This article has been accepted for publication in
Educational Philosophy and Theory, published by Taylor & Francis.

Ethical Leadership Means Sharing Power: An Interview with Felicity Haynes

Liz Jackson

Felicity Haynes earned Honours degrees in English and French literature from The University of Western Australia and completed her doctorate on reason and understanding at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign through a University of Illinois fellowship. After that she worked at the State Education Department participating in the construction of a new philosophy and ethics curriculum and joined The University of Western Australia (UWA) as a Lecturer. In the course of her career, she became the first female elected Dean (for Education) at The University of Western Australia, and the first female elected President of the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia (PESA) in 1985. She founded the Association for Philosophy in Schools in 1987, and also served as National President of the Australian Institute for Art Education.

Felicity has published ground-breaking essays related to gender and education in *Educational Philosophy and Theory* in the 1980s and 1990s (e.g., Haynes, 1989; 1999), and has written more recently about curriculum (2006), trust (2018), and R.S. Peters and reasonableness (2013). Although she retired in 2003, Felicity has remained active in academic and scholarly life. Among her recent publications is an edited book, *Philosophy in Schools* (2016, Routledge).

As Immediate Past President of PESA and as a scholar with a keen interest in equity, gender, and identify issues (e.g., Jackson, 2019; Jackson & Peters, 2020), I reached out to Felicity as I was curious to learn from her experience over time. Thinking about the hurdles I have faced in my career, I was interested in knowing if she had similar challenges or experiences, and what advice she might have for others to succeed in the contexts of higher education and the field of philosophy of education.

In this interview, which was conducted through a series of emails in early 2021, I enjoyed learning from her broad view. Felicity shares in her interview a variety of challenges faced, as a woman and as a philosophical thinker, over time. She also provides an entirely unique perspective, informed by her own philosophical and life journey, and shares a great deal of practical wisdom related to how to be a leader, face challenges, and move forward as an ethical and caring actor.

The following interview has been lightly edited and reorganised with confirmation from Felicity, but it is basically published here in its entirety. I wish to thank Felicity for her generosity with her time and for her warmth and friendliness during this unique spell in our history, where we cannot meet face to face given COVID-19 restrictions and related complications, which makes an email conversation with richness and depth a special treat.

*** * * * ***

Liz: First, I would like to ask a bit about your personal background and how you became a philosopher of education. What did you want to do or be when you were growing up?

Felicity: When I was a child, I had no idea of what I wanted to be as an adult. The world was full of infinite possibilities. But I did not make friends easily; fellow students seemed to have interests in clothes, movies, boyfriends, going to parties which were of little interest to me, so I guess I retreated into the world of books. Sheer escapism. I have a twin sister who would probably be categorized as dyslexic today, but she was excellent at sport, and incredibly neat and tidy. I think we both wanted to be artists, but I would be a romantic artist, wild and world-changing, while she would be the technician working out how to be efficient. She had a successful career as a technical artist for an architect; I became a philosopher because every question begat another question, an infinite progression of chaotic possibilities.

Liz: How did you get into research in education?

Felicity: I was never interested in empirical research as such and indeed was kicked out of the science subjects at secondary level for asking why there was a selective interest in "facts" (such as needing to know the historical dates of events, without the context which made those events important). But I was fascinated by the invisible value structures which underpinned the direction of research. So, asking the questions about research in science (for instance in the new subject of philosophy of science which followed from Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, and in Karl Popper's *Objective Knowledge*) raised central questions *about* research in education.

Liz: When I decided not to become a schoolteacher but to rather do a research postgraduate and doctoral degree, my family was very sceptical. They were concerned it was a waste of money (which I did not have—I had to take out loans to complete the degrees). They also seemed concerned it would not lead to any clear career path, and would distract me from other important things, like getting married and having a family. Did you experience any kinds or similar social pressures, from family or peers?

Felicity: I think my father really wanted me to follow his career in law or politics, but law had a compulsory first year unit in philosophy, and I was hooked, deviated towards the Arts! I actually did do Honours in French and English literature rather than philosophy, but that was because I was bonded to the Education Department, and they would only allow university study in subjects which could be taught in secondary schools. (I'm not sure that my love of existentialists like Camus, de Beauvoir and Sartre, would have served me well in teaching!) However, my fiancé at the time was studying philosophy so I sat in on his lectures and was allowed to attend student seminars without official enrolment (a benefit in that I could speak my mind without worrying about a correct response). I taught myself formal logic which was fascinating for its abstract structure. One of my favourite subjects at school was Euclidean geometry in the days when it was taught. My father always considered an Arts degree, even with Honours, a waste of time which could not lead to a professional career.

Liz: Were your teachers supportive?

Felicity: At secondary school, my favourite teachers were in Visual Art and Latin, and they were supportive. Science and maths teachers dismissed me as lazy, and/or stupid, but it was really because I just lacked interest in the way they taught facts. In my adult years, I *loved* philosophy of science, formal logic, and Euclidean geometry, but because I could study them independently.

Liz: Tell me about your career trajectory.

Felicity: English Honours could have led to a career in journalism, except that I had heard stories of how cadet journalists were sent out for routine reporting, say on horse racing, and had little opportunity for creative reporting. I had no idea what I wanted to do with my life, except marry my

boyfriend whom I met in first year. I was bonded to the State Education Department and had had to apply for an extra year of training allowance when I elected to do Honours. When I informed the Head of the Teacher Training College that I was engaged to be married, he advised me not to marry formally, as there was an oversupply of teachers, and married teachers were unemployable, and he wanted me to continue in Education. When I defied him, he managed to continue to employ me in my studies as advisor to Curriculum Studies, recommending books for the English literature course. A consequence of this employment by the Education Department was that years later I was invited by the Education Department to take part in the construction of a new Philosophy and Ethics subject in the Revised Curriculum Framework exercise, even though I had little formal qualification in philosophy.

Liz: What were some of the key turning points in your career?

Felicity: When I completed my Diploma in Education, I was offered a job lecturing in English at the Kindergarten Training College, one of the few teacher training institutions that allowed married women to be students at the time. That was a real challenge to me as many of the students had no interest in my love of English literature, and I had to adapt to teaching them basic writing and communication skills. But having the same students over their four years of training allowed me to adapt to their needs, and them to adapt to mine. At this stage I was commissioned to write a text for tertiary students at the West Australian Institute of Technology (now Curtin University) in critical thinking, which included chapters on definitions, ethics, formal logic, rules of composition. I adapted this draft *Logic and Language in Education* for a self-published book, *The Art of Argument,* which was used as a text for primary trainee teachers at Edith Cowan University.

Liz: How did you discover philosophy of education? And PESA?

Felicity: The Head of Education in the 1970s Bert Priest had "discovered" philosophy while in the Navy in World War 2 and as a New Zealander happened to be present when Karl Popper visited New Zealand (in the early 60s?). Philosophy of education had just started in the London Institute in the United Kingdom under R.S. Peters and in Harvard in the United States under Israel Scheffler. Bert had visited the London Institute and invited Bill Taylor to visit UWA on his study leave. So UWA probably was a leader in Australian universities in philosophy of education. There had been an opportune increase in the number of teacher trainees at UWA at the time, and the department was able to employ three philosophers of education at Senior Tutor level. Bert let me choose my own topic for the required Honours thesis, and because conceptual analysis was then in fashion, I chose to write a conceptual analysis of Alan Montefiore's simplistic assumption of truth. There were problems finding examiners for the thesis, but it won me a university prize and the offer of a tutorship in the new area of philosophy of education.

PESA was in its infancy, with an eclectic membership and there was open conflict between various factions, one of the more memorable being when Jim Walker, of a Marxist or at least social science persuasion, stormed out of a keynote being delivered by a traditional Catholic speaker Brian Crittenden. Evers and Lakomski in a conference in Christchurch, New Zealand, offered an inflammatory attack on The London School – the term Malet St Mafia was a term of derision for the conceptual analysts.

Liz: What was it like? Did you feel like you belonged?

Felicity: The debate was usually pretty rational, and "schools" were pretty inchoate, so I enjoyed the interchanges. The only "school" with which I identified was the existentialists, possibly because of my reading of the existentialists like Camus and Sartre in French literature. But the only other

Australian existentialist was Donald Vandenberg who was either ignored or ridiculed in PESA Conference. (Perhaps Marjorie O'Loughlin, but you can ask her about that!)

Liz: What were the important initial influences on your thinking?

Felicity: My mentor was Bert Priest, unqualified academically, who met Peters in New Zealand, and Popper, and had read philosophy on a naval warship entering Tokyo in World War 2. I think he was only the second person to create philosophy of education in an Australian university, and he expanded it till at one stage in a department of only 17 staff we had five philosophers of education. He did not follow a particular school, though mostly influenced by Popper, the analytic school and Gandhi, but at one stage he made philosophy one of the four compulsory units for graduate trainee teachers. The major influence on *my thinking* was probably Wittgenstein, whom Bert Priest could not understand, but I thought *Philosophical Investigations* was the most exciting thing I had read. I'd start my lectures by writing on the board "This sentence makes sense." I'd then ask the class if they agreed, and then ask, as Ludwig does, "What sense?", opening the door to making the distinction between syntactic/structural and semantic /scientific sense.

Liz: How did you adapt, or move on, or reject those ideas or those theorists, as your thinking developed?

Felicity: Priest allowed me to develop a Masters unit called evolutionary epistemology, because Popper had used the term. But I used Stephen Toulmin's work more and wanted the students to think more deeply about what we treat as "true statements", and trainee teachers could encourage their students to question their own assumptions about truth. The distinction between semantic and syntactic sense became less important. This led not only to discussion in class about social construction of knowledge (influenced by James Walker) but cultural influence on social acceptance, the rise of empiricism, the "culture" of grants and funding of universities. My rejection of the narrowness of empiricism led me to promote an understanding of aesthetics and even a new Masters course on aesthetic understanding. There was an historical moment at UWA when at Academic Board (I was one of two non-professorial elected members) Michael Scriven tried to remove Art from the list of matriculation subjects. I argued that aesthetics, or the valuing of holistic and practical knowing, informed most scientific knowledge, that there was a high correlation between matriculation results in Art not only in music but in engineering, and cited as evidence Robert McKim's compulsory and successful engineering courses in imagination. I had to rely on scientific evidence as well as reasoned argument to win the point, and it felt good.

Liz: How has your experience of PESA, and the organisation itself, changed over time?

Felicity: Well, PESA itself has evolved so my experience of it has too. The Australasian Association of Philosophy (AAP) considered PESA not sufficiently established as a discipline so ignored it, apart from some joint members of PESA and AAP like Jeff Malpas, from Murdoch, until the mid-1980s (I think), when they included a section on philosophy of education for the first time. PESA was generally concerned with philosophy at the tertiary level only, and I am proud to have been one of the few who encouraged the introduction of philosophy as a subject in schools, especially using the work of Matthew Lipman in the states. In the eighties, I was commissioned to write a curriculum for philosophy at secondary level for the Education Department in Canberra by a member of SOPHIA (the Society of Philosophers in America), who had not heard of PESA. I do not know whether the curriculum was ever implemented.

Liz: You have achieved many "firsts". You were the first woman President of PESA and in the same period (the 1980s) you were the first woman Dean of Education at The University of Western Australia. What do you think it means to be the first woman to achieve these things?

Felicity: When I was elected President of PESA it was at the Annual General Meeting of a small PESA conference with the executive sitting around a wood fire, and I was knitting a jumper for one of my children. My ex-husband was also nominated and there was considerable debate as to who would make the better President, but in fact I do not think gender even entered the debate. The vote was close. At a recent PESA conference we were honoured to have the keynote lecture named after us, but there was considerable debate as to who should go first in the naming B. T. Haynes and F.A. Haynes, or F.A Haynes and B.T Haynes Lecture. Fortunately, gender made no difference, and it is now the Haynes's Lecture. I do not think my being female made any difference in PESA. (Though my promotion at UWA was entirely a different matter, and I was more proud of that, especially when the new Vice Chancellor appointed me Chair of the Committee of Deans as the only female Dean on the Committee, where I was also the only non-professor, apart from the Dean of Economics, who was gay. The month after I retired, Senior Lecturers were automatically promoted to Associate Professors, whereas previously they had had to apply to an external Committee, but as I was still at Senior Tutor level, I was beyond consideration).

Liz: What barriers did you have to tackle debate to enter these roles and succeed within them?

Felicity: Absolutely no problem in PESA. On my election to the Professorial Board at UWA and consequent appointment to Academic Council there were only three women in a membership of 70. (It was common for a male professor to follow a speech of mine by reiterating my points as if they were his, and I learned to retort that I was grateful to the honourable professor for reminding Council of the point that I had made only three minutes ago.) Friday afternoons had a ritual informal gathering for drinks at University House of all Heads of Departments, but I could rarely attend, having to pick up our three children from school. Apparently at one of these meetings the Head of the Classics Department declared that I could only have been appointed Chair of the Committee of Deans because I was sleeping with the young and handsome Vice Chancellor. The problem was how to deal with this rumour? I chose to ignore it. There was bullying by some male members of my faculty when they decided to move trifling amendment after amendment to a motion when I was Chairing the meeting. None of the other faculty members spoke up though I know they were aware of the tactics. So I required the two to leave the meeting. Several weeks later, they were expelled without notice or severance pay by the Deputy Vice Chancellor, apparently for circulating an anonymous gossiping letter about our female Vice Chancellor Fay Gale. I did not inform him of the faculty incident, but I think he knew.

At another time I applied for promotion to Associate Professor, but the same DVC, who had worked with me on several academic committees, phoned and advised me to withdraw my application before it reached the Selection Committee as the compulsory reference from the Head of Department, details of which he could not reveal, would be damaging to my reputation. I stormed into the Head of Department and demanded to know what he had to gain by writing such an untrue and unfair reference, and he said he had not written it, but had been advised on its contents by a previous Head of Department, whose statistical research I had criticized in a philosophy of science seminar for its bias in the choice of subjects. This statistical Head had been appointed to a Chair at a Victorian university several years ago but was still clearly exercising some political control over the department. I was planning to write a critical review of gender bias in his statistical research but decided that that was too personal an approach and refrained. One of my earliest "victories" on appointment to staff in 1978 was to criticize another academic at a staff seminar for flawed research methods in his Special Education research, so that there was some continuing antagonism between psychologists and those philosophers who queried the "impartiality" of statistical research.

Liz: What major things happened in PESA while you played a leadership role?

Felicity: I can't remember any particular changes. The increasing numbers in philosophy of education led to increased variability in approaches. I remember a Queensland conference where an existentialist philosopher was savagely criticized by the more empirical philosophers, and there tended to be a separation into discrete ideological groups, so that Marjorie and myself tended to be classified as existential feminists, whatever that means, but I regarded myself more as a social philosopher than an existentialist, interested in the social values embedded both in literature and philosophy. It was interesting to me that Gabrielle Lakomski was not considered a feminist, perhaps because she published in collaboration with her colleague Colin Evers. She was highly competent and intelligent.

Liz: We often discuss now that women face different challenges than men in academic work, to be "kind" and not "bossy"; to do more service and administration rather than to focus on research, leadership, and broader visions; to be more sociable but not aggressive. Were these sorts of things challenges for you in your career?

Felicity: I was lucky to have Paige Porter as my Executive Dean at the next level of hierarchy, a female Vice Chancellor, a female indigenous Equity Officer, and a female Union Officer. It seemed a time of change, but unfortunately it did not last. I was concerned that there was still a male hierarchy of power in the department, so tried to construct a more level platform of power, dividing departmental meetings into three committees—academic research, research supervision, and practical teaching, each appointing their own chairs, though I attended each monthly meeting. Those Chairs would then report to a Management Committee chaired by myself which could vote and act on recommendations generated from those discrete meetings. Staff could nominate which committee they wished to be on, but they had to be on two of the three. I believe this system was democratic and fair, but as soon as I left on a year's study leave, the new (male) Head of Department abolished the lot and took back control of all staff meetings. I used to lead Masters' seminars on the difference between power and strength, particularly in relation to the power of teachers in the classroom, but the distinction (from Eco) was not understood by the men in the department.

I did try to feminize the department a bit. I put up works of art (my own and part of the UWA Art collection) on the corridor walls and bought fresh flowers for the admin desk each Monday morning). I think the female general staff appreciated this, but it was regarded with some disdain by male academic staff who rarely attended. I organized a weekly soup kitchen in the staff common room for postgrad students to discuss their own research, where I brought two large pots of soup, but people could bring a plate if they wished. I think it was more of a social gathering than an intellectual exchange of ideas.

Liz: What achievements or attitudes toward work and life are you proud of, looking back?

Felicity: I really think I did achieve the idea of a community of scholars working towards shared ideals while I was head. Ethics underpinned it, but most of the boys thought it undermined their natural authority and resisted it. I was elected Dean before the university structures were reformed and it was still a departmental matter, and one of the contenders for the job approached me before the election to ask me to stand down as he thought he had the numbers. My reply was that if he had the numbers, he had nothing to fear from an election, and he was surprised by the strength of the support for me.

Liz: Did you face challenges "to have it all"? Or did you have to make hard choices and sacrifices?

Felicity: I was trying, as Marilyn French suggests, to move beyond power, or at least give women with lower academic status more participation in the decision-making. But I did discover that many of them saw that power as a bit of a burden. Most of them had higher workloads with tutorials and supervision, and saw admin as taking valuable time away from their scarce time for research needed for promotion. Personal sacrifices were considerable, especially for a single mum with three dependent children still at school. Missing that Friday afternoon convivial meeting of Deans is a good example. Having most postgraduate lecturing done from 4-6 pm after school time to cater for teachers doing part-time studies was detrimental to my time to be with my kids after school. Bonus was that they often learnt to prepare the evening meal without my help.

Liz: You have conducted research in philosophy of education, gender studies (including a monograph) and other areas. Your work on gender in philosophy of education was novel for its time, and much of your research has pushed boundaries in this area. Were you pressured to go into gender/women's studies or feminist theory? Was it an early interest? Were these areas taken seriously by your peers at the time?

Felicity: I had never considered myself a feminist, and indeed by somewhat horrified by the aggressive anti-male feminism I encountered in America in the early seventies. The greatest influence on my feminism was the book by Carol Gilligan *In a Different Voice*, which used the metaphor of males and females forming a composite and harmonious view of the world. I attended a lecture at Harvard University in which Howard Gardner was speaking alongside Carol Gilligan and his assumption of authority strikingly exemplified her binary ethical system. It is only now I am away from any need to exercise power that I recognize that part of my "feminism" arises from my own need for autonomy from a rather controlling father. But perhaps I can exercise that by writing my memoirs one day. I do not see myself as a feminist, but someone who recognizes and desires respect for difference, as a way of increasing choices about ways of being in the world. (A similar argument could be given for studying different languages and cultures in order to give any person more choices in forming their own identity.)

Liz: What would you say is the major characteristic of your own work?

Felicity: Oh, holistic and creative in general. I completed Honours in Literature and have always loved those literary works which challenge conventional thinking through satire or irony or create new possibilities of seeing the world otherwise! Arthur Koestler (The Act of Creation) was another of my heroes, despite my disagreement with his politics. So it could be novels or science fiction, or even better poetry which had to be so concise in form that it challenged the reader to use imagination to fill in the gaps of sequential logic or prose. This makes writing academic papers difficult, but I respect the concomitant need for rational structure.

Liz: How would you like to think your work will be used in the future?

I think it will be largely forgotten. *The Art of Argument* was used as an introductory course at two WA Teachers Colleges in preference to critical thinking or informal logic courses and I still have many unsold copies. I do not think my gender had much to do with that. The fact that arts were considered less important than science, even less than sociology, makes it play a less important place in one's academic career. I think as National President of the Australian Institute for Art Education, I had some influence in shifting the emphasis toward epistemology and away from empirical research in the arts. In 1989 (I think) Paul Getty funded fares and attendance to an international conference for the Arts and Education in Boschenhoofdt in Holland, and Howard Gardner was the keynote attraction. There in a keynote, I revealed the contradiction between his denial of mind and his assumption that creativity was a chance neural chance event. As a non-professorial female, I am not sure how that was received, but in the conference proceedings my

paper was given precedence over Gardner's. At an international arts education conference in Darwin in 1991(?) the National Curriculum was being revised to focus on consistent measurable outcomes; I gained some notoriety by waving an inflatable dinosaur and saying that any adaptation to new demands had to maintain the unique identity which allowed both tradition and innovation in arts education. I hope that my work will be used to challenge the easy assumptions that scientific researchers tend to make and allow us to value creative works of the imagination which could inspire changes in a materialistic scientific view of what is real.

Liz: In your view, what obstacles that women face have been resolved (if any!) and what are the most important problems do you think that remain and how might they be addressed?

Felicity: It would seem that the old obstacles still remain, those of juggling the needs of colleagues, other professionals, and children, to say nothing of meeting the needs of one's spouse. While we were students, it was assumed that if my husband wanted to attend an out-of-state conference, I would stay at home and mind the children. If I wanted to go, even if delivering a paper, I had to arrange for someone else to mind our three kids, and still at least organise meals, housecleaning for the family. It amazes me that I did it, though. It was still the seventies, no family to help, and though speeches were being made about equality for women, the contest between home duties and academic success for women was still a problem. There is more attention now given to child care within academic institutions so the issue of dropping kids off to a child care centre by Dad *or* Mum in time for the 8:30am lecture has been resolved, but the issue of having to collect the kids from school at 3:45 on a Friday afternoon when I was Heads of Department meant that I was unable to attend the regular totally male drinking session at University House for Heads of Departments, where most of the important politicking was done. Academic Council had 17 members, only two of whom were female. One was the professor of sociology, a very butch lesbian, and the other was me, in the position of Senior Tutor and therefore one of the three elected members. My memory is of me making what I took to be a logical argument, to be met with silence and a male professor making exactly the same point later without acknowledgement, and being listened to.

Liz: To wrap up, I am thinking about if there are any special messages you would like to convey to readers of this interview, young scholars in the field, or if there are other parting words of wisdom or other thing you wished I had asked.

Felicity: My university has inscribed on its walls the motto from Socrates Seek wisdom. But wisdom of course presumes both knowledge and experience. I want women to be aware of the limits placed on their possibilities and discover the strength to be able to overcome those limits. Probably read Marilyn French's book *Beyond Power*, or Carol Gilligan *In a Different Voice*. But probably the greatest influence on my way of living has been Martin Buber, and his I-Thou relation. It is a matter of not treating others as a means to an end, but existing in dialogic relation with them, even in the teacher-student relation, and even when in conflict with those in power. My writing has usually been to this end. I guess it is the basic ethical principle of equity – do unto others as you would they should do unto you.

Liz: What advice do you have for colleagues in philosophy of education today?

Felicity: The encounter with the Other occurs often and more safely through the reading of literature as much as through personal relationships. The reading of philosophy operates at a higher level of intellect and is rewarding at that level, but the reading of literature, as F.R. Leavis said last century leads to a wider understanding of what it means to be a better human. Teaching is not just the teaching of subject matter, but a way of teaching to become human.

Liz: What does leadership mean to you? Do you think everyone should try to become a leader?

Felicity: I really don't think you can try to be a leader. When I was at school, I thought I had been elected to be House Captain and was proud of my leadership capacity, even surprised at my apparent popularity. But I found out years later that the students had actually elected another person, strong in athletics and the teachers thought that the person who they elected could not cope with the additional responsibility and her studies, so distorted the results. But I think I did make a good leader, and a good Head of Department who tried to lead by example rather than domination. My grandfather was a bishop and a headmaster of a private boys' school, and not popular in the Synod because he spoke his own mind fearlessly. But his biggest lesson to me is that leadership is more about example than power. Ethical leadership means sharing power rather than just using it.

Liz: Is there anything else you would like to comment on now?

Felicity: Thanks for this opportunity to think things through. It has taken longer to reply because the internet on the farm has been down, so that has been an excuse to get on with making fig jam and housework rather than finish this. But the technicians are coming out today, so the longer time has been an opportunity to reflect on and revise what I have written. Good luck with the edition!!!

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Michael Peters, Nesta Devine, and Cathy Legg for discussion and feedback during the process of conducting this interview.

References

Felicity Haynes (2018) Trust and the community of inquiry, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 50:2, 144-151, DOI: 10.1080/00131857.2016.1144169

Felicity Haynes (Ed.) (2016) *Philosophy in Schools*. London: Routledge.

Felicity Haynes (2013) R. S. Peters: The reasonableness of ethics, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 45:2, 142-152, DOI: 10.1080/00131857.2012.752984

Felicity Haynes (2006) Sublime Heterogeneities in Curriculum Frameworks, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38:6, 769-786, DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2006.00230.x

Felicity Haynes (1999) More Sexes Please?, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 31:2, 189-203, DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.1999.tb00384.x

Felicity Haynes (1989) On equitable cake-cutting, or: caring more about caring, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 21:2, 12-22, DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.1989.tb00165.x

Liz Jackson (2019) The smiling philosopher: Emotional labor, gender, and harassment in conference spaces, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 51:7, 693-701, DOI: 10.1080/00131857.2017.1343112

Liz Jackson & Michael A. Peters (2020). *From 'Aggressive Masculinity' to 'Rape Culture' An Educational Philosophy and Theory Gender and Sexualities Reader, Volume V*'. London: Routledge.