much as anything by academic, by senior administrative leaders, but also in consultation because we have a unionized faculty for instance in the context of the collective bargaining process. I think there is an enormous amount of overlapping interests on these areas. ~ Fred

Notwithstanding Fred’s comments, the implication, in the remarks of most senior administrators, is that a failed policy is not the failure of the policy-maker. By focusing on the structure of the organization as a barrier, and insisting they do not have power over decentralized units, senior administrators shift the focus away from their own responsibility and accountability in the implementation of educational equity policy.
Barrier (vii) – Shifting Public Policies and Politics

Shifting Federal and Provincial government legislation was also cited as a potential barrier to educational equity. One administrator, Karen, gave the example that the current government prioritizes domestic access over international access and has earmarked funding for these priorities. This policy was seen to be in conflict with university priorities to augment international recruitment and internationalize the environment and curriculum. This reality is set against the claim that there are not qualified faculty candidate pools among designated equity-seeking groups. Government legislation seeks to increase the number of positions available for new domestic doctoral graduates. Karen viewed this legislation as competing with other governmental imperatives and incentives to grow international student numbers. Graduate seats for domestic graduate students cost the university money, while international graduate students generate money for the university. This example was used to highlight how university administrators have to continue to lobby government to point out contradictions or policies working at cross-purposes. It was also used to illustrate how university administrators have to be creative in ensuring they are maximizing funding opportunities and remaining compliant with government legislation and accountable to public funders.

I think there might be some political barriers at a high level. For example, we all agree that international enrolment is really important, but the provincial government says you’re in university where we’re providing funding and we anticipate that you’re going to be having the domestic students in our province as first choice students. You’re limited right off the bat by increasing diversity at one level, unless you can cleverly define ways by having them above your counts expected from government dollars. Its tricky because it’s very expensive for students coming in, so there’s a barrier right off the bat in terms of costs. There is also a danger depending on the party in power as to whether you have a particular value, far right conservative as opposed to party with relatively liberal social views could create different sets of issues. ~ Karen
Indeed, having to make decisions about the balance of domestic and international students is difficult based on the huge financial discrepancies and implications of funding either group. The government domestic graduate student policy can be viewed as unhelpful to the educational equity cause if one takes the position that international graduate students are the most critical element for advancing equity. The policy can alternatively be viewed as helpful to the educational equity cause if one takes the position that employing greater numbers of increasingly diverse domestic doctoral graduates is the key to advancing equity. In any case, it is important to point out that the statement made by Karen incorrectly conflates diversity with international status, a common error made by several administrators participating in this study.

**Barrier (viii) – Collection and Analysis of Employment Data**

All respondents reported that the Federal Contractors Program (FCP) was useful in raising awareness about employment equity and that rigorous and transparent data collection was critical to setting goals and tracking progress. The FCP was established in 1986 as a means to advance workplace equity for women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, and members of racialized/visible minorities (HRSDC, n.d.). These are the designated groups that continue to experience systemic discrimination in the Canadian labour market. The FCP applies to institutions that receive contracts valued at $1 million or more from the Government of Canada. The Program requires institutions to compile and maintain workforce data, to complete workforce analysis, to establish short and long term goals, and to regularly report on educational equity efforts and progress. Consequently, institutions are expected to conduct regular employment systems reviews in order to ensure they are in compliance with the FCP. That having been said, most respondents admitted data collection systems and methods at their
institutions have been flawed or inadequate. For some, the survey tools were described as poor. For others, campus community members were sceptical of the usefulness of the surveys or were mistrustful of the motivations behind the data collection. Consequently, results of data collection have not been as robust as they could be and, therefore, particularly ineffective in informing or compelling potential policy interventions.

Only those senior administrators with specific human resources or equity responsibilities imbedded in their job descriptions spoke about the work they were doing to improve systems and methods to meet FCP requirements. While accountability to the government may arguably be the primary driver for campus efforts towards equitable representation of faculty and staff, some administrators commented on their commitment to equity with or without looming legislative requirements.

We had a questionnaire on our HR website which we asked people to complete, which asked them which designated group they belonged to, etc. It was a bad questionnaire. We have in fact just redesigned it and about to launch this version. On problem with this badly designed survey is that people didn’t respond to it (60% response rate). Federal and provincial governments take non-response and count as white able-bodied male…so you get a complete distortion of what’s actually going on. People think, “why do I need to respond to this?” People don’t know why the university needs to know. We’ll launch with an educational campaign. We need to know who’s here and how are they doing so we can track how people are progressing. [We] have been told by different members of designated groups that they are concerned that information may be used against them. The fact that people are concerned about this is horrific. ~ Arlene

It’s a shift in emphasis…in terms of saying this is something we want to do not something we have to do, but legally of course we do have to do it, but that’s not how we want to approach it, not how we want to set things up. ~ Teresa

We collect data every year, we report on it, it’s very, very visible, we’re very explicit about our data. ~Teresa

Table 25 summarizes the number and frequency of references to the barriers discussed above.
Table 25
Themes in Barriers to Educational Equity: Direct Quotes from Administrator Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>“we collect data every year”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“very visible, we’re very explicit”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“bad questionnaire…just redesigned it”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“people didn’t respond to [the questionnaire]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“governments take non-response…as white able-bodied male”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“complete distortion of what’s actually going on”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“people don’t know why university needs to know”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“designated groups…concerned that information may be used against them”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“saying this something we want to do not something we have to do, but legally of course we do have to do it”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized and Collegial Environment</td>
<td>“challenges happen at implementation of policy”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“at the higher levels there isn’t a problem, but at the actual level of implementation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we do adhere …to a collegial governance model”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a lot of decisions are made in academic units”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a kind of distributed responsibility”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“policy…going to help put some boundaries around or raise expectations”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“driven as much…by academic, by administrative leaders, but also consultative”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“unionized faculty…collective bargaining process “</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Systemic Issues</td>
<td>“processes we have…institutions are strikingly slow to adapt”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it takes a long time to complete a Ph.D….market over weighted towards those who are more privileged”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>”fundamentally challenge is institutional behaviour”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“like any institution [there is] a tendency to conservatism”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“actually inherently quite conservative as institutions”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“tendency to want to preserve the status quo”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“manifested in the kind of structures we have, the kind of people who populate those structure”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Constraints and Education as Commodity</td>
<td>“institution…is…challenged by a whole host of features…based in fiscal reality”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it is a balance, particularly these days when budgets are so tight”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we can’t afford to offer programs that student’s won’t take”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we’re not in a position to cater to every individual need and taste”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we just don’t have the funding to do that”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we need to fight against a pure commoditization of education”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we need to balance offering things that are popular and…profitable versus important but…smaller in overall demand”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Awareness and Issues</td>
<td>“they just don’t think about it”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“subtle pressures”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“they felt the prejudices were too great…from colleagues”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a lot of faculty would be quite upset if they were accused of bias”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“in many cases they’ve never thought about it”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarized Ideological Debates</td>
<td>“a problematic counter-active debate between quality/excellence and equity”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“people start talking about academic freedom”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity in Leadership</td>
<td>“power to shape the institution still remains in a homogenous administration”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“senior administration is dominated by males, largely white males”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting Public Agendas</td>
<td>“political barriers…for example…provincial government”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“danger depending on the party in power…could create different…issues”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The enablers identified will now be discussed under the following thematic headings: (i) framing equity as excellence, (ii) top-down and bottom-up approaches, (iii) clarity of authority, accountability, and agency (iv) establishing an ethos to shift cultural norms, and (v) informed selection committees and hiring practices.

**Enabler (i) – Strategically Framing Equity with Excellence**

Some senior administrators emphasized the importance of viewing diversity, equity, and inclusivity as fundamental principles of quality and excellence. They suggested an integrated vision of educational equity and academic excellence should guide the university from its values and mission statement through its strategic and academic plans and priorities. As well, some administrators said speaking about and demonstrating how equity and excellence are interconnected is just as important as committing to values and beliefs in institutional policies.

We have focused on the fact that for us to be the best, which is one of our aspirations, we think that the link between equity and diversity and excellence has to be really really strong. Part of our culture, part of our values is that our diversity is what will make us excellent. If you start with that as your basic value, much of what you do has to link back to that. It’s not an add on, it’s part of who we think we are and how we want to present ourselves and how we want to function. That statement that we have took a long time to get written. It has absolute support from the top of the institution, supported by every one of our Deans, and throughout our institution- that is who we are. ~ Teresa

Right at the start I think it needs to be imbedded in the university’s strategic planning process because if universities are going to articulate certain values and commit to certain goals they need to be up front about those issues so they need to be in the strategic plan. ~ Vince
Enabler (ii) – Top-Down Driven and Bottom-Up Supported Approaches

Overwhelmingly, senior administrators thought that implementation could not succeed without efforts made by both uppermost administration and departmental champions. Interviewees said a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches are needed and that the senior leadership team has a critical role to play in setting and modelling expectations as well as incentivizing and rewarding efforts to advance educational equity. Community members, and particularly faculty, often are observed to have passions and interests, which respondents said should be nurtured and sponsored by senior administration. Examples were given of how the university could invest some funds, whatever the fiscal reality, in order to incent and reward innovation. For instance, some universities subsidized or seeded one-time initiatives that were expected to enhance the achievement of equity goals. These investments in strategic initiatives were seen as helping to meet University equity goals, they said, even when governments might not fund a particular aspect of that initiative.

Teresa pointed to research that suggests senior administrative leadership is a necessary, but perhaps not sufficient ingredient to successfully developing and implementing educational equity policy. She agrees that administration must champion educational equity efforts and recognize, support, and reward students, faculty, and staff who take up and advance the efforts.

It has to be both from bottom up and top down…most of the research would tell you that if most of the senior administration does not have a commitment to diversity and equity, then it is very easy to let some of these issues fall by the wayside. It comes from a commitment from the top then reinforcing constantly that commitment as it goes down the university. ~Teresa

Vince reinforced the idea that commitments, including expectations and resource allocations, need to be made by the uppermost administration but also championed and advanced by faculty
and other community members across the university. Vince spoke to the importance of being strategic in achieving educational equity goals. By this he meant designing and implementing a strategic action plan that identifies champions, sets aside resources, and is monitored by a steering committee. Vince asserted that while this process engages the entire university and requires decentralized champions, it is very much driven by senior administration.

Underpinning each commitment there’s a strategy to help bring them to life. The strategy tended to have faculty members or committed individuals or champions for [various] areas to make the plan have an organic ground up feel to it. As we rolled out our strategies around our strategic plan, all of those [strategies] had a champion and meant to be from the ground up, with steering committees. Most strategic plans I’ve been a part of were very much top down. In many cases beautiful documents that just ended up on the shelf and didn’t go anywhere. To imbed it into the university, the champions are the one’s who try to make sure the commitments come to life. We actually make resource allocation decisions based on those commitments. ~ Vince

Philip took the perspective that educational equity efforts would only be successful with champions from within the decentralized units. He clearly articulated his belief that senior administration cannot direct units on expectations around educational equity.

As much as we can, we try to be a bottom-up organization, rather than Provosts and Deans deciding to do certain things. It’s better if impetus for that comes from the bottom-up, from individual faculty, students, groups of students, or people that have a passion for something. This provides an opportunity then for administration to help to nurture that and support it. Universities work most effectively when whatever you want to do has champions. We’re not very hierarchical structures, neither Deans nor Provosts have the real authority to tell people what to do, particularly faculty. So, always need to have someone prepared to invest their own time, passion and interest in whatever it is that you want to do. Things work best when they come from the bottom up. But, that only works if there is a culture that is conducive to that and open to nurturing things that come from the bottom-up. ~ Philip

Philip’s view was that the university is not hierarchical and that uppermost administration did not have power over units across the university. At the same time, Philip said that the decentralized units would only succeed within a culture that encourages and supports those unit educational
equity efforts. Does Philip believe that the senior administration has any role to play in creating that culture? The comments by Phillip are consistent with earlier documented remarks by administrators who felt they did not have the power to exert influence on decentralized units to effect change at the departmental level. Again, this raises the question of where administrators feel they actually do and do not have authority and agency as change agents. It seems to me that a fundamental responsibility of leaders and managers is to set a vision and articulate a strategy for all units to implement. Leadership and management is concerned with policy and human resource management. Is the senior administration not expected to set goals, measures, and performance indicators for success across a myriad of priorities? It seems there are quality assurance and performance management tools currently utilized to hold units accountable. Why should educational equity efforts not be measured using the same kinds of accountability tools? It seems that agenda setting by leaders, who articulate value for educational equity, is not translating to policy formulation, legitimation, and implementation at the unit level.

Fred reported educational equity initiatives, in his institution, have sometimes been driven by senior administrators and, at other times, driven by faculty. Fred was an outlier when he discussed the collegial governance model as an enabler to advancing educational equity, suggesting a distributed model of authority and accountability can lead to successful implementation of educational equity policy.

I’ve never actually seen an experience of these being a problem on the administrative side wanting to move forward. I think there’s a really strong commitment to fairness and equality to full representation. I think people in the university community generally are looking for ways to achieve equity as best we can. It seems to me on the student side, there is very much a desire to recognize the various groups who historically have not had proportional access to higher education, making sure that path is, or that the barriers are removed as much as possible. Those initiatives, some of them are driven by senior administration, some ideas come forward from faculty, and they come forward through the collegial governance models, and programs and policies are implemented. ~ Fred
Interestingly, Fred prefaced his remarks with a claim that he had never actually seen resistance from any administrator he had worked with. Recall that de-contextualization of a problem, taking it out of its systemic context, is a discursive barrier. Is Fred actually identifying the signs of resistance correctly among his administrative colleagues? Does he understand that he and his colleagues are part of a larger system whose structures and policies are inherently inequitable?

Fred demonstrates the minimization mindset described above – he seems focused on seeing the good and the good intent in people which is missing the point about the very real negative outcomes and inequities caused sometimes by “very good and well intentioned people”. Fred refers often to the collegial environment and collegial system of governance. Addressing educational equity is not about morally judging individuals or their character. It is about transcending individual intentions and addressing the ways individuals perpetuate, even through neglect, omission, and denial, and play into systems of power and privilege that maintain structural inequities.

Fred also viewed the unionized academic environment, a unique structural nuance within the university governance system, as a potential enabler and unions as allies for social and cultural change in the institution, citing efforts by unions to imbed educational equity goals in collective agreements. Recall that Fred thought that efforts by unions, to imbed equity expectations in collecting agreements, could both require and empower faculty to enact equity policies and practices.

When I think of the faculty side, I think it’s probably driven as much as anything by academic, by senior administrative leaders, but also in consultation because we have a unionized faculty for instance in the context of the collective bargaining process. I think there is an enormous amount of overlapping interests on these areas. ~ Fred
Enabler (iii) – Clarity of Authority, Accountability, and Agency

In this thematic area, interviewees highlighted the importance of the people in the institution, and primarily senior administrators, as critical drivers of educational equity policy. Earlier, some administrators personified the organization, highlighted systemic barriers, and effectively underplayed or overlooked their individual role and influence on organizational structures, culture, and behaviour. Here, there is an opposite sentiment and recognition that individual administrator actions are critically important, whether or not they accurately perceive their level of accountability and authority to act. Inquiries about issues of authority, responsibility, and accountability within the decentralized collegial model of the academy yielded varied responses. Some asserted that the university is not hierarchical and, therefore, the senior administration does not truly have authority over faculty. Others rejected the idea that they could not assert some sort of power – albeit employing diplomacy – and use their positions to inform faculty and strategically work to achieve educational equity goals.

Vince, Phillip, Teresa, and Sebastian described their perspectives on the authority of senior administrators to effect change with respect to educational equity. Vince spoke to the role of senior administrators in constructing equity strategies.

Equity is everywhere. Equity is an individual stance that each of us have, so if it is to succeed, it must be carried out by everyone in the university. There is an equity strategy as well. Equity was sufficiently important to us in the plan, even though it was in many commitments, we actually had a [senior administrator] to construct an equity strategy. Within the plan, in the vision statement, there is a section that speaks to values. Many of our values have equity imbedded in them, like integrity, like mutual respect, like public interest. That’s how things start from my perspective. You’ll see many policies that speak to equity. We created a statement of respectful working environment and when we got that statement out, which is sort of a policy, we weren’t certain the extent to which we would be able to use that to deal with issues when their arise around harassment in the workplace or environments that are not respectful. It has turned out to be quite useful. ~ Vince
Phillip asserted senior administrators must model the ideals and values that he felt were conducive to creating a climate that enables the achievement of educational equity.

There is nothing magical about this. Senior administration needs to walk the walk, model the ideals that you want to see in the community, that administrators exhibit respect for colleagues that they want to see in the community. With whatever member of the community, discussion with colleagues always must be done in an atmosphere of respect and mutual understanding and learning. This is really critical. ~ Philip

Teresa was adamant in expressing that, while educational equity is the responsibility of everyone in the academy, one person in particular should be accountable. She felt, for this reason, it was important to have a senior administrator specifically assigned to advancing and accounting for progress on an educational equity file.

[Colleagues] said it’s everybody’s responsibility, why does somebody have to have it in their title? My response is yes it is everybody’s responsibility [but] if you make everybody responsible then no one is held accountable. ~ Teresa

Sebastian provided an example where he exercised his power to strategically influence change at the departmental level.

[An example of a success] is creating a forum for the recruitment and selection of faculty, and creating institutional policy that says you must include in our searching process active strategies that would promote the inclusion of the widest possible diversity of candidates in your large pool and you begin the search process. Not saying there should be a quota, not saying there should be so many of a particular size or colour of tomato or carrot in your final pool, but just pushing the issue that you need to have the widest, most diverse pool of candidates on which to begin your search process is a very effective way of making change. We had a very influential black faculty member in the department of history here. Not surprisingly the individual taught black history. He came to retirement and immediately a request from the department came forward to replace with someone able to teach black history but not necessarily a visible minority. I said, wait a minute this is not going to look very good if we are not replacing a Black faculty member at least with a Black faculty member in an area that is related to Black history and its very relevant to student learning and would be important as a role model. The push back was that “we don’t have a card carrying Jew who teaches Jewish History”, “we don’t have someone who is Muslim teaching Islamic History”, “so why would we have to hire a Black faculty member to teach Black History”? So an interesting institutional response that on one level you could argue was eminently sensible. So aggravated was I that I said,
“if you can produce a significant number of people in your shortlist who are of colour, then you can go ahead and fill the position…I don’t care if you fill it then with someone who is a White member of the Klu Klux Clan…if you can demonstrate that you have a significant number of people who are Black in the pool. I will let you choose who you consider to be the best candidate. They were very reluctant…they kept telling me there were no such candidates. But they not only had a pool that was majority Black, but they chose a Black candidate and they actually came back to me and said, “We have two people and we can’t choose between whose the best; is there any possibility that we can make two appointments? ~ Sebastian

In his example, Sebastion made a decision to push back on misinformation and misperceptions about qualified pools of scholars for a specific available position. He perceived a level of personal accountability, authority, and agency on which he deliberately chose to act. Consequently, he affected personal perceptions and behaviour at the level of the decentralized unit, which in turn resulted in the hiring of two qualified faculty who belong to an equity-seeking social and cultural group.

Enabler (iv) – A Culture Supportive of Equity and Change

Discussions about the various roles of administrators in relation to faculty specifically, and the community generally, led to comments about the need to establish an ethos that permeates and influences all aspects of organizational structure and culture. These conversations suggested both individual and systemic efforts are needed in order to change established norms and behaviours. Arthur, Teresa, Phillip, Vince, and Greg referenced culture and climate. Arthur suggested that attitudes and perspectives of individuals are influential.

[The institution] has taken remarkable steps to address issues…is ahead of their time. There is a climate of progressive thought, but attitudes of individual could always be improved. Working on mindset is the best approach. Progressive thought is the [institutional] DNA. But sometimes this can be the enemy of progress at the same time. You are never as progressive as you think you are. ~ Arthur
Teresa also focused on the importance of individuals maintaining a positive and upbeat attitude to influence the climate.

We focus on the positive and upbeat and why this is an important thing to be doing rather than…somebody’s complained [and now] what are we going to do about it and what sanctions are there going to be. ~ Teresa

Philip emphasized the importance of creating a culture that is open to change and new ideas, while qualifying that every university has its cultural and climate challenges.

I think this is a community that is open to change and new ideas. We all have our challenges. Israeli Apartheid Week is a good example. We like other universities have had our challenges with this issue. About five years ago there was a high level of discord, which led to [the establishment of an initiative that in turn] led to an improvement in the atmosphere and tone of the discussion around that particular set of issues. ~ Philip

Vince suggested that individual intercultural understanding is critical along with a strategy for change led by someone with specific responsibilities to advance educational equity goals.

Equity is an individual stance so to be successful we need to impact the culture of the place. That turns out to be incredibly difficult to do. We are making some inroads. I would say it has a ways to go. Intercultural understanding turnout out to be the most difficult to bring to life. After four years of planning, we rolled out the first iteration of the plan, just now cleaning up last parts of the plan and intercultural understanding. That strategy will be launched in the next few months. We hired someone responsible for equity and diversity. I told him I didn’t have a clear sense of how we were going to make this part of the plan work. He would act as a virus - infect us in that area. Ultimately infect the entire university. We’ve made incredible progress. We continue to work away at it. ~ Vince

Greg acknowledged the need for culture and climate change as well as the commitment to take the time to effect this change. However, he expressed uncertainty about how to go about effecting culture and climate change with respect to educational equity.
It’s a challenge. I think it’s about culture change and that is something that takes time. Not to say we ignore it, we can’t do that obviously, the next part is how do we actually action that. ~ Greg

Together, these administrators pointed primarily to individual factors that could influence climate and culture change. To codify and institutionalize values and commitments that support educational equity, they suggested the need for demonstrable shifts in individual attitudes and behaviours, which in turn reinforce values and establish new cultural norms. Individual qualities they felt would support an ethos conducive to educational equity included positive attitudes, progressive thought, openness to change, awareness, and sensitivity to equity issues.

**Enabler (v) – Informed Selection Committees and Hiring Practices**

Strategic recruitment, consistent selection protocols, and informed selection committee members were seen as critical to recruiting the best talent, which includes members of designated equity-seeking groups. Administrators felt that clear policies that outline inclusive recruitment strategies and training requirements for members of hiring committees are key. They also thought that different forums and methods of educating faculty members would be most effective rather than relying on one tactic which might not resonate with all individuals. Further, they felt that ongoing communication and education needed to be pursued diligently, including leveraging relationships to reach the minds and hearts of individuals.

Greg referenced training of senior leaders as an important prerequisite to advancing educational equity, especially in the domain of recruiting and retaining equity-seeking faculty and staff. Greg critiqued the limited scope of training efforts. He acknowledged the challenges in training handfuls of individuals who sit on committees rather than casting the training net more
widely to ensure more people across committees, and within departments, have a greater understanding of the issues. With a wider range of faculty and administrators trained, Greg felt they might be better equipped to make more informed hiring decisions in support of equity goals.

We have instituted a very significant leadership training program for administrators. We have sessions…where we talk about examples and scenarios; we talk about all potential forms of discrimination, for example gender, sexual orientation. What we’re trying to do is get the leaders on side and get them to understand the issues. In many cases they’ve never thought about it. Then we can have them start to think about their hiring practices. We do require at least one member of every selection committee to understand. That’s not the same as having everybody sitting on the search and selection committee understanding the issues, as well as the leadership of that department, and then one step further having people within the whole department understanding what the issues are. ~ Greg

The other important issue to highlight here is the repeated reference to university administrators not having thought of equity issues before. Greg offered the disclaimer, which is repeated throughout this study by various senior administrators, that many leaders have not thought about issues of equity. Unawareness is offered as an argument that these leaders have good characters and intentions. The lack of cognitive awareness about equity is accepted as a reason rather than problematized as an excuse. Diversity and equity issues have always existed in society and by extension in educational institutions. In the 1970s, the introduction of multicultural legislation was followed by a plethora of governmental and non-governmental bodies and programs established to respond equitably to the increasingly diverse population of Canada. It is inconceivable that any individual, in the last century, has not thought about these issues, even on a superficial level. Moreover, it is incongruent that an individual who has not given serious thought to these issues would be hired into a leadership position in higher education. University searches for both senior administrators and faculty members should have, as one of their recruitment criteria, the requirement that candidates have demonstrably thought about and acted
on diversity and equity in the context of higher education. This would be the minimum qualification in the area of educational equity. It would be even better if candidates could demonstrate intercultural competence and effectiveness leading and championing the implementation of strategic diversity and equity plans.

Fred emphasized the usefulness of financial incentives for equity hiring. This is an interesting approach to motivating behaviour in support of educational equity, given the perception that the lack of funds represents a barrier to pursuing equity goals. Fred also highlighted the importance of data-driven practices. He asserted it is important to set requirements for departments that are based on demographic statistics collected by the university. Fred, like most others interviewed, primarily discussed gender equity.

In the last decade some time, [the institution] brought in a program where as an incentive for various appointments committees in the various academic units, if there are two candidates that rise to the top of the heap and they really are, have sort of an equal or are seen as equal by the hiring/appointments committee, and if the appointments committee then chooses the female candidate then the university puts in some extra funding centrally in support of that persons’ role. And, there are a number of other sorts of incentives along that line. We now have our incoming cohort of faculty members are roughly an even split 50/50 male to female appointments and of course it’s going to take more than a few years because we’ve got a lot of professors who are tenured who will be with us for some time. So, I think it will take a little time to shift that balance overall to 50/50, but that’s another area where I think universities as a whole and certainly [our institution] needs to continue to take action. In general, I think here, as in most places, the various academic units have a good deal of representation when it comes to making appointments decision and it will be driven in some measure by central university policy. On the enabling side or the side of just wanting to make sure that we have a process that is transparent and really tries to ensure that the best candidate is chosen for whatever position, is…a number of requirements of the academic units. At some point I think they have to provide statistics on the applicant pool. How many male and female and different…of course that’s going to vary a lot by discipline. There are just a number of policy practices that I think can help to…they can be informational, educational and help to sensitize academic units to the issue in a way that maybe some folks don’t think about as directly as those who look after hiring for the institution as a whole. I think it’s possibly the administrators at various levels of the university, people that have to take responsibility for appointments who are looking at institutional data changes where needed and so forth. ~ Fred
Teresa spoke to the importance of continuing to expand the pool of candidates until there is a sufficient amount of diversity, among equity-seeking applicants. She highlighted this as a necessary procedure in order to facilitate the equitable evaluation and selection of faculty from a diverse pool of qualified scholars.

You’re not going to be as active as you could be in ensuring that when you’re trying to recruit you are advertising and collecting the greatest number of potentially good applicants as you can. You’ll stop if you’ve got two and they both happen to be white and male. We don’t stop. We say we need to extend our search. We keep going until we have a very diverse candidate pool. ~ Teresa

**Enabler (vi) – Campus Community Awareness and Communication**

Two administrators discussed the importance of providing information to campus partners, to ensure they are educated about expectations concerning educational equity. They suggested using multiple methods of communication and working with individual faculty members, at a personal level, to help them appreciate the importance of equity issues. Gordon referenced the need for broad communication of expectations and Teresa shared an example of an approach to take to help faculty better respond to accessibility and accommodation requests.

I think that information and education about expectations is important. There needs to be an understanding of the values for this place. We need to get the message out there in many different ways…no one way works for all. ~ Gordon

For example, we have seen a huge increase in students with disability with some push back from faculty about accommodation, teaching, etc. When you sit down with someone and give them a personal example and ask them how will you expect colleagues to accommodate [you]...start to personalize it, use other members of the community to personalize it; that has a powerful message. So we’re shameless about personalizing it and getting as many champions on board, it’s a work in progress. ~ Teresa

Table 26 summarizes the number and frequency of references to the enablers discussed above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarified Authority, Accountability and Agency</td>
<td>“We’re not very hierarchical structures, neither Deans nor Provosts have the real authority to tell people what to do, particularly faculty” “it is everybody’s responsibility [but] if you make everybody responsible then no one is held accountable” “if [equity strategy] is to succeed, it must be carried out by everyone” “we actually had a [senior administrator] to construct an equity strategy” “senior administration needs to walk the walk, model ideals” “some [initiatives] driven by…administration, some ideas…from faculty” “[initiatives] come forward through the collegial governance models”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Supportive of Equity and Change</td>
<td>“only works if there is a culture that is conducive to that and open to nurturing things that come from the bottom-up” “must be done in an atmosphere of respect and mutual understanding and learning” “there is a climate of progressive thought, but attitudes of individual could always be improved” “we focus on positive and upbeat” “to be successful we need to impact the culture of the place” “this is a community that is open to change and new ideas…we all have our challenges”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Community Awareness</td>
<td>“working on mindset is the best approach “intercultural understanding…the most difficult to bring about” “information and education about expectations is important” “need to get message out there in many different ways” “sit down with someone and give them a personal example”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Top Down” and “Bottom Up” Approaches</td>
<td>“it needs to be imbedded in university’s strategic planning process” “[statement] has absolute support from the top of the institution” “it has to be both from the bottom up and top down” “research would tell you…if most of the senior administration does not have a commitment….easy to let…issues fall by the wayside” “comes from a commitment from the top then reinforcing constantly…down the university” “have faculty members or committed individuals or champions” “steering committees” “make resource allocations” “better if…from the bottom-up, from…people that have a passion” “opportunity then for administration to help to nurture…and support it” “things work best when they come from the bottom up”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Selection Committees and Practices</td>
<td>“incentive for various appointments committees…university puts in some extra funding” “make sure that we have a process that is transparent” “creating forum for the recruitment and selection of faculty” “creating institutional policy that says you must include in our search process, active strategies” “not saying there should be a quota” “pushing idea that you need to have the widest, most diverse pool of candidates on which to begin your search” “we say we need to extend our search…until we have a very diverse candidate pool”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategically Framing Equity with Excellence</td>
<td>“universities…need to be up front about those issues” “the link between equity and diversity and excellence has to be…strong” “part of our culture….is that our diversity is what will make us excellent”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Summary

This chapter has detailed the findings from analyzing the narrative interviews provided by senior administrators, with a focus on the barriers and enablers that senior administrators highlighted. The interviews surfaced several topics that could be interpreted as barriers and enablers. Eight barriers were identified, including: (i) challenges experienced in collecting and analyzing accurate employment demographic data, (ii) challenges perceived by virtue of a decentralized organizational environment with distributed authorities, (iii) systemic and organizational barriers to change, (iv) fiscal constraints, (v) individual denial and resistance to change; (vi) polarized ideologies and debates that position equity in conflict with meritocracy and academic freedom, (vii) a lack of diverse voices among governing and administrative bodies, and (viii) challenges presented by shifting government party politics and policies. On the side of enablers, seven were identified including, (i) a clear sense of authority and accountability, (ii) an institutional ethos conducive to change, (iii) complementary expectations for top down and bottom up approaches, (iv) informed selection committees and hiring practices, (v) appropriate framing of equity as integral to quality and excellence, (vi) developing individual competencies, and (vii) raising awareness and providing education.

Summarizing the analysis of barriers to educational equity perceived by senior administrators, eight themes were identified, each referenced by one or two administrators. Poor data collection, as a barrier, was discussed at great length, followed closely by perceived barriers posed by the decentralized collegial environment, structural and systemic issues, and financial constraints. Summarizing the analysis of enablers to educational equity perceived by senior administrators, six themes were identified. The two themes more frequently cited were: a
clarified sense of authority, accountability, and agency; and a culture supportive of educational equity and change. Three additional themes were discussed almost as frequently as the two just identified: campus community awareness; top down and bottom up approaches; and informed selection committees and practices. All five of these themes were discussed in terms that highlighted quite a bit of overlap, suggesting that these particular enablers may rely on each other to effectively work as enablers.

On the question of the challenges and opportunities related to educational equity, senior administrative narratives highlighted mindsets of denial, polarization/defense, and minimization as well as discourses of traditionalism, binary polarization, and de-contextualization. On the subject of barriers, administrators expressed their concern with managing fiscal constraints, reacting to supply and demand, achieving economies of scale, making profit, and deferring authority to collegial units, for instance; all of these are neoliberal discourses related to deficit reduction, consumerism, efficiency, productivity, and de-centralization.

Implications of thematic barriers and enablers will be discussed in Chapter Ten. The next chapter, nine, will continue to analyze interviews, focusing on the question of whether and how identity influences educational equity perceptions and practices.
CHAPTER NINE

FINDINGS FROM INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

PART C: SOCIAL IDENTITY AND EDUCATIONAL EQUITY IN ACADEME

Introduction

This chapter is the third of three sequential chapters examining the themes drawn from a total of 10 interviews with Presidents, Provosts, Vice- and Associate Presidents, as well as Vice- and Associate Provosts who agreed to participate in this study. Recall these are senior administrators from a sample of nine Canadian institutions selected for this study based on their ranking among the top universities nationally and globally. This examination of, what I refer to as the private domain of discourse analysis in my study, builds on discussions in Chapters Seven and Eight. The focus of this chapter, subtitled Part C, is on responses to the second open-ended interview question that ventured to explore reflections of senior administrators on the implications of their social identity on educational equity policy implementation. This second interview question was optional. It asked willing respondents to first self-identify their racial and gender identities. Then, interviewees were asked to comment on whether and how they thought their gender and racial identities influence their perceptions, experiences, understanding, and practices with respect to educational equity policy implementation. Before discussing the themes related to identity, I will first discuss why the issue of identity is important to my study.
Hurtado et al. (2012) urge us to “consider how social identities are created, recreated, and manifested in diverse college environments” and to “be critically conscious of the real power and privilege attached to these socially constructed identities” (p. 73). Such constructed identities, including race, class, gender, ability, and sexual orientation, are complex and intersecting (Jones, 2009; Jones & McEwen, 2000). Administrators whose social identities reflect membership in groups that have historically dominated the social, cultural, and political norms, in society and in academic institutions, will necessarily have greater power and privilege. Identity is critical to this study in so far as it speaks to social group membership and consequential positive or negative regard within the dominant culture. Identity salience as part of identity development may potentially be related to developing socially responsible leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2010). Increasing salience of social identities, whether targeted or privileged, seems to be an important part of the process in developing a critical consciousness of oppression, which may then lead to equity-minded action and coalition building between privileged and oppressed groups and their members (Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005). In this sense, understanding social identity theory and utilizing it in relation to creating learning environments that produce equitable outcomes is important. Also, in developing intercultural competencies, as is the case for transformational resistance, individuals must become critically conscious of social oppression and be motivated by social justice (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). Thus, understanding how social identities are constructed, and the relative power and oppression attached to group membership, are important concepts to be considered in my study.
In Canada, most, if not all, universities can be described as being predominantly “White” institutions of higher learning, influenced socially, culturally, and politically by Western European, Anglo, and Christian values and ideologies. Gusa (2010) described four aspects of “White” middle-class dominant norms in the academy, which he refers to as “White institutional presence” (p. 466). The first is “White” ascendency: “thinking and behaviour that arise from White mainstream authority and advantage…a sense of superiority, a sense of entitlement, domination over racial discourse, and White victimization” (p. 472). The second is monoculturalism, which manifests in pedagogies and curriculum that do not account for or include globally diverse and ethno-relative cultural perspectives; instead, the focus is on White Eurocentric content and pedagogies. The third is “White” blindness: “a racial ideology that obscures and protects White identity and White privilege” (p. 477). The fourth is “White” estrangement: “distancing of Whites physically and socially from People of Color” (p. 478). According to Gusa, all of these aspects, of White institutional presence, are pervasive in decision-making and often occur through social and institutional policies that are not developed through a critical anti-racist lens.

My study sought to examine whether and how social identity and privilege influence senior administrator perceptions about, understanding of, and action on educational equity in the academy. Notwithstanding the intersectional nature of identity, I chose to focus on gender and racial identity. Recall in my introductory chapter, I discussed my interest in understanding the gendered and raced aspects of educational equity. The rationale I cited for my interest included evidence of a disproportionate underrepresentation of racialized women among the senior ranks of administration in Canadian universities and my own experiences navigating the academy. As a racialized woman, I have traversed through the gendered and raced academy, first as an
undergraduate, then as a staff member, followed by my journey through graduate studies, and all the while ascending to my current role as a senior administrator. Although race and gender are socially constructed, racism and sexism are real based on group ascription (Adams et al., 2000; Omi and Winant, 1994). A critical race theory perspective posits that racism is pervasive throughout social and educational systems (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) and, therefore, structurally manifests itself in the reproduction of inequities between racial groups in non-racial or seemingly race-neutral matters (Morfin, Pérez, Parker, Lynn & Arrona, 2006).

The second interview question in my study asked participants to optionally self-identify across race, ethnicity, and gender and to comment on the extent to which they perceived a relationship between their social identities and their commitments to educational equity. Specifically, participants were asked, “If you are comfortable, please comment on whether and how you think your gender and racial identities factor into your perceptions, experiences, understanding, and actions around educational equity in the academy”. If participants chose to answer the question, they were also asked to self-identify their gender and race or ethnicity. By asking about identity, my aim was to invite reflection on belonging to any given social group and its implications on social and cultural positionality, power, and privilege in the context of Canadian society and institutions of higher learning.

I will now turn to discussing the themes that emerged from responses of senior administrators to the question of the implications of their gender and racial identities in regard to their perceptions, experiences, understanding, and actions concerning educational equity in the academy.
Themes Aligned with Interview Question 2:
*If you are comfortable, please comment on whether and how you think your gender and racial identities factor into your perceptions, experiences, understanding, and actions around educational equity in the academy. So as not to make any assumptions, if you choose to answer this question, please first tell me how you identify your gender and race or ethnicity.*

This section analyzes and discusses the themes from narrative interviews with senior administrators, with a focus on the question of whether and how administrators think their gender and racial identities factor into their perceptions, experiences, understanding, and actions regarding educational equity in Canadian universities. Recall that all participants willingly responded to this optional question. All participants identified as “White”, with some elaborating on having Western or Northern European ancestry. Some referred to themselves as “Anglo”. Three of the 10 participants identified as women and 7 identified as men. A number of themes emerged from rather personal discussions of whether and how participants perceived their own social identity to influence the advancement of educational equity goals.

It was my intention to explore the distinct perspectives of other racialized women administrators who might have participated in my research. In the end, I did not have any racialized respondents, male or female-identified. The absence of racialized respondents is somewhat curious, as, from name and face recognition methods as well as self-disclosed identity, there were a few racialized administrators among the sample of 33 individuals invited to participate in my study. The absence of racialized women administrators, specifically, is less surprising. There were far fewer racialized women administrators, across all institutions, from which to draw on, and this presented a challenge from the outset. Consequently, the sample of invitees had far fewer racialized women administrators. Additionally, senior administrators have to make difficult decisions regarding where they will spend their time, particularly when their
schedules are quite congested with a multitude of, often overlapping, day-to-day responsibilities. That being said, I wonder if agreeing to speak to the subject of educational equity presents different challenges and dilemmas concerning the possibility of being identified with such a small pool of racialized, and particularly racialized women, administrators. I also wonder if these racialized senior administrators have any concerns regarding the ability to be authentic and, therefore, regarding whether their words would be appropriately construed or not. Concerns about being misconstrued may certainly be present for non-racialized administrators; however, in a gendered and raced environment, racialized men and women may feel particularly vulnerable to the implications of being misconstrued in the context of commenting on the academy and its record on educational equity. These concerns, if they exist, could be barriers to participation. It is also possible that some racialized men and women administrators may simply not be particularly interested in surfacing or focusing equity-related issues for any number of other personal and professional reasons at this given point in their careers.

While I was not able to obtain lived-experience narratives related to the motivations, experiences, and behaviours of racialized women in relation to their administrative roles generally and to the advancement of educational equity specifically, there were some comments from White-identified administrators, both men and women, who remarked on their perceptions of the educational equity landscape for racialized men and women in the academy. Among the remarks made were acknowledgement that senior-most administrators, as well as members of governing and decision-making bodies in the academy, do not represent or reflect the profile of the social diversity among students and graduates in the academy, nor of our social diversity nationally and globally for that matter. Specifically, they reported that race and gender diversity is missing from a largely homogenous administration, which primarily reflects White and male
identities. This domination by White and male identities has implications on the cultural ideology perpetuated at the University and possibilities for non-White and non-male identities to not only enter the ranks of administrators but also then to act in ways that interrupt the dominant cultural ideology. Had I been successful in recruiting and interviewing racialized administrators, the extent to which their perceptions and behaviours aligned or conflicted with the dominant White and male cultural ideology would have provided an interesting avenue to explore.

**Whether and How Identities Influence Educational Equity**

There were a range of generally affirmative responses to whether identity might affect personal perspectives, understanding, and actions in relation to educational equity. The differences were found in the nuances of how individuals conceived of identity and other complex factors that interplay to influence perceptions and behaviour. Karen articulated the general sentiment expressed by all participants, that of interest in discussing the subject. In her case, she indicated a particular interest in discussing gender, based on her own identity. She felt that identity had played a significant role in her upbringing and professional experiences.

I’m female and white and happy to talk about this, particularly the gender question I’ve thought a lot about. In my experience, they have definitely affected how I grew up. I was only the 2nd female graduate with a Ph.D. [in my field] from my institution. When I arrived on campus to do my Master’s degree, it would have been one of the better-known faculties for [my field]. I would say about 30% of the cohort of faculty were women, a strong set of women were faculty there. There was a famous…female professor [in the field]…there who gave a talk on the use of inclusive language. It was something I have to say up to that point I hadn’t really thought about. The focus of her talk was that most books were written in sexist language and she advocated that we should re-write all textbooks in gender neutral language, which on first blush is a ridiculous proposition. On the other hand, it sensitized me in a way that I had not been. I can remember walking out with one of my colleagues saying, “Oh, wow, that was fascinating”. There was no end to the discussion. The department head at the time who was a brilliant guy said, “I really
think you need to read this book. It’s really fascinating and would really shed some light on the issue.” The speaker said, “What’s the name of the book?” and he said, “The ascent of man” without even realizing that the title of the book itself was problematic. So it was a perfect demonstration, which gave her a forum to say you haven’t thought of this very carefully. It’s really interesting because of course I was not wanting to identify as a feminist at that time because of all the negative connotations at that time. But now of course I realized I’ve always been a feminist and I realized that very quickly after that. I realized as I was going through my graduate program, which was me and all men, how there was subtle forms of discrimination, that I became more sensitized to and very vocal about. When I became [a senior administration] in the faculty, I was one of the voices that called everybody on their language. One of my colleagues came from [another male dominated field] where she was an n of 1 or 2 percent. There was no hope for her to make changes to the culture. I came from a faculty where 30% were female, and thus there was opportunity for changes, to make things better for people coming behind us. We had very different experiences in terms of how we managed and talked about issues of gender and it spilled over into other issues of diversity, other types of diversity. ~ Karen

Philip expressed mixed views on how identity had factored into his efforts to advance educational equity. He first asserted the opinion that everyone brings with them their own culture and, therefore, bias to every situation. Then, he followed up by reflecting that he did not think that his own identity or, using his words, culture and bias, factor predominantly into his decision-making around hiring specifically. Philip did not discuss how he escaped bringing his own bias, based on who he is, to selection processes. There seemed a disconnect between thinking that everyone cannot help but bring their identity or culture to play in anything they do, and thinking that he himself does not bring his identity or culture to bear on the particular task of hiring. Philip did not explain how he was able to do this, or why this would be desirable. Philip implied being unbiased is possible and desirable when he said he did not think his views on who should fill positions are “coloured” by who he is. The use of the term “coloured” connotes an undesirable distortion or bias. Interestingly, here is an example of day-to-day lexicon that attributes a negative or undesirable connotation to colour, inferring positive or desirable connotations to lack of colour or whiteness. This is very similar to using the terms
“dark/darkened” or “black/blackened” to connoted negative or undesirable aspects. These are very subtle and insidious ways that whiteness aesthetically becomes engrained in our psyche as the representation of pure and right, while “colour” comes to represent something tainted and incorrect. While Philip made reference to bias as a possible influencer, he did not link this to the potential that he might unconsciously express implicit bias and perpetuate the social construction of stereotyped thinking. Philip also did not relate implicit bias to the possibility of unconsciously acting on his power and privilege in ways that may contribute to individual or systemic inequities.

I’m a white male. Does that bias me? I think we all bring our own culture and background to everything we do. So, to a certain extent I think that’s true. The kinds of things that I’m continually sensitive to and work hard at addressing have to do with gender equity. That’s always something that comes to the fore in an engineering context because it is a discipline, which is traditionally under-represented in terms of women at the faculty and student level. I don’t know; it’s hard for me to judge and answer that. I don’t think my views as to who should be in what positions are particularly coloured by who I am. Somebody else could probably judge that. ~ Philip

Fred responded to the question by commenting on the need to be continually self-reflective, open to increasing his own awareness, and engaged in opportunities to learn new skills to ensure one is appropriately attending to equity issues, whatever one’s identity. He referenced his involvement on equity committees and his participation in collective bargaining. These involvements in addition to learning about the principles of natural justice and becoming trained in mediation were provided as examples of the ways he has committed to developing knowledge and skills relevant and transferable to the context of educational equity. Fred also commented on the importance of picking up on sometimes elusive aspects of equity, which he refers to as the “subtleties and nuances” of equity. Fred admitted that it has not been obvious to him whether and how his own identity may be influencing his efforts and success advancing educational equity.
Fred opined that what might be more important than one’s identity is that one’s attitude and behaviours be guided by particular values that support equity and fairness. He touched on critically important precursors to advancing educational equity; he spoke of the importance of developing attitudes, knowledge, and skills in order to be individually more competent and effective in advancing equity. However, like Philip, Fred did not relate the question of identity to issues of power and privilege and, therefore, the potential for perpetuating implicit bias and systemic discrimination. In fact, Fred suggested that being driven by evidence of a problem or inequity should render identity irrelevant.

It’s a good question. I have to reflect on it. I’m a middle-aged white guy. The important part of my development as an academic leader over the years has been a very keen attention to questions of equity in general. When it comes to academic evaluation for academic work for students or by fellow academic colleagues, it comes as part of training and development. I’m taking for instance training in conducting tribunals and understanding principles of natural justice and having those principles inform the kinds of decisions I can make. It seems to me that when I reflect on my own experience, it’s been a period of becoming increasingly more aware of the obligation of the institution to ensure that there is equitable treatment all the way around. Being involved in a number of initiatives, so we have for instance an equity committee at the university, we’ve had a number of initiatives in support of the experience of women over the years, there’s even I’ve been involved in the collective bargaining process, and being aware of for instance historical inequities in salaries of male and female faculty members and then working out processes whereby those inequities can be resolved. I think in administrative roles, over a period of time, I’ve had the opportunity to gain a greater awareness of some of the subtleties and nuances of the broader question of equity as it applies in the university context. So, had my identity as a white male academic had an impact on that? I think probably it’s not immediately apparent to me. What’s probably more important is a drive to be informed obviously by values that guide equitable treatment, of fairness, so that’s a key part. I think the other part of it is also to be informed and to be open to being informed by the evidence and so in that respect I’m not sure if it matters if an administrator is male or female or a particular ethnic background. It seems to me that what’s probably equally as important is attitude and sensitivity to the question. ~ Fred

Arthur shared that his experiences growing up in a racially segregated environment had significant impacts on his perspectives and behaviours with respect to equity. Arthur expressed that he is always thinking of issues of equity as a direct result of his early involvement and
commitment on a “dissident” campus combating social injustice and oppression. Arthur reflected on having spent years actively working on developing more nuanced and complex thinking about and understanding of equity issues. He identified in himself a heightened sense of awareness of his own privilege as well as a heightened awareness of his influence within authoritative systems and structures. With this awareness of privilege and positionality, Arthur asserted that he had a role to play in helping to facilitate more refined and productive discussions about equity within the academy. He said he had a responsibility to “bridge issues” with other “White” members of the dominant institutional culture; perhaps he meant bringing about greater understanding or acceptance of the issues surrounding equity. He did not elaborate his exact meaning nor how he was currently doing this and to what effect.

I am conscious of this all the time. I have recollections of being a student…I was at one of the most dissident campuses [in the country]. I was committed to social justice and the [defeat of racial segregation]. I became an academic because of these experiences. It took me…years…to become more thoughtful and more sophisticated about these issues. I was a child of 4th generation white privilege. I think my awareness and background strengthened my commitments. I am highly attuned, predisposed to assumptions of authority. I’m quite willing to declare my own subject position. I’m ok with acknowledging potentially problematic experiences. I feel I am useful in moving the institution to a more refined productive engagement with equity. My utility is to bridge issues to the white dominant culture, to those with whom it may be a bit more off-putting.

~ Arthur

Like Arthur, Vince also experienced growing up in a racially segregated environment, which he echoed had shaped his views on equity. Vince also named his privilege and admitted that he has had to force himself to think of the issues, to continually bring the issues to the fore of his consciousness. From a position of privilege, he reflected on how easy it was for him to lose sight of the ongoing need to address issues of equity that may not be impacting him directly on a day-to-day basis. Vince stressed the importance of actively bringing equity issues to one’s awareness when one is in a dominant position, with a certain amount of power and privilege.
Vince commented that his awareness of his own identity had been accentuated by his numerous experiences of immersion among people of different cultures. He talked about the diversity among his friends and his experiences travelling abroad as instrumental to his awareness of difference generally.

Absolutely. I’m an aging white heterosexual male. So, I belong to the group that tends to be dominant in the university if you look at the professoriate at the university or senior tables at the university. I grew up on a farm in rural southwestern [town in] Ontario. It’s an interesting town because it was the last town to be unsegregated. When I was growing up…banks and restaurants were segregated but the community found a way to live in completely inappropriate and interesting ways. The farm beside our farm, it was a Black family, so I grew up playing with the kids on the farm but then you’d go into town and things would be segregated. I grew up with it and had been aware of how toxic it was all my life but I hadn’t experienced it as an individual because I’m from a highly privileged group. I have had friends all of my life from a wide range of groups and I’ve travelled extensively and close friends from different villages or sexual orientations. It’s something we all have to focus on, especially those of us in the dominant group. I’m very aware who I am and where I come from. It’s a challenging question. I have a position that gives me great privilege and a reasonable amount of power. So, from that perspective I have to force myself to think about these issues. They’re not issues I tend to be confronted with that many marginalized groups are. I will say when I came [here] I didn’t find it a particularly welcoming environment. That was one of the things that struck me. If I’m coming in as one in one of the most privileged environments at the university and I didn’t find it particularly welcoming, how would other people find it? ~ Vince

Greg talked about coming from a family that had held racially biased and discriminatory views. He said these views always perplexed him as a young person and he rejected these racist attitudes. In the context of recruiting faculty and staff, he wished to believe that his actions were not influenced by the identities of the individual candidates. He reflected on his involvement in hiring several women into his academic department as evidence of his non-discriminatory approach. Greg expressed aspirations to be just in his attitudes and behaviours. While he felt his work was not done, his assessment of whether he had been successful in combatting biased or discriminatory thinking and behaviour lacked a systemic analysis. As seen with other administrators, Greg did not comment on how his perceptions and behaviour may be influenced
by implicit bias perpetuated by inequitable discourses on diversity. To highlight this point, his follow-up comment, regarding his hiring decisions, demonstrated the discourse of binary polarization that pits quality up against equity. As has been argued throughout this study, equitable searches are compatible with aims to hire the best candidates. Greg’s need to reassure people that the female candidates that he hired were in fact qualified acts as a discursive barrier to advancing educational equity.

A very good question. I come from the U.K. I am a Caucasian male. I have rejected most of the prejudices that have come out of traditional English society, I would say. I had grandparents who grew up in India during the British Raj. I always found their attitudes puzzling. I couldn’t understand why they felt that a brown person couldn’t do a job as effectively even when the evidence was actually clear that they could compared to say a white person. I’d like to think that most of my administrative decisions have not been impacted in any way by the gender or ethnicity of the individual I was going to hire. In fact, I was quite proud of the fact that, when I was chair of the department, out of the recruits I brought in only one was male and four were female. It did redress the gender balance in the department. But, I was careful to ensure that was always around quality; I was not bringing in somebody then who was a woman because I thought we needed a woman. ~ Greg

Gordon was another participant who referenced his immersion among people different from himself as instrumental to developing his current consciousness of and commitment to educational equity.

I am a male, Caucasian. I think I’m effective. I grew up in a small community in B.C. I had classmates who were Japanese, Aboriginal during my high school experience. Through our local fishing industry, in my mid 20s I realized a lifelong lesson. My classmates who were Aboriginal were a few years behind. The boys would go to the fisheries with the men and girls would go to the canneries with the women. They know so much, from these experiences, about fishing, weather, tides, currents, boats, engineering, and plumbing, although these students were viewed not as leading students in school or university. It was so sad to me how university students knew little in comparison. This taught me to be respectful, not to judge people on what they look like. I’ve been a faculty member for over 40 years and been to and worked in [and] been exposed to other cultures. I’m not perfect but I’m pretty sensitive and aware of difference. I tend to focus on the similarities. ~ Gordon
Sebastian described having personally experienced bias and prejudice, although this experience did not translate to systemic discrimination. Nonetheless, he indicated that this personal experience contributed to his current understanding of and commitment to equity.

My personal experiences in moving to another country have been hugely influential in my own commitment to issues of diversity. Part of it is a confession of ignorance on my part. It was really quite the wake up call for me to see how subtle systemic discrimination can be because the recipient has perceptions about inclusiveness that probably no one else around them appreciates. Having people imitate and make fun of my accent, then the realization that I was White, I fitted in, in looks, with the community I was in. Amazing learning curve to then say so what would have happened if my accent was much thicker and more difficult to understand or what would have happened if I didn’t look like the people here…no wonder people feel as if they are being discriminated against. I learned by experience what systemic discrimination was from both sides, from my own and other people, in ways that I couldn’t be taught about…I had to do that by experience. I’m not a micromanager but my skill set is to inspire, engage, aggravate, promote people to take responsibility themselves. Into that steps a naïveté, some may say an arrogance, to not actually play the hierarchical game of “I don’t have the power to tell a department…”. I speak it like it is. If I think something is inappropriate, I think there is injustice, I think this is wrong, I say so and it leads me into all kinds of trouble. I’ve had a life experience of doing that that has sometimes meant that I haven’t progressed in the system as fast as I might have wanted…other times people have liked that. ~ Sebastian

Arlene described a lived experience of gender discrimination during her academic career.

She was very brief in her remarks.

I don’t know that I’ve got anything to say. I’m female. Like many female academics I started off as a course lecturer not with a tenure track position. It seems very clear this happens to women more than men. When I did get a tenure track position, it was clear that I was getting paid a lot less than colleagues. That experience certainly shaped how I view what’s going on now. ~ Arlene

Teresa also described early experience with discrimination; hers was related to socio-economic class discrimination, although she shared that she was not the first in her family to attend university. Teresa hoped her experiences had contributed to her sensitivity toward issues of equity and she acknowledged dimensions of equity, other than gender and socio-economic class, which still require much more attention.
I am a female white privileged individual, formerly from England. I am from a good socioeconomic background, certainly not first in my family to go to university. I’m very very aware that I’m privileged. I’m also of an era…of seeing massive change for white women in terms of their ability to move forward in the workplace. I fully acknowledge that I’ve worked very hard, but have a lot of privilege. I hope then that I am sensitive to those who haven’t had the socioeconomic or race privilege that I’ve had. Years ago, when I was presenting [the] employment equity report…a couple of individuals said, “Women are doing really well, why do we need [to spend resources targeting women].” My response to that was white middle class women are doing well; women of colour, Aboriginal women, women with disabilities, lesbians, etc. I don’t think they are doing proportionately as well. Therefore, we will still need [resources targeting women] until such time as the intersections of gender with other equity issues is on a level playing field. ~ Teresa

The thematic areas that emerged in response to the question of the role and influence of identity on educational equity include: (i) the importance of being aware and open-minded, (ii) the importance of be willingness to act within their authority, (iii) the importance of having a nuanced understanding of equity, (iv) the importance of experiencing early transformational encounters to shape their thinking and behaviour; (v) the importance to acknowledge power and privilege, and (vi) the importance of developing skills to be more effective in advancing educational equity. Below, I briefly summarize each of the six themes.

(i) **Being Aware and Open-minded**

Administrators most frequently commented that being open-minded when encountering difference and having some awareness of historical inequities facing equity-seeking groups was critical and helpful to advancing educational equity.
(ii) Being Willing to Act Within Authority

Many administrators made connections between their social identities and experiences, whether with bias, discrimination, or privilege, with their level of awareness and commitment to use their power to mobilize efforts towards educational equity. When the discussion turned to action-oriented strategies to achieve educational equity, several administrators discussed their responsibility to help mobilize other administrators, faculty, and staff towards change. Several administrators said it was important to be willing to act within one’s authority. They remarked that they do this by leveraging their awareness of inequities, their commitment to change, and their strategic thinking and relationship building skills. Some talked about the importance of engaging in ongoing critical reflection and stepping outside the prescribed bounds of hierarchy in the academy to achieve equity goals.

(iii) Having a Nuanced Understanding of Equity

There were references made to being attentive to the subtleties and nuances of inequity as well as acting on awareness in order to make change. It is noteworthy that several administrators used words like “puzzling” when they described racist attitudes of people around them, perhaps indicating a form of minimization if not denial, characteristic of a lack of deeper understanding of the process by which everyday subtle and systemic forms of racism take place (Essed, 1990, 2002).
(iv) **Transformative Encounters with Difference**

Several administrators relayed early transformational experiences, immersion among people of different cultures, as well as personal experience of bias and discrimination that they felt were influential in developing their current consciousness and commitment around equity issues. Some of the personal experiences shared were direct lived experiences of inequities and others were indirect observed experiences. Through their childhood, and other life experiences, many reflected on what it meant to be a good person with good intentions. The focus in these stories was on the affective and, to some extent, the cognitive aspects of their commitment and understanding of equity-related issues, but far less on behavioural aspects of their actions in support of equity.

(v) **Acknowledging Power and Privilege**

While participants were not asked to identify across social identity dimensions other than race and gender, many did self-identify membership in other dominant social groupings. Some identified as heterosexual or having been raised in middle or upper class households. Belonging to these other, unprompted, social groups was shared in the context of acknowledging their privilege. Some suggested that an awareness and acknowledgement of their privilege worked to strengthen their commitment to equity issues. Others reflected that, because of their privilege, they have had to actively work to keep equity issues at the fore of their consciousness.
(vi) Developing Skills to Advance Equity

A few administrators commented on the need for professional development for administrators in order to develop commitments and skills to adequately address equity. These administrators felt this development happens over the course of engaging in both formal professional leadership development exercises as well as through hands on experience in an administrative role over time. They saw equity commitments and skills as leadership qualifications. None of the administrators interviewed identified themselves as an expert in any equity-related field. As non-experts, they referenced the usefulness of formal and information professional development, but they did not discuss the value of having experts in the field to provide educational equity policy advice and/or leadership for strategic planning purposes. Again, conversations about attitudes and knowledge were aligned with individual affective and cognitive development, but less aligned with developing skills to inform individual behaviours as well as systemic change in support of educational equity.

Table 27 indicates the number of Presidents who made relevant references to the themes and the frequency with which those themes were references.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Part of Quote Demonstrating Discourse Related to Theme</th>
<th>Number of Different Admin</th>
<th>Frequency of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Awareness and open-mindedness          | “up to that point I hadn’t really thought about”  
  “it sensitized me in a way that I had not been”  
  “more aware of the obligations of the institution to…equitable treatment”  
  “a drive to be informed…by values that guide equitable treatment, of fairness”  
  “part of it is also to be…open to being informed by the evidence”  
  “equally important is attitude and sensitivity to the question”  
  “I am conscious of this all the time”  
  “my awareness and background strengthened me commitments”  
  “It’s something we all have to focus on, especially…the dominant group”  
  “I have to force myself to think about these issues”  
  “I’m pretty sensitive and aware of difference”  
  “part of it is a confession of ignorance on my part”  
  “I am sensitive to those who haven’t had the socioeconomic or race privilege” | 7             | 42              |
| Willingness to Act within Authority    | “I was one of the voices that called everybody on their language”  
  “opportunity for change, to make things better for people coming behind us”  
  “I’m continually sensitive to and work hard at addressing…gender equity”  
  “working out processes whereby those inequities can be resolved”  
  “I am useful in moving the institution to...productive engagement with equity”  
  “my utility is to bridge issues to the white dominant culture”  
  “when I was chair of the department, out of the recruits I brought in only one was male and four were female…it did redress the gender balance in the department”  
  “my skill set is to inspire, engage, aggravate, promote people to take responsibility”  
  “not…play the hierarchical game of ‘I don’t have the power to tell a department…””  
  “If I think something is inappropriate, I thing there is injustice…I say so” | 7             | 11              |
| Nuanced Understanding of Equity issues | “there was subtle forms of discrimination, that I became more sensitized to”  
  “I think we all bring our own culture and background to everything we do”  
  “aware of historical inequities in salaries of male and female faculty members”  
  “gain a greater awareness of some of the subtleties and nuances of…equity”  
  “to become more thoughtful and more sophisticated about these issues”  
  “to see how subtle systemic discrimination can be”  
  “recipient has perceptions about inclusiveness that…no one else…appreciates”  
  “white middle class wome are doing well, women of colour, Aboriginal women, women with disabilities, lesbians…[not] doing proportionately as well”  
  “we still need [resources targeting women] until such time as the intersections of gender with other equity issues is on a level playing field” | 6             | 9               |
| Transformational Encounters            | “being involved in a number of initiatives in support of the experience of women”  
  “being a student…I was at one of the most dissident campuses….I was committed to social justice…I became an academic because of these experiences”  
  “I grew up with it and had been aware of how toxic it was all my life”  
  “I’ve had friends…from a wide range of groups and I’ve travelled extensively”  
  “these experiences [growing up]…taught me to be respectful, not to judge people”  
  “that experience [gender inequity]…shaped how I view what’s going on now”  
  “my personal experiences…have been hugely influential in my own commitment” | 6             | 7               |
| Acknowledgement of Power and Privilege | “I did not want to identify as a feminist”  
  “I was a child of 4th generation white privilege”  
  “I am highly attuned, predisposed to assumptions of authority”  
  “I’m quite willing to declare my own subject position”  
  “I belong to the group that tends to be dominant in the university”  
  “I hadn’t experienced it as an individual because I’m from a…privileged group”  
  “I have a position that gives me great privilege and a reasonable amount of power”  
  “They are not issues I tend to be confronted with…many marginalized groups are”  
  “I’m very aware that I’m privileged” | 4             | 9               |
| Skill-building and Professional Development | “important part of my development…has been…attention to questions of equity”  
  “training…and understanding principles…inform the kinds of decisions I can make” | 1             | 2               |
Chapter Summary

This chapter has analyzed and discussed the findings from the narrative interviews provided by senior administrator, focusing on the question of whether and how identity factors into perceptions and practices concerning educational equity. Interviews indicated that many senior administrators felt that personal identity did play a role in influencing their own capacity to advance educational equity. The conversations concerning identity went in many different directions, surfacing some themes that were directly related to identity and others indirectly related to identity. The six themes identified were discussed.

Neoliberal ideologies and discourses were also manifest in the responses to the question of senior administrative identities and their relationship to understanding and mobilizing educational equity. Discourses of denial and universalism, characteristic of denial and minimization mindsets were paramount here. Many administrators did not relate their individual attitudes, experiences, and behaviours to systemic processes that generate institutional cultural norms and influence institutional policies and practices. These were self-described well-intentioned and open-minded administrators who hoped that their values and commitments would translate to equitable policies and practices. A few administrators acknowledged their power and privilege; however, there were not deep discussions about how power and privilege could be leveraged through authority and accountability, to mobilize educational equity in a sustained and systemic manner. In fact, many administrators described a lack of agency in a collegial decentralized academic environment. This discourse of decentralization manifested as a neoliberal discursive barrier to educational equity as it served to create an ambiguous deference and delegation of authority and accountability.
Having now documented and discussed all of the findings from data collected through Presidential installation speeches and senior administrator interviews, I will now turn to making concluding remarks which include an analysis and further discussion of the findings, implications of the findings, as well as suggested recommendations and final thoughts about future research.
CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSION: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In my introductory remarks, I stated that while most, if not all, Canadian universities name diversity, inclusivity, and/or equity values in their vision and mission statements, these institutions define and interpret equity-related issues in varying ways. These differences in defining and interpreting equity-related issues affect whether educational equity policies are adopted as well as how and to what extent they are enacted, enforced, and evaluated (Pal, 2001). My research set out to explore how educational equity is perceived, understood, and practiced by senior administrators in a sample of Canadian universities, as well as to uncover the ideologies and discourses that may (re)produce the conditions for effectual or ineffectual educational equity policy implementation. The purpose of my research was fivefold: (1) to investigate the social, political, and cultural ideologies and discourses that dominate in the academy and influence the educational equity policymaking process; (2) to learn about the perspectives and practices to which individual senior administrators perceive themselves to be committed in relation to educational equity; (3) to identify the thematic barriers and enablers to advancing educational equity, as perceived by senior administrators; (4) to identify discursive practices among senior administrators, in relation to educational equity; and (5) to consider the ways that senior administrators believe their social identities and positionalities influence their success advancing educational equity. My study sought to uncover the dominant ideologies and discourses driving Canadian university agendas and examine the extent to which these affect the academic
organizational culture, and specifically the political will and skill of senior administrators to lead change in the area of educational equity. The following were my research questions:

1. What are the ideological underpinnings of dominant discourses in academe and how do these discourses relate to educational equity policy implementation?
2. How might senior leader discourses and ideologies affect educational equity policy implementation?
3. What barriers and enablers are thought to influence educational equity policy implementation according to senior administrators?
4. How do senior administrators perceive and practice educational equity?
5. How do senior leaders think their own social identities and positionalities influence their perspectives and practices in relation to educational equity?

Using critical race feminist and critical discourse analytical frameworks, my study sought to interrogate whether and how prevailing neoliberal ideologies and discourses drive Canadian university agendas and to examine the extent to which neoliberal discursive barriers manifest in the perceptions and utterances of senior administrators in relation to educational equity. In addition to engaging a method of narrative discourse analysis, whereby I examined interviews provided by current senior administrators, my research also employed a method of document analysis, by examining installation speeches delivered by several current Presidents. Through this study, I also expected to learn about the barriers and enablers to advancing educational equity in Canadian universities, from the perspective of senior administrators. Data collected and themes drawn out from interviews and installation speeches suggest that there are discourses regarding educational equity that are influenced by neoliberal ideology. These discourses assess
educational equity issues and goals using neoliberal values, principles, and criteria that are counterproductive to achieving educational equity. While there were outlying data, for the most part, the themes, discussed below, were consistently in support of this conclusion.

Manifestations of Neoliberal Discursive Barriers to Educational Equity

Proponents for educational equity policies in higher education argue that structural and systemic social inequities to accessing, participating at all levels of, and benefiting from the academy continue to exist. These advocates say that higher education institutions have not engaged in adequate information gathering and understanding of the problem, in part due to constraints imposed by neoliberal global, national, and provincial politics driving institutional agendas. In Chapter Five, I examined and discussed how the neoliberal ideology influences dominant social and institutional discourses, which can hinder educational equity efforts. As discussed in that chapter, the neoliberal ideology gives rise to discourses of marketization, consumerism, managerialism, and hyper-individualization. Lewis (2008) examined the implications of current neoliberal ideologies, articulated in discourses of marketization, privatization, and commodification, on the historic role of institutions of higher learning with respect to “critical transformative possibilities” (p. 47). She examined this tension by looking at the ways local policies and practices align to adapt to ideologies imported from larger social, political, and economic systems and structures (Lewis, 2008). Indeed, in their installation speeches, a number of Presidents felt it important enough to caution their university communities about embracing uncritically the neoliberal rhetoric of globalization and marketization. Some senior administrators, in their interviews, also expressed reluctance to fully embrace the market-
oriented values and principles that would see education purely as a commodity and students essentially as consumers. However, there were still Presidents and senior administrators who used market-oriented discourse of supply and demand when discussing fiscal challenges facing their universities. Though senior administrators generally concurred that educational equity is an important issue warranting attention in academe, the full range of neoliberal discourses described in this study were evident throughout speeches and narrative interviews, which are summarized in the next section.

The neoliberal ideology endorses a range of discursive barriers, which can impede anti-racism efforts and educational equity policy implementation in universities. The range of discursive barriers discussed and explored in my study were those advanced by Henry and Tator (2010), including discourses of denial, colour-blindness, equal opportunity, de-contextualization, blaming the victim, binary polarization, balkanization, tolerance, traditionalism, and political correctness. While all of these discursive barriers were manifested to some extent in the interviews of senior administrators, the most prevalent discursive barriers revealed were discourses of denial, equal opportunity, and tolerance attributed to interviewees themselves as well as discourses of denial, traditionalism, binary polarization, and political correctness described by senior administrators while describing the attitudes and behaviours of their faculty and administrative colleagues. Indeed, a recurring theme among discursive barriers surfaced in senior administrator interviews related to their expressed challenge dealing with resistant colleagues who position equity within a binary that places equity in opposition to quality or meritocracy as well as to equality or academic freedom. The binary polarity constructed regarding equity on the one hand and efficiency on the other hand was also subtly underpinning
the discourse concerning fiscal and economic constraints as barriers to achieving educational equity.

Quality, efficiency, equality, and equity are not mutually exclusive principles. These principles may be defined and enacted in ways that are complementary, helping to simultaneously promote excellence, accountability, opportunity, and social responsibility. However, increasingly, the terms quality, efficiency, equality, and equity define and are defined by neoliberal ideologies in ways that can undermine or conflict with educational equity goals. Quality, efficiency, and equality are often expressed and defended using the language of consumerism, managerialism, competitiveness, individualization, and politically correctness – all discourses that emerge from or are supported by a neoliberal ideology. Using a critical social analytical framework, one can argue against the neoliberal conceptualization of quality, efficiency, and equality as being incompatible with equity. First, defining quality as exclusive of equity is arguably a substandard form of quality. Equitable practices have been shown to attract and engage the most talented employees and to generate more creativity and innovation in the production and delivery of goods and services. As an excellent education is dependent on talented, engaged, creative, and innovative students, faculty, staff, and administrators, one must ask whether a university that does not attend to equity can truly boast being excellent or preeminence? Second, efficiency at the expense of equity may actually result in direct and indirect monetary, human, and temporal costs associated with either not dealing with equity issues or attempting to redress inequities after some harm or injury threatens the university. Thirdly, equal treatment without redressing historic and ongoing inequities that tip the scale of equality of opportunity, do not make for a meritocratic system. Instead, such a system perpetuates both inequality and inequity.
Discussion and Implication of Findings

Before reflecting on the implications of the findings in my study, it is important to consider the different contexts and conditions in which the installation speeches and narrative interviews were shared. Generally, Presidential installation speeches take place on the occasion of the convocation of cohorts of graduands; thus, remarks are directed at students and typically focus on what the university now expects will be the responsibilities of its newest graduates. The speeches are considered in the public domain, prepared and rehearsed primarily, as mentioned, for an audience of graduating students but also for other administrators, faculty members, staff, community members, parents, and invited dignitaries. Thus, the tone and content should be considered within these constructed and scripted settings. Certainly, with any public speech by a university President, there are public relations interests that might preclude Presidents from straying too far from institutional rhetoric, although there is some latitude given to and taken by Presidents to select those issues that they would like to champion and impress upon the university community as they take up their posts.

The interviews with senior administrators took place in an informal setting, which assured the confidentiality of their remarks. The interviews are, thus, considered in the private domain. The responses may or may not have been scripted and rehearsed, depending on the extent to which the interview participants felt it necessary to prepare based on the information about the focus of the interview questions they were provided in the Letter of Information. That being said, it seemed to me that participant responses and patterns of speech were spontaneous and unrehearsed.
Analyzing Presidential installation speeches and senior administrator narrative interviews for signs of which educational equity issues senior academic leaders may be most mindful or passionate about, I found themes across the four domains of educational equity set out in this study: (a) improving access for historically under-represented students, (b) establishing inclusive campus climates, (c) developing globally inclusive curricula, and (d) recruiting and retaining equity-seeking faculty and staff. The themes are summarized in the following sections under headings that are aligned with the interview questions. The first section broadly discusses whether and how educational equity is perceived as a policy issue. Following are subsections discussing specifically how educational equity is perceived as a policy issue; subsections are aligned with the four educational equity domains. The subsequent section discusses the barriers and enablers to educational equity articulated by senior academic leaders. The final section discusses the question of whether and how senior administrators speak about their own identities in relation to their roles in advancing educational equity in the university.

**Whether and How Educational Equity is a Policy Issue**

With respect to *whether* educational equity is perceived as a policy priority for universities, Presidential installation speeches and senior administrator interviews demonstrated a generally ubiquitous view that educational equity *is* a policy issue. However, the question of *how* educational equity is a policy issue yielded much more variability in responses. Installation speeches frequently referenced diversity, inclusivity, and equity, signalling these issues are of import to incoming Presidents of institutions of higher learning today and/or that these administrators recognize the issues are important to their audiences.
Given the relationship between knowledge and power (Foucault, 1969/1972), the academy, as a site of both knowledge production and dissemination, seems, according to Lee (2005) an appropriate arena in and from which to take up the cause of social justice. Lewis (2008) argues that universities are situated historically as sites of “social critique and important cultural production” (p. 47). Indeed, the alignment of educational equity with the social and intellectual mission of the academy did emerge as a major theme when examining remarks across both Presidential speeches and senior administrator interviews. In interviews, several senior administrators indirectly referenced social responsibility by suggesting that equity is among the fundamental values of the academy and that all societies should attend to equity issues, particularly countries like Canada that espouse multiculturalism.

In their installation speeches, Presidents linked the missions of universities to developing socially conscious and responsible citizens and to promoting citizenship locally and globally, thereby contributing to peaceful, inclusive, and sustainable societies. They referenced a need to be aware of, acknowledge, and work to remedy systemic social inequities in communities and to leverage critical learning, teaching, and research in ways that seek to improve the health and welfare of people in the world. Specifically, the four themes that emerged related to the role of the university in developing socially responsible citizens, strengthening and sustaining communities, critically analyzing and problem-solving social issues, and addressing systemic social inequities. A substantial number of Presidents foregrounded in their speeches the role of the university in promoting social responsibility and, to a lesser but not trivial extent, the role of the university in addressing systemic inequities.

In interviews, senior administrators consistently asserted that educational equity was indeed an issue requiring policy intervention. The themes discussed included an
acknowledgement that equity is an issue that needs more attention and ongoing effort, the recognition that internationalization goals create a need to attend to equity, the observation that all societies must attend to equity, the assertion that attending to issues of equity is among the core values of the academy, and the opinion that our multicultural society specifically calls for attention to equity. The statement that equity is a core value fundamental to the academic mission and essential in a multicultural society emerged from both installation speeches and interviews, though articulated in slightly different ways. Presidents referenced these themes more frequently in their installation speeches than did senior administrators in their interviews.

Taken together, these sentiments from uppermost administrators are consistent with the arguments made by both Lee (2005) and Lewis (2008); however, it remains to be seen whether the perceived values and commitments articulated by Presidents in their installations speeches and senior administrators in interviews bear out in their actual practices. As higher education institutions can play pivotal roles in developing and graduating socially conscious leaders, capable of more effectively dealing with the global human condition, I would argue university administrators and faculty must model the lessons they impart to their students, who they expect will be, global citizens and leaders. In this way, administrative and academic leaders in universities have an obligation to pursue educational equity as part of their individual and organizational mandates.

Specifically How Educational Equity is a Policy Issue

With regard to the specific ways that senior academic leaders perceive educational equity to be an issue, both Presidential speeches and senior administrator interviews cite a number of
issues across the four educational equity domains: (i) improving access for historically under-represented students, (ii) establishing inclusive campus climates, (iii) developing globally inclusive curricula, and (iv) recruiting and retaining equity-seeking faculty and staff.

In public speeches, where public relations and interpretations may factor more heavily into the scripting of messages, the issues most frequently emphasized were financial access for students broadly as well as globalizing the curriculum. In private interviews, with less concern for editing messages, the issues most frequently emphasized were access issues specifically for Aboriginal students and the need to redress inequities faced by women and racialized faculty members. Below, I discuss responses across all four educational equity domains.

(i) Access for historically under-represented students. In the first educational equity domain, Presidential installation speeches referred to three distinct student populations: Aboriginal learners, students with no or low financial resources, and first generation students. Senior administrative interviews also referred to three prior ity student populations: Aboriginal students, non-Aboriginal marginalized students, and students from low-income households. Both speeches and interviews referenced access for Aboriginal students and students from low-income families. However, in speeches, access for students from low-income families was most frequently referenced as a priority, while, in interviews, access for Aboriginal students was most frequently cited as a priority. There seems to be a heightened awareness and response to the issue of access and support for Aboriginal learners. This mindfulness of Aboriginal access needs may be a result of both federal and provincial incentives for post-secondary institutions to support Aboriginal learners. For instance, at the federal level, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC, 2013) offers bursaries directly to Aboriginal post-secondary
students and it offers funding for colleges and universities to design and deliver courses tailored to First Nations and Inuit students. At the provincial level, one example is the introduction of the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities’ (MTCU) Post-Secondary Education Fund for Aboriginal Learners (PEFAL). Funding through PEFAL has been made available to colleges and universities that can demonstrate initiatives designed to increase access to higher education for Aboriginal students as well as to improve their retention and graduation rates (MTCU, 2011).

Furthermore, statistical data and research on the educational attainment of Aboriginal learners and communities is well documented. This data has clearly pointed to the gap in educational levels between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal populations in Canada. Reports from Statistics Canada (NHS, 2011) and The Caledon Institute of Social Policy (Mendelson, 2006) indicate that the education attainment gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal learners continues to grow wider despite the doubling of Aboriginal people with university degrees over the last decade. According to reports from the National Household Survey (2011) and Mendelson (2006), from 2001 to 2011, the percentage of Aboriginal people, as a proportion of the entire national population, who held university degrees increased from 4% to 9.8%; in contrast, over the same period of time, the percentage of non-Aboriginal people, among the Canadian population, who held university degrees increased from 15% and 26.5%. Drummond, Giroux, Pigott, and Stephenson (2012) find that nearly 40% of Aboriginal Canadians do not complete high school; however, those Aboriginal students who do complete secondary schooling enter post-secondary schools at rates similar to non-Aboriginal students. The research by Drummond et al. also identifies a complexity of systemic issues complicating access to higher education,
including endemic poverty and the intergenerational effects of violent and traumatic residential school system experiences.

There were several comments regarding the need to remove financial barriers for students who wish to access higher education. Many Presidents and senior administrators cited concrete investments in financial aid, to ensure equitable access for students with low-incomes or from low-income households. Although the demographics named are often entwined with one another, none of the respondents explicitly named or discussed the racialization of poverty, the intersections between racial identity and first generation university experience, the potential financial challenges experienced by first generation and racialized children, nor the other compounding effects of social marginalization across other dimensions of social identity. For instance, a significant number of Aboriginal students and students from low-income circumstances are, in fact, also first-generation students. Furthermore, non-Aboriginal racial and ethnic groups have different experiences in relation to poverty and racism in Canada, thereby, affecting their opportunities for access to higher education. In fact, it is notable that, across speeches and interviews, there was very little reference to access issues for non-Aboriginal racialized students of any ethnic background. It is also notable that there was a consistent trend of confounding racialized students with international students, and a consequent silence concerning equity issues facing domestic racialized students. The incorrect conflation of racialization with international status, while overlooking the intersectional nature of identity and positionality, signals a mindset of minimization which is encouraged by neoliberal discourses of denial and colour-blindness.
(ii) **Inclusive campus climates.** In the domain of establishing inclusive campus climates, there was no overlap on key themes across the speeches and interviews. In installation speeches, two relevant issues were asserted: that a diversity of learners and scholars enriches the academy and that a shared humanity exists across diversity. In interviews, the themes cited were the need to build inclusive campus environments for greater numbers of international students on campuses as well as the need to create a sense of place for Aboriginal students. It is notable that there was very little reference to any other dimensions of diversity among students, particularly domestic racialized students, for whom an inclusive campus environment is important given the number of reports by students and faculty on the experience of overt and systemic racism in universities. Furthermore, administrators did not discuss concrete strategies to counter the individual and systemic factors that contribute to institutional climates that are less than welcoming for certain campus community members. Here, again, a minimization mindset appears, which is, as mentioned previously, influenced by discourses of denial and colour-blindness.

(iii) **Globally inclusive curricula.** Themes from installation speeches and interviews, in the curriculum domain, did not directly correspond with one another. In this domain, installation speeches surfaced three broad and unspecific themes: the need to integrate learning with social responsibility and citizenship goals, the need to enhance teaching programs, and the need to internationalize the curriculum. Interviews uncovered three similar but more specific themes: the need to acknowledge that a diverse student body contributes to a richer learning experience, the need to impart cross-cultural competencies to students, and the need to promote the liberal arts. This domain overwhelmingly received the most frequent references in Presidential installation
speeches. Relative to installation speeches, interviews yielded much fewer references to developing globally inclusive curricula.

Speeches were much more explicit about the need for curriculum enhancement in the context of a global student body and demands for a global education. Presidents made strong calls for curriculum change to engage students in critical social analysis and to develop social and moral responsibility among graduates such that they may, as citizens, contribute to strong, inclusive, and just societies. As the President of Western, Amit Chakma, directly put it in his 2009 installation speech, “Let us have the courage to review our curriculum to ensure that we can meet the needs of our future citizens”. On the subject of curriculum change, there was not the same level of explicit and passionate advocacy for change expressed by senior administrators in their interviews. Interviews touched, to a very limited degree, on aspects that help to globalize the student learning experience but not specifically aspects that relate to curriculum change. For instance, there were some references to the need to include intercultural competences as a student learning outcomes; however, the aim was primarily for the purpose of equipping students to succeed in a more competitive global marketplace, rather than to become more socially responsible and global-minded citizens of the world. This focus on global competitiveness approaches the neoliberal discourse of individualization and competitiveness.

The stark difference in articulated commitment, or lack thereof, to curriculum change is worthy of examination. Presidents are titular heads of universities and, therefore, political figures. As such, the purpose and content of their Presidential installation speeches will necessarily fall within a narrow band of what is politically expected by the public, the government, and the institution. While they may be able to strongly advocate for general curriculum change in this political context, in the institutional setting they may defer to other
institutional leaders, including decentralized academic heads, to specifically take up the curriculum change agenda, to formulate and legitimize new academic programming policies, and to implement and evaluate the effectiveness and results of any curriculum change. This deference of authority is consistent with neoliberal discourses of decentralization and the concept of authority is discussed in later sections in relation to the concepts of agency and accountability.

(iv) Equity-seeking faculty and staff. In the domain of recruiting and retaining equity-seeking faculty and staff, installation speeches highlighted the need for the university to provide appropriate career opportunities, to practice fair organizational processes, to foster an engaging work environment, and to articulate equitable institutional values for its employees. Interviews highlighted the need to bridge the gender-equity gap among the professoriate and senior ranks of administration, the need to address racial inequity in recruitment of faculty, the need to establish committees to identify and advance educational equity goals, and the need to leverage the Federal Contractors Program to collect data in support of educational equity policy implementation. The frequency and specificity of the themes in installation speeches and interviews were in stark contrast with one another.

Installation speeches were relatively silent on the subject of the recruitment, engagement, and retention of talented employees generally, and equity-seeking employees specifically. However, in interviews, this domain received the most frequent and fervent references. Furthermore, in interviews, senior administrators signalled very specific thematic areas concerning equity for university employees. Interviews overwhelmingly cited the need to address the persistent gender gap in the professoriate and among the ranks of administrators. To a much lesser extent were references to addressing racial inequities in hiring practices. Interestingly, the
focus with regard to redressing any racial inequities was in reference to the selection of individuals for faculty positions. There was not the same level of conversation around the disproportionate representation of racialized individuals among the professoriate or ranks of senior administrators, as there was when discussing the gender gap. In the narratives related to equity-seeking faculty and staff, deference to decentralized units resurfaced. Senior administrators cited academic freedom and meritocracy arguments as barriers to exercising their authority to effect departmental practices. Discourses of binary polarization very clearly emerged in these narratives. Furthermore, some senior administrators suggested that the best institutional entry points for racialized and gender minority faculty are through area studies programs. Such remarks are characteristic of the discourse of balkanization.

Having summarized key findings across all four educational equity domains, in response to the question of whether and how educational equity is a policy issue in academe, I will now turn to discussing the barriers and enablers that emerged from speeches and interviews.

**Barriers and Enablers to Educational Equity Policy Implementation**

Turning to the question of perceived barriers and enablers to educational equity, senior administrator interviews yielded many more barriers and enablers than did Presidential installation speeches. In part, this may have to do with the different perceived purposes of the speeches and interviews. Installation speeches are intended to be visionary and inspirational, whereas the interviews were specifically framed to surface challenges and opportunities. However, there were some themes across barriers and enablers cited in installation speeches that did overlap with themes in barriers and enablers that emerged in interviews.
In installation speeches, two barriers were cited: (i) the need to be critical of the rhetoric of globalization and market-oriented neoliberal agendas as well as (ii) the need to come to terms with economic pressures that are placing financial constraints on public institutions. The interviews surfaced eight barriers, including: (i) challenges experienced in collecting and analyzing accurate employment demographic data; (ii) challenges perceived by virtue of a decentralized organizational environment with distributed authorities; (iii) systemic and organizational barriers to change, (iv) fiscal constraints; (v) individual denial and resistance to change; (vi) polarized ideologies and debates that position equity in conflict with meritocracy and academic freedom; (vii) a lack of diverse voices among governing and administrative bodies; and (viii) challenges presented by shifting government party politics and policies.

Installation speeches highlighted fiscal constraint as a key barrier to the university generally, while interviews highlighted fiscal constraint as a key barrier to specifically advancing equity. As well, globalization and market-oriented discourse emerged, not as a single theme but rather, throughout the entirety of the interviews in some form or other. While a few Presidents specifically used the term globalization in their cautionary remarks regarding avoiding market-driven orientations and other neoliberal rhetoric, senior administrators interview responses were steeped in neoliberal discourses in relation to philosophies on globalization, marketization, democratization, and managerialism, for example. These discourses, woven throughout narratives, manifested as neoliberal discursive barriers to educational equity policy implementation, which is discussed in further detail below. Notable, many Presidents and senior administrators were, in fact, speaking about barriers to representational diversity rather than barriers to equity. Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin (2002) explain that representational diversity is focused on numeric, compositional, or structural diversity among the academic community. In
contrast, they say, equity is focused on classroom and interactional diversity as well as the actual experiences and opportunities afforded to diverse members within the academic community (Gurin et al., 2002).

On the side of enablers, there were two highlighted in Presidential installation speeches: (i) the importance of modelling leadership attitudes and behaviours for social change as well as (ii) the importance of making financial investments to achieve equity-related social goals. Interviews highlighted six enablers: (i) a clear sense of authority, accountability and agency; (ii) an institutional ethos conducive to equity and change; (iii) campus community awareness and communication; (iv) expectations for both top down and bottom up approaches; (v) informed selection committees and hiring practices; and (vi) framing equity as integral to excellence in strategic plans. The most frequently cited enablers by senior administrators were the need for leadership skills and attitudes, clarified authority and accountability among leadership, and an organizational ethos conducive to equity and change.

The two enablers referenced in installation speeches were referenced within the narrative interviews. Throughout the interviews, senior administrators discussed the importance of individual leadership attitudes and behaviours as prerequisites for advancing educational equity. While the issue did not come up specifically in response to the question of enablers, administrators frequently returned to the notion of the importance of attitudes and skills to convey respect and understanding for diversity. In that sense, the references to modelling leadership remained in the affective/feeling and cognitive/thinking domains of learning, rather than the behavioural/doing domain of practicing lessons learned. The issue of making financial investments in equity-related fields and initiatives, referenced in speeches, was imbedded in the narratives that surfaced the theme of supporting top-down and bottom-up approaches to
advancing educational equity. Senior administrators commonly suggested that the role of senior administration is to support, if not drive, educational equity initiatives of decentralized units, through the provision of financial and other incentives.

Individual and Systemic Approaches

It is instructive to discuss barriers and enablers in terms of whether they may be primarily influenced by individual or systemic factors and/or whether they act on micro-, meso-, or macro-social levels of educational equity policy influence. At the micro-social or individual level, factors and processes play out in the intrapersonal and interpersonal domains. At the meso-social or systemic institutional level, factors and processes occur in the organizational and departmental spheres. At the macro-social or systemic social level, societal and cultural factors and processes influence the implementing of educational equity policy in the academy. The barriers and enablers that emerged from Presidential installation speeches as well as senior administrator interviews are mapped onto the micro-, meso-, and macro-social levels of policy influence in a two by three matrix depicted in Table 28. Barriers and enablers are labelled with an “S” if they emerged from speeches and with an “I” if they emerged from interviews. While there were only two more thematic barriers identified than thematic enablers in speeches and interviews, it is interesting to note that the majority of barriers cited were in the meso- and macro-social levels of influence, the institutional and social systemic levels of influence. In contrast, the enablers cited were split between the micro-social or individual level and the meso-social or institutional systemic level of influence.
Table 28  
*Matrix of Micro-, Meso- and Macro-level Barriers and Enablers to Educational Equity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Micro (Individual Factors)</th>
<th>Meso (Systemic Institutional Factors)</th>
<th>Macro (Systemic Social Factors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual leadership attitudes and behaviours (I)</td>
<td>Decentralized and collegial governance structure (I)</td>
<td>Homogenous leadership and governance bodies (I)</td>
<td>Social and political neoliberal agendas (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher education and academic systemic issues (I)</td>
<td>Institutional data collection and analysis systems (I)</td>
<td>Social and political economic constraints (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polarized discourse driven by neoliberal ideology (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shifting public political parties and agendas (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal and economic constraints (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablers</td>
<td>Individual leadership attitudes and skills (S)</td>
<td>Institutional financial investment (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus community awareness of issues (I)</td>
<td>An institutional ethos conducive to equity (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual clarity of authority, accountability, agency (I)</td>
<td>Strategically framing equity as part of excellence (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informed selection committees and hiring practices (I)</td>
<td>Institutional Top-down and bottom up approaches (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (S) denotes items from installation speeches and (I) denotes items from interviews

It appears, from the speeches and interviews reviewed in this study, that the level at which the majority of perceived barriers are working to impede educational equity policy implementation is not congruent with the level at which the majority of perceived enablers are working to facilitate educational equity policy implementation. Most barriers to educational equity named were systemic, societal, institutional, and cultural in nature, while most enablers cited were individual, intrapersonal, and interpersonal in nature. As the literature discusses the
need to undertake efforts across multi-social levels of policy influence, and senior administrators are identifying the greatest barriers at the systemic level, it may be that efforts are disproportionately being placed, knowingly or unknowingly, on efforts that may only have influence at the individual level, with little effect at the systemic level, where most needed.

That being said, several of the perceived enablers at the individual level could be viewed as necessary though insufficient precursors to systemic change. For instance, developing attitudes, knowledge, and skills of individual positional and non-positional campus leaders may lead to these institutional actors thinking and behaving in ways that may be necessary to mobilize enablers that work at the systemic level. Also, campus community awareness and education targeting individual attitudes, knowledge, and behaviours at large might have some impact on influencing change at the departmental level and, then, perhaps creating an opportunity to agitate for more widespread institutional change. As well, informed individual selection committee members, including faculty and senior administrators, can effect hiring practices at the local departmental level as can efforts made by individual administrators to champion and support top-down and bottom up initiatives that emerge at the departmental level. Most importantly, several of the enablers targeting individual attitudes, knowledge, and behaviours of senior administrators could be critical preconditions to these leaders imagining and pursuing systemic initiatives to advance educational equity. It is certainly plausible that developing individual competencies among administrative leaders could facilitate systemic change; however, this kind of individual development must be coupled with a clarified sense of positional authority, accountability, and agency.

Endorsing or enduring neoliberal discursive barriers to educational equity while at the same time neglecting the systemic spheres of policy influence can have grave impacts on the
efficacy of educational equity policy implementation. My study supports findings from related research that demonstrates that senior university leaders overwhelmingly articulate commitments to access, diversity, inclusivity, and other equity-related goals. At the same time, my findings support the literature that further demonstrates formalized strategies for achieving stated equity goals and objectives are less well articulated and systematically pursued. The literature is clear that a comprehensive and balanced multi-level approach must be considered in order to facilitate effective educational equity policy. Educational equity efforts need to be mobilized from all levels of the university, employing both individual and institutional interventions (Richer & Weir, 1995; Rowley et al., 2002; Guo & Jamal, 2007; Hurtado et al., 2012).

Rowley et al. (2002) used a multi-level conceptual framework to study the incongruence between rhetorical articulations on the one hand and policy and program implementation on the other. The multi-level framework used was underpinned by theories of organizational behaviour that support the notion that diversity in higher education is “impacted by various institutional contexts” (p. 16) and can, therefore, be analyzed across several dimensions and domains in the academy. The dimensions they identified in their model are institutional-level dimensions, which include a “historical, organizational/structural, and compositional characteristics of the institution; and individual level dimensions, which include behavioural and psychological aspects of individual university community members such as their perceptions, actions, and experiences” (p. 71). In their final analysis, Rowley et al. (2002) concluded that strong institutional commitment to diversity must transcend rhetoric in mission statements to include articulation of institutional diversity goals and priorities, core support from administrative leadership, programs and activities that evaluate and reward progress as well as the growth and diversification of the student body. All of these strategies, they say, are critically important to
attracting and retaining a more diverse faculty as well as to moving “higher education institutions from rhetoric, to self-reflection, and into action and outcomes that enable them to be leaders of social progress and realize their role in expanding the ideals of an American pluralistic democracy” (pp. 21 - 22).

According to Guo and Jamal (2007), an integrated social justice approach that attends to individual and institutional issues may prove to be the most effective way to leverage individual pre-conditions and mobilize institutional change within different spheres of influence in Canadian institutions of higher learning. With regard to mobilization of change, Guo and Jamal examined three selected models commonly used to address issues of diversity in educational settings: the intercultural, the multicultural, and the anti-racist educational models. They argue that the anti-racist model is the most inclusive framework for implementing change as it has the potential to integrate all levels and spheres of influence (personal/self, classroom, institutional, community), thereby providing a more effective approach to diversity. Richer and Weir (1995) also suggest that to build an inclusive university requires challenging “much of the daily practice of the academy” (p. 6). Combined individual and systemic approaches can work at the institutional level by influencing policy, procedures, and practices; these policies, procedures, and practices become the tools to enable the development and employment of attitudes, knowledge, and skills for behaviour change. This institutional approach will complement simultaneous work at the individual level to influence awareness and shift attitudes such that educational equity efforts are optimized.

Having surveyed the literature on the subject of processes that improve the climate for diversity in organizations, Hurtado et al. (2012) summarize four overarching themes:

The literature can be understood through four overarching themes that help improve the climate for diversity, specifically in the organizational dimension. These include (having
a clear definition of diversity that influences practice (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007), working with multiple elements of organizational culture (Williams et al. 2005), creating shared responsibility for assessing, planning and improving the climate (Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007; Kezar et al. 2008; Rankin and Reason, 2008; Williams et al. 2005), and having comprehensive evaluation and assessment systems (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007; Rankin and Reason 2008; Williams et al., 2005). (p. 63)

Hurtado et al. go on to say that all of these thematic processes are strategically located in the institutional dimension of their multi-level model, and specifically in the organizational/structural aspect of this dimension. It is at this organizational/structural level that senior administrators are “intimately involved in decision-making process that affect assessment, planning, and leading change initiatives” (p. 63).

I will now turn to discussing themes I uncovered in speeches and interviews, which related to the question of whether and how identity influences senior administrative perceptions, understanding, and practice regarding educational equity.

The Role of Identity in Educational Equity Policy Implementation

Using face and name recognition methods (Henry, Kobayashi, & Choi, 2012) as well as self-reported information, I determined that among the 15 Presidents whose installation speeches were analyzed, 4 are female and 11 are male. Among the 15 Presidents, 4 are racialized of varying ethnic and national origins, and 4 are White, also of varying ethnic and national origin. Based on self-identification, I determined that among the 10 senior administrators who participated in the study interviews, all identified as White. Among this sample of 10, seven administrators identified as male and three identified as female. With respect to the role that identity plays in influencing the perceptions and practices of senior administrations in relation to
educational equity, there were a few differences in how this issue was expressed in Presidential installation speeches as compared to senior administrator interviews.

Six diverse Presidents shared personal stories in their installation speeches to help deliver their messages on the socially transformative potential of universities. Three of the six Presidents, who used self-disclosure in their speeches, are White and male identified; two of the six, who self-disclosed, are racialized and male-identified; one who self-disclosed is racialized and female-identified. Among the six lived experiences shared in speeches, two Presidents disclosed being the first in their family to attend university. Three different Presidents disclosed belonging to a cultural group that values education but having never imagined the possibility of achieving the level and status of President in a university founded upon Western European traditions. One President disclosed academic and professional experiences as a member of the dominant cultural group in a social environment of extreme injustice and his consequent awakening to the need to use his education and privilege to work for the cause of social justice. These six Presidents shared their early personal and political experiences, which shaped their relationship with and understanding of social inequity, to animate their messages about the value of education with respect to social and economic opportunity and quality of life. These public statements certainly point to good intentions. However, whether and how these imagined intentions are realized should not be assumed or taken for granted. Whether and how senior administrators actually affect educational equity are subjects beyond the scope of this study. Furthermore, out of context and without reference to the complexity of varying social circumstances and privileges influencing individual administrators, remarks about succeeding in spite of their marginalized identities can imply and propagate a discourse of equal opportunity.
In senior administrator interviews, identity was more critically engaged in response to the pointed question posed to them. The themes discussed, in order of most to least frequently cited, include: (i) the need to be aware and open-minded; (ii) the willingness to act within their authority; (iii) the need for a nuanced understanding of equity issues; (iv) the importance of encounters with if not immersion in cultural difference; (v) the need to acknowledge power and privilege; and (vi) the importance of skill-building. The most frequently cited themes were related to the importance of being aware and open-minded as well as the being willing to act within the parameters of one’s authority. In response to the question of the role of identity in influencing educational equity, several administrators returned to the notion that emphasizing similarities or commonalities is more important that focusing on difference. These administrators felt that identity is or should be separated from attitudes and behaviours that would advance educational equity; instead, they shifted the discourse to the need to have an enabling mindset. These particular administrators articulated their perception that what one does and how they do it is more important that who they are; they felt it was more important to possess values to help guide fair hiring decisions, for example, rather that focus on their own and others’ identities. These assertions may not in and of themselves be problematic, however, intercultural development theory suggests that individuals can get stuck minimizing and trivializing difference if they focus on universal commonalities, ideals, and values at the expense of noticing how difference matters (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009), particularly in stratified social spaces that create real inequities. This mindset feeds into and is reinforced by several neoliberal discourses evident in senior administrative narratives.

Thus, the most frequently referenced theme, cited by senior administrators when discussing identity, is actually related to several discursive barriers to anti-racist and educational
equity efforts. As mentioned, the focus on being aware and open-minded was shared in the context of focusing on human commonalities rather than differences, expecting mutual respect, and adhering to principles of fairness. These values and principles hint towards universalism, which, in the intercultural literature, is consistent with what is referred to as a minimization orientation (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, 2009). Individuals in this mindset often still view difference from their own ethnocentric cultural lens and social position. This mindset is also characteristic of individuals who express discourses of colour-blindness, equal opportunity, de-contextualization, balkanization, and political correctness. These discursive practices can mask the ways that privilege factors into decision-making. A more complex understanding of difference and equity can move individuals out of a more ethnocentric worldview to a more ethno-relative worldview. Administrators did indeed highlight the need to have a nuanced understanding of diversity and equity as well as the need to acknowledge power and privilege. However, their discourse seemed to reveal a possible incongruence between the attitudes, knowledge, and skills they thought were important to have, on the one hand, and the attitudes, knowledge, and skills they actually possessed to enable educational equity, on the other hand.

This brings me to the topic of skill building, which was the theme least referenced in relation to the question about the role of identity on the perception and practice of educational equity. Administrators suggested that developing skills through day-to-day professional experiences as well as intentional formal professional development could help build capacity to advance educational equity. Relatedly, none of the administrators identified having expertise in equity-related issues. A couple of administrators referred to specific highly situated positions established in their institutions to advance equity, but none flagged the need for any level of equity-related competencies as requirements for senior administrator positions generally. As
well, none of the administrators explicitly highlighted the value of having knowledgeable and competent academics and professionals, like personnel in human rights and equity offices as well as faculty experts in equity-related areas, advising the leadership in the identification and advancement of educational equity goals. While awareness raising, education, and training of senior administrators are often among the first initiatives to be called for by campus equity proponents, and undertaken to advance equity implementation, it is noteworthy that the notion of developing skills among senior administrators was least frequently cited as an enabler by interview participants.

The themes of having a more sophisticated understanding of equity and of acknowledging power and privilege are related to a set of related enablers which I discuss under the heading of a clarified sense of authority, accountability, and agency. It seems that administrators interviewed are saying that being clear about and exercising privilege and power within their spheres of authority and agency is important. However, most of these same administrators did not definitively articulate and demonstrate how they have or might have actually exercised this authority and agency to effect educational equity. In fact, the second most frequently cited possible enabler, a clarified sense of authority, accountability, and agency seemed to be thwarted by an earlier mentioned barrier, that is, working in a decentralized collegial institutional structure. There seemed to be overwhelming reluctance to be directive in what is perceived to be decentralized collegial culture within an environment of distributed accountability. This deference of authority is accompanied by discourses of binary polarization found in speeches and narratives, particularly focused on the view of some in the academy that equity is in direct opposition to academic freedom and meritocracy.
In the next section, I will organize and discuss recommendations to advance educational equity in higher education, under headings consistent with each of Creary’s three foundational pillars for organizational change: leadership, governance, and accountability (2008). The recommendations offered are based on both the findings of this study as well as the literature on best practices for advancing and achieving educational equity in higher education.

**Recommendations**

As discussed earlier, Creary (2008) argues that three foundational pillars are essential to effectively manage organizational change to support more diverse, inclusive, and equitable organizational policies, procedures, and practices. Creary posited that the three essential pillars, which must underlie the effective formulation, implementation, and evaluation of equity policies, are leadership, governance, and accountability. She defines leadership as “the ability to influence, motivate, encourage and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of an organization”, governance as “the mechanisms and systems used to ensure that appropriate leaders are involved and established processes and policies are followed”, and accountability as “the acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility on the part of various leaders for their roles in performance management and process improvement” (p. 9). Creary offers a four-step model built on the three foundational pillars just described. This model may be used to guide administrative tasks associated with leading and managing educational equity policy.
Creary’s (2008) model starts with leaders articulating the vision that will drive the desired change. Next, she says, specific goals, objectives, and strategies need to be established. The following task is that of developing and implementing policies and programs to achieve desired strategic goals and objectives. Finally, she asserts organizations must incorporate a system of continuous monitoring, evaluation, and improvement (Creary, 2008). According to Blackmore (2006), the conditions necessary for educational equity include the political will of governing bodies, self-reflection from leaders, mobilization of resources, and strong policies. These conditions map well to Creary’s pillars. Self-reflection may be considered a leadership mindset and skillset necessary for educational equity. Political will of governing bodies is in part related to the ways individual and groups of actors make choices in the decentralized collegial governance system of the academy. Mobilization of resources and strong policies are very much related to the clear location of accountability as well as action-oriented senior leaders willing to use their authority and agency to enforce the implementation of policies, thereby strengthening the policies at the same time.

An examination of senior administrator remarks related to the concepts of leadership, governance, and accountability uncovers possible ways that educational equity policy processes may be thwarted in Canadian academe.

**Leadership Competencies (Attitudes, Knowledge, Skills) for Educational Equity**

While administrators emphasized the importance of establishing a culture or ethos that engenders initiatives that support educational equity, they expressed discouragement in what they characterized as the conservative nature of the university culture. They commented that
universities are slow to change and that culture change takes time, although they did not remark on the critical leadership competencies they might employ to help shift or reinvent the culture. It was as if the culture produced and perpetuated in the university was apart from the individuals, and particularly the leaders, that make up the university and its culture. It was also as if the community is devoid of a significant number of progressive faculty members who vocally and actively take up the cause of educational equity on a day-to-day basis. Not discussed was the cultural marginalization of these vocal and active faculty members as well as the silencing and paralyzing effects of the dominant cultural norms on progressive faculty and professionals who take up the ranks of senior administrators.

At the same time, senior administrators suggested leaders who are open-minded, self-reflective, capable of critical thinking, action-oriented, and willing to take calculated and creative risks will be more successful in facilitating educational equity. Some senior administrators listed formal and informal professional development involvements as helpful and invited such opportunities to develop competencies in the area of diversity and equity. None of the administrators interviewed described themselves as experts in the field, however, a couple of them referred to the introduction of senior positions with particular expertise and responsibility for advancing educational equity goals. Indeed, senior administrators interviewed exhibited, through their discourse, signs of varying levels of individual competency, as defined by certain attitudes, knowledge, and skills required to effectively lead and influence educational equity policy implementation. Under the pillar of leadership, I offer the following four recommendations:
**Recommendation 1: Developing senior leadership competencies.** Senior leadership should participate in opportunities to formally and informally develop competencies to lead the effective implementation of educational equity policies. Both self-directed as well as institutionally sponsored awareness-raising and skill-building initiatives, aimed at developing senior administrator competencies in equity-related areas, should be a part of a multi-level strategy to develop leadership capacity for change. That being said, efforts to develop such leadership competencies (attitudes, knowledge, and skills) in equity-related areas are **necessary but not sufficient preconditions** to advancing educational equity policy implementation.

**Recommendation 2: Developing a nuanced understanding of equity and power.** Naming and acknowledging the historical effects and systemic nature of inequities is a necessary starting point from which to begin to develop a nuanced understanding of equity issues and power relations. Senior administrators and policymakers should consider the ways that implicit discursive barriers, fuelled by prevailing neoliberal ideologies, can covertly impede anti-racist educational equity efforts in the academy. Senior leaders should be equipped to recognize barriers to advancing educational equity that emerge, covertly or overtly, from neoliberal market-oriented and hyperindividualized philosophies. They should be able to articulate counterarguments to and neutralize neoliberal debates that polarize equity and academic freedom as well as equity and excellence. Senior administrators should consult with experts in the field to help develop or to seek advice on nuanced approaches to educational equity.
**Recommendation 3: Fostering an ethos conducive to educational equity.** Senior administrators should recognize their critically important roles, individually and collectively, to foster culture shifts to effect more responsiveness to educational equity expectations.

**Recommendation 4: Diversifying senior administrative and governing bodies.** Innovative and equitable recruitment strategies should extend to the selection processes for senior administrators, members of Boards of Trustees, members of Senates, members of institutional alumni associations and councils, and any other governing bodies. Qualifications for positions on these governing bodies should include: a level of competency and/or lived-experience in the areas of diversity, inclusivity, and equity. As well, diverse marginalized voices, among faculty and staff, should be engaged in the design of a range of institutional policies.

**Governance and Governing Educational Equity in the Academy**

In my study, there was unanimous support from administrators for both top-down and bottom-up approaches that would see clear statements of values, philosophies, and commitments from the senior-most leadership as well as financial investment to support and recognize innovative bottom-up approaches championed by individuals within decentralized units across the university. It was less clear what specific strategies and tactics senior administrators had or would employ to both initiate top-down and support bottom-up efforts to advance educational equity. The decentralized collegial governance model is one nuance among many in a complex organizational institutional structure. There have been instances of success advancing discreet educational equity goals in this environment, demonstrating that it may not be the structure per
se that is the barrier but the political will and skill to navigate the structure to more systematically achieve educational equity goals.

Hardy (1996) says that organizational context is critical to the management of any type of organizational change. To understand Canadian university contexts and their sources of power to influence change, Hardy first describes several archetypes of organizational governance models – the bureaucratic, professional-bureaucratic, technocratic or rational-analytic, collegial, organized-anarchic or “garbage can”, political, as well as mixed models comprising a combination of one or more of the above mentioned “ideal” archetypical models (pp. 163 - 182). Hardy then explores the extent to which characteristics of these archetypical models are evident in actual university governance and decision-making (Hardy, 1996). She says,

The bureaucratic model focuses on efficiency and uses routines and procedures to achieve largely predictable outcomes. The technocratic model focuses on optimizing effectiveness by using defined goals, analyzing of options, selecting and resources a course of action. The political model is described as a model whereby actors attempt to influence decision-making in the pursuit of advancing or protecting their self-interests. The organized-anarchy model is described as decision-making “by default and by chance” within a constellation of complex and fluid influences and processes. The collegial model describes decision-making processes as motivated by common interests or goals, which have the potential to benefit the institution as a whole. (p. 173)

In her study of the governance models employed within Canadian universities, Hardy concludes that elements of five types of organizational governance models overlay a primarily professional-bureaucratic institutional structure. She finds that the professional-bureaucratic model is the “basic building block of universities” (p. 173); however, this model most accurately describes the university structure or formal organizational arrangement rather than how it operates. With respect to how the academy actually operates, she finds that any one or more of five governance and decision-making models – political, anarchic, collegial, bureaucratic and technocratic – may
be superimposed over the primarily bureaucratic – professional structure in the academy. Hardy summarizes the research finding on the aspects of the bureaucratic model found in universities:

[C]ertain characteristics of the bureaucratic model described by Weber were present in universities: coordination through the division of labour; standardization of activities; use of impersonal criteria; an administrative hierarchy; and formal rules and regulations (Baldrige, 1971; Blau, 1973). It was also pointed out that other bureaucratic features were absent: direct supervision of work; detailed operating rules; and a high degree of centralization (Platt and Parsons, 1968; Baldrige, 1971; Blau, 1973). Blau drew attention to the inherent contradictions between the rigidity and discipline present in a bureaucracy and the flexibility and innovation required of scholarship, and between authority based on position and authority based on expertise and knowledge. He argued that the bureaucratic and academic features coexisted in a decentralized bureaucracy. (p. 164)

Hardy (1996) says that the rhetoric of higher education assumes that universities are collegial organizations. However, Hardy demonstrates that collegiality at the discipline or professional level often overrides collegiality at the institutional level due to loyalties of individual actors to their professional group. That being said, Hardy suggests that institutional missions act to establish shared beliefs and ideologies that attempt to commit and motivate university members to collective institutional goals. She goes on to say,

To understand universities – whether overtly political or apparently collegial – we need to adopt a concept of power that includes power to achieve common goals and not only power over others (e.g., Parsons, 1967; Knight and Willmott, 1985; Clegg, 1989)…A political perspective is needed, then, which recognizes that power can be mobilized to promote common goals as well as self-interest, and to prevent conflict as well as to prevail in the face of it. In other words, power should not be conceived as simply power over another individual or group; it also comprises a capacity to achieve collaborative outcomes. The political – or perhaps we should say politic – manager adopts a political perspective that gives credence to other actors within the organization and incorporates them into the management process, instead of merely ignoring them. In this way, an understanding of power and politics helps actors to realize their initiatives, while managerialism and the unitary model provide little help in managing the politics of either conflict or collegiality, or in realizing strategic change in higher-education circles. (pp. 9 - 10)
Prior to the 1970s, most universities were described as having centralized administration and decentralized systems to deal with academic initiatives. After the great expansion of higher education in the 1960s and 1970s, Tudiver (1999) reports that the majority of universities adopted models tending towards decentralized administration. At the same time, faculty members and politically active students lobbied for greater democratic processes in the administration of universities in the mid 1960s and found themselves participating to a much larger extent in the governance of the institution (Tudiver, 1999). Tudiver discusses the roots of the collegial notions of university governance and organizational structures of accountability. He describes universities in the 1950s and 1960s:

Universities possessed an aura of shared governance marked by informal, collegial relations between faculty and administration, and academic community where professors enjoyed freedoms to carry out their work. Administrative hierarchies were relatively flat. Department heads reported to deans who had only vice-presidents and president above them. Professors were not ruled by any other chain of command, and few officials appeared to exercise much authority over them. They could do pretty much as they saw fit in the classroom, without threat of appeal from students or discipline by officials. Terms such as equity, fair procedure, due process, student rights, affirmative action, and sexual harassment were not yet part of the vocabulary. (p. 29)

Hurtado et al. (2012) describe a number of processes that are enablers to achieving educational equity in a decentralized collegial academic environment. To begin, they say institutional leaders need to establish shared commitments, goals, and responsibilities. Members across the university must share responsibility for developing and implementing equity policy and achieving its objectives. A crucial step in preparing the campus community for this shared ownership is to engage in a self-assessment exercise. Studies have shown that university Presidents who create networks of individuals to facilitate the process of achieving equity find success in achieving the goals they set out. Hurtado et al. summarize the literature on strategies
that have been found to be most helpful to senior administrators, and other institutional decision-makers, as they embark on assessing, planning, and leading change initiatives in the area of educational equity. The findings, from a variety of sources, are quite comprehensive and worthy of quoting in their entirety:

First, there must be shared responsibility throughout the college or university for diversity work in its design, implementation, and success (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007). A crucial early step in climate transformation is to prepare the campus community for shared ownership of the entire process of self-assessment (Rankin and Reason 2008). Throughout the process, leaders need to create shared understandings of the new values and processes (Kezar and Eckel 2002), and share results with the campus community (Rankin and Reason 2008). One empirical study found that nonlinear deployment strategies by presidents are particularly effective, as they create networks of individuals that facilitate the process (Kezar et al. 2008). Specific processes that have been effective for presidents include developing an internal network, hiring strategic personnel, mentoring faculty of color, developing faculty partnerships in revising curriculum, supporting student affairs staff, engaging with students, and developing networks external to the institution (Kezar et al. 2008). In addition, using a human resources frame that focuses on relationships and developing individuals was cited as the most helpful approach to transformative diversity work in that study. Additional models support a collegial approach that involves and empowers faculty to engage in the change, and that committees must include campus-wide representation and provide training for all leaders charged with disseminating the vision and implementing the diversity plan (Williams et al. 2005). Throughout change processes, campus leaders must also keep in mind the political nature of the work, effectively manage resource allocation, and acknowledge related power, interests, and conflicts that arise (Williams et al. 2005). (p. 64)

When equity is required, funded, or legislated by the government, like imperatives to reduce the educational gap for Aboriginal learners and legislation to ensure physical access and accommodation in service, employment, and housing for persons with disabilities (OHRC, n.d.), university administrators seek to comply. Without financial and legislative levers, educational equity efforts are stalled. Prioritizing educational equity is political because it involves the values and interests of various political and institutional actors.
It is posited by Hardy (1996) that the decentralized and collegial organizational structure may not be the greatest barrier to change in an academic environment, but rather the political determination and savvy to compel, if not inspire, change. Thus, it might be valuable for senior administrators to interrogate whether and how they are able to influence the actions of colleagues and community members in relation to certain priorities and not others. Administrators may benefit from exploring the interpersonal, relational, and political processes undertaken by leaders who may have had success influencing social change at the level of the decentralized unit. Furthermore, senior administrators might also investigate internal institutional levers to both incent and enforce the effective implementation of educational equity policies. It would also be helpful to develop and broadly communicate concrete ways that the university, through the provision of central resources and the requirement of institutional quality assurances, for example, supports both university-wide and departmental educational equity efforts. As well, taking an inventory of and publicizing ongoing and successful educational equity initiatives, that emerge from departments and are supported by the central administration, will serve to communicate both institutional philosophical values and practical commitments. Under the pillar of governance, I offer the following four recommendations:

**Recommendation 5: Responding to shifting public politics and policies.** Senior administrators should anticipate political changes, which may influence policy shifts, and they should mobilize, across the higher education sector, to lobby the government on issues that do not erode the achievement of educational equity goals.
**Recommendation 6: Navigating the decentralized collegial organizational structure.**

Senior administrators should leverage the decentralized collegial structure and culture by identifying central champions for educational equity to work with and support departmental champions. Performance-based and financial incentives and rewards should be introduced to motivate and recognize efforts towards achieving educational equity priorities and goals.

**Recommendation 7: Developing a data-driven multi-level strategic plan.** A multi-level university-wide strategic action plan should be developed to address the four domains of educational equity discussed in this study. Educational equity priorities identified in this action plan should be aligned with other institutional academic plans and priorities and should have actionable and measurable objectives. Data collection methods and systems should be improved in order to inform the identification of educational equity objectives and facilitate regular monitoring and evaluation of progress against goals.

**Recommendation 8: Informing selection committees.** Hiring committee members and key senior decision-makers should receive information and training on educational equity policy objectives, institutional equity gaps, recruitment strategies to surface qualified equity candidates, and approaches to assess qualifications that reduce selection bias. There also needs to be a mechanism in place to account for the application of equity-related information and processes. Efforts should be made to codify recruitment and selection policies and practices so that selection committees have a consistent set of principles and protocols to guide their thinking and decision-making.
Mobilizing Educational Equity through Accountability, Authority, and Agency

Neoliberal ideology can have counteracting effects on efforts of individual senior administrators to identify and exercise their power and agency with respect to educational equity. Wilson (2007) suggested, “the discourse of neoliberalism represents a radical inversion of the notion of ‘human agency’” (p. 97). He describes this inversion as a reconstruction of the notion of justice to fit neoliberal purposes:

But the concept of “justice” has been reconstructed to fit neoliberal political and economic objectives. This reconstruction is part of a larger discourse to reconstitute liberalism to include human conduct. The invisible hand of the market not only allocates resources but also the conduct of citizens. Economic agency is no longer just about the market allocation of resources, but the allocation of people into cultural worlds. This represents the radical inversion of the economic agent as conceived by the liberalism of Adam Smith. As agents, humans are implicated as players and partners in the market game. The context in which individuals define themselves is privatized rather than publicized; the focus of concerns is on the self rather than the collective. Power operates internally, not externally, by inducing people to aim for “self-improvement.” The effect has been to negate the “social” in issues of “justice” or “injustice.” Individual subjects are rendered responsible, shifting the responsibility for social risk (unemployment, poverty, etc.) to the individual. (p. 97)

Wilson asserts that neoliberal discourses of “self-improvement” hide the reality that racism and economic inequality are factors in and determinants of numerous issues of social justice and equity. In this way, neoliberal discourses constitute a “politics of language [which] create persuasive alternative truths about social justice” (p. 99). In the context of women academic leaders in academic institutions, Acker (2010) says,

Within these gendered (and also classed and raced) academic fields, leadership is a tricky business, especially for those whose initial habitus is not well matched to the expectations held by others….While agency means ‘the capacity to act’ it is usually described in more complicated ways, for example the ‘capacity and willingness of actors to take steps in relation to their social situation’ (Goddard, 2000, 3). In the past few decades, some theorists of ‘reflexive modernity’ have argued that with the loosing of traditional ties and
changes in the nature of work, ‘prescribed roles and identities are replaced by the imperative to self-consciously and reflexively construct one’s own identity’ (Kenway and McLeod, 2004, 526). In other words, agency is progressively detached from structure (Adkins, 2004, 192), a claim that many meet with scepticism (Skelton, 2004). (p. 135)

Extrapolating from this quote, I suggest that neoliberal ideologies influencing gendered and raced universities necessarily affect the performativity of all institutional actors depending on how they self-identify.

Discursive barriers to educational equity have the power to take over and take in subjects who become complicitous, whether intentionally or not. The process of governmentality can draw some senior administrators into docility or compliance with what are perceived to be inevitable political and global processes supported by the government of the day. Neoliberalism as a form of governmentality, therefore, can fuel a sense of futility among some senior administrators who are unclear about their authority and agency to advance educational equity within their institutions and across the higher education sector. As a result, senior administrators may fall into performing the normative role they perceive is expected of them as agents stewarding public funds in the service of the government, a significant source of funding for institutional academic and research programs. I use a dramatic performance metaphor to help illustrate how institutional agents may confine themselves to a script created by and for the benefit of socially normative expectations (Figure 7). In this example, the academy, educational equity, diversity discourse, and administrators are likened to the metaphoric setting, plot, script, and characters in a performance, respectively. In this story, the academy is the stage on which discourses of diversity and educational equity, representing various narratives, are performed by a cast of institutional actors, including scholars, academics, educators, practitioners, and
administrators, who are expected, by constructed social and institutional norms, to follow various prescribed normative scripts to maintain the status quo.

**Performance:**
The Quality (Meritocracy), Equality (Academic Freedom) vs. Equity Debate

**Act I:**
Educational Equity Performativity (People and Policies)

**Setting:**
The University as a Neoliberal Gendered and Raced Social System

**Cast of Actors:**
Scholars, Academics, Educators, Practitioners and Administrators

**Roles:**
- Protagonists or Heroes Maintaining the Status Quo:
  - Actors w/ neoliberal, social conservative, multicultural, or universalist intercultural worldviews
- Antagonists or Villains Challenging the Status Quo:
  - Actors w/ anti-racist, anti-colonial, feminist, critical, or indigenous worldviews

**Plot:**
This is a story of how discourses can be polarizing, (re) constructing discrete binaries used to rigidly describe, interpret, and evaluate characters and ideas. Driven by a hegemonic neoliberal ideology and discourse, the academy amplifies and centres the perspectives, knowledge, and behaviours (performance) of actors who approach (or are perceived to approach) dominant and normative neoliberal values, principles, and goals. Actors who deviate (or are perceived to deviate) from the hegemonic neoliberal parameters of acceptable perspectives, knowledge, and behaviours are both overtly and systematically diminished and marginalized. The academic terrain is depicted as a battlefield across which neoliberal protagonists and antagonists play out conflicting notions of what is at stake and what is to be gained in the quest for educational equity.

*Figure 7. A Performance Metaphor for Neoliberal Discourse on Educational Equity*

Depending on their social identities and positions in the academy, senior administrators may be cast into roles predetermined by social and institutional expectations. Their awareness of and agency over the scripts prescribed by social and institutional norms will depend on their critical consciousness and willingness to be active social and political agents. Each actor has to determine how much agency they have and are willing to exercise to re-write or improvise their script. There will always be consequences for exercising power; however there are consequences for not doing so as well. Each actor, in exercising their agency or not, determines the consequences with which they are willing to live and with which they expect their fellow actors
to live. As a cast of characters, a group of administrators can also exercise their collective agency to introduce storyline changes. Individual administrators may also have opportunities, depending on who they are and their level of influence, to move from an acting role to a producing or directing role, so they actually have more agency over writing and expressing the script.

Stepping out of the metaphor into the reality of the neoliberal gendered and raced academy, the questions that arise for me are whether, how, when, and in what form a movement to effect real educational equity might come, and what roles will senior administrators play in awakening and advancing such a movement for change. This is a complex question and the answers are equally complex. In interviews, I learned of a few universities that have intentionally recruited senior administrative positions tasked with developing and implementing university-wide educational equity strategies and action plans. I also heard a concrete example of how a senior administrators, not specifically mandated to address educational equity, internalized accountability for educational equity as part of their responsibilities as a senior leader. This administrator described actively exercising their authority and agency within the bounds of the collegial governance structure. This is one example of the possibility that a senior administrator can actually demonstrate success in exercising their central administrative authority and agency to influence a positive educational equity outcome at the departmental level. The senior administrator, in this example, utilized critical and creative thinking and took a calculated risk to appropriately challenge recruitment processes at the departmental level. He suggested innovative strategies and offered incentives that influenced the equitable hiring of not one racialized scholar, as planned, but in fact two qualified racialized scholars given the resolve of the administrator and the re-imagination of departmental outreach efforts. At the same time, this senior administrator effected shifts in some individual attitudes and perspectives at the departmental level.
Many senior administrators interviewed expressed reservation associated with exercising administrative power and asserting authority to ensure the mobilization of educational equity policy initiatives. This tentativeness was related to their belief that they held limited power and, therefore, authority within the decentralized collegial governance structure of the university. Consequently, senior administrators reported deferring authority to the decentralized academic units. In many cases, it was unclear who these senior administrators believed was ultimately accountable for advancing educational equity and, if deferred to the academic units, it was unclear how and from whom those in the units might derive their authority in this regard. If senior administrators believe they do not have the authority or are not accountable for advancing educational equity policies and practices within the governance structures and systems of their respective universities, they will likely not develop, recognize, and use leadership competencies and personal agency to lead and influence the design, legitimization, implementation, and evaluation of effective educational equity policies. Under the pillar of accountability, I offer the following four recommendations:

**Recommendation 9: Acknowledging accountability for educational equity.** While responsibility for educational equity appears to be diffuse, accountability must be centralized among a relatively small number of key leaders within decentralized units as well as within the senior administration. Educational equity goals have a better chance of being accomplished if accountability is clearly situated within the administration, either by delegation of accountability to an existing senior administrator or by establishing in a new senior administrative role with a specific accountability for university equity mandates. How it gets done is less important than having someone clearly accountable for the work getting done.
**Recommendation 10: Framing equity as part of excellence.** Statements of commitment to diversity, inclusivity, and equity should continue to be imbedded in institutional mission and mandate statements. Additionally, in these statements, diversity, inclusivity, and equity should be framed as part of the definition of excellence in higher education.

**Recommendation 11: Communicating and promoting educational equity commitments.**

Campus community awareness and communication should be an integral part of any strategic action plan that includes educational equity goals. Widely promoting educational equity values, objectives, and successes can work to shift cultural expectations and behaviours.

**Recommendation 12. Exercising authority and agency.** Authority and accountability for advancing educational equity should be clearly imbedded in a senior administrative position specifically tasked to advance educational equity across the university or folded under the mandate of an existing senior administrator, perhaps selected based on their demonstrated leadership attitudes, knowledge, and skills in the area. Specifically, administrators with such accountability should be to employ the ability to rationalize investments in educational equity, the ability and willingness to allocate resources appropriately, and the ability to inspire local champions to take up the cause in the interest of both their departmental and university goals.

**Conclusion and Future Research**

There is a growing body of knowledge about the barriers to achieving educational equity and critiques of institutions that have not been willing or able to develop, implement, and
evaluate comprehensive and strategic educational equity policy. At the same time, there is a growing body of literature available to guide institutions in their efforts to develop comprehensive educational equity strategies and policies. Fruitful future research might include projects that examine exemplary universities that tangibly demonstrate their commitments to educational equity, not only in their institutional discourse but also in the identification and assessment of key performance indicators across both micro and macro-social domains of policy influence. Such research would help to evaluate whether and how some institutions are able to strategize to achieve both short and long-term educational equity goals. As well, studies that are able to engage greater numbers of women and racialized administrators would be beneficial. Such studies could contribute to uncovering the varying perspectives and practices of diverse administrators in the academy.

My work has been aimed at building on and growing a body of knowledge concerned with uncovering new possibilities for more effective educational equity policy implementation in the 21st century Canadian university. Reflecting on this research, I conclude by suggesting that valuing, understanding, articulating, and supporting counter arguments to neoliberal discursive barriers to educational equity are essential affective and cognitive prerequisites that may help senior administrators mobilizing requisite behaviours to successfully lead change, govern institutional actors, and account for progress in relation to educational equity. It is my hope that this work encourages readers, as potential agents of change, to further critique their own approaches and contributions to educational equity while working within the institution, especially those who are current and aspiring administrators.
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