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Abstract
While organizational theory is a helpful analytical framework for educational leadership, it has a key depth problem—the absence of feminist voices. Some scholars have responded to this problem by gendering organizational theory. This scholarship offers an important, albeit still seldom used, reference for educational leadership. Teasing gendered organizational theories apart through three distinct feminist lenses (liberal, radical, and postmodern) offers nuanced practical possibilities for school leadership. As a call to praxis, this paper proposes a new framework for equitable, hope-based decision making in schools. This model uses gendered organizational theory to imagine more equitable schools and districts.
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Background
School districts are complex organizations, composed of many organizational units joined by a common vision of student support and achievement (Bolman & Deal, 2010). Organizational theory—the study of the structures, behaviors, and motivations of collective members—is particularly helpful for understanding these complex systems within education (Bolman & Deal, 2010). However, there is a fundamental depth problem within organizational theory. Until recently, women’s voices in general and feminist voices in particular were virtually absent from the scholarship on organizational theory. Tancred-Sheriff and Campbell (1992) called it the “pervasive maleness in the field. The male fact exists in a double sense: Men have produced a
body of organizational theory and...men are assumed to be the primary objects of study” (p. 31). Beginning in the 1990s, following closely on the rise of third wave feminism, a cadre of scholars began what they called gendering organizational theory to address this issue (see especially: Acker, 1990; Calás & Smirich, 1992; Mills, 1992; Mills & Tancred, 1992; and Tancred-Sheriff & Campbell, 1992).

While gendered organizational theorists offer powerful insights, their theories are still seen as outside or auxiliary to organizational theory proper; therefore, the instruction of organizational theory in graduate programs including educational leadership continues to be taught from a male-dominated framework (Burnier, 2003). Recognizing that “gender is a crucial, yet neglected aspect of organizational analysis” the following paper highlights the contributions and possibilities of feminist organizational theory (Mills, 1992, p. 93). Inherent in the work of gendering organizational theory is a commitment to hope or imagination—the ability to think beyond how organizations are to how they might be. This radical hope is essential in building a framework for more equitable educational leadership in schools and districts.

This paper is organized to parallel my own sensemaking about gendered organizational theory. The following section gives an overview of the theory. Subsequent sections complicate and add nuance to understanding multiple perspectives within gendered organizational theory. I came to the academy with a working knowledge of feminist theory and frameworks. I use this background to remap or re-read the gendered organizational scholarship through three feminist lenses: liberal, radical, and postmodern. After setting up this theoretical foundation, I discuss how educational leaders can move from understanding theory to applying it to schools. This work builds toward an early conceptual framework for centering radical hope in schools.

Gendered Organization Theory, an Overview

Gendered organizational theory makes gender bias, discrimination and privilege more visible within organizations. This work is also necessary in the school equity movement. Feminist organizational theory, like feminism, is not only a theory for or about women (hooks, 2000). Creating equitable opportunities and conditions for all people to survive and thrive is central to the feminist agenda (hooks, 2000). Feminist organizational theory explores the ways gender impacts all relationships and behavior within organizations. Mills and Tancred (1992) write, “A gendered analysis of organizations includes both women and men and places gender at the center of the explanatory framework” (p. 8). Feminist scholars contend that this work benefits all members of organizations.

Gendered organizational theory is built on three key assumptions about gender and gender relations, each of these have important implications for equity work in schools. These assumptions and implications are briefly summarized in table 1.

Gendered organizational theory developed alongside and in some cases in collab-
oration with third-wave feminism. Third wave feminism popularized in the 1980s and beyond, considers micro and macro aggressions, multiple/intersecting identities and the power dynamics inherent in the social constructions of gender in a media saturated culture (Mack-Canty, 2004). Using intersectionality, the third wave ideology espouses a commitment to make room for a broader range of identities within the feminist dialogue, particularly, LBGTQ voices, women of color voices, and men (Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000).

Intersectionality is a structural analysis and critique of the systems of social inequalities (Collins, 2000; Granka, 2014). In particular, Collins’ (2000) work illustrates the way these identities function as a matrix of oppression causing patterned experiences of advantage and disadvantage. The role of identity, the privileging of multiple voices, and the importance of micro and macro aggressions are all issues central to gendered organizational theory and equity work in schools.

**Liberal, Radical, and Postmodern Theories**

Teasing gendered organizational theories apart through three distinct feminist lenses (liberal, radical, and postmodern) offers nuanced practical possibilities for school leadership (Acker, 1990; Crow, 2000; Halberstam, 1991). Within the gendered organizational theory literature, very few scholars identify specifically with a liberal, radical, or postmodern frame. Instead the gendered organizational theory literature presupposes a general feminist perspective. In many ways this oversimplifies the feminist influence on gendered organizational theory. Therefore, I am reorganizing the literature around gendered organizational theory to better ground educational leaders with a more complex reading of the feminist influences that contribute to gendered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender is a social construct.</td>
<td>Gender is patterned and socially produced. In U.S. culture, gender continues to be understood primarily in limiting binary distinctions between men and women (Acker, 1990, 2006; Duerst-Lahti &amp; Kelly, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered differences in patriarchal societies—including the United States—disempower women (Acker, 1990).</td>
<td>Discrimination is often built into the organizational structure, as in the glass ceiling (Cotter et al. 2001; Bell et al. 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism, gender discrimination, and gender bias in organizations is not always overt (Acker, 1990, 2006).</td>
<td>Processes of discrimination are often—and increasingly—covert, as in a subtle dialogue between a manager and his women colleagues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizational theory. Briefly, the liberal feminist framework examines issues of access and aims to mobilize legislative change (Acker, 1990; Crotty, 2013). Radical feminism explores the “monopolization of knowledge and culture” by the dominant patriarchal group (Acker, 1990, p. 419; Crotty, 2013). Postmodern feminism deconstructs truths, knowledge, and discourses as well as the ways identities are socially constructed.

**Liberal Feminist Organizational Theory**

Liberal feminism is a theoretical frame that grew out of the early tradition of liberalism (see Mill & Taylor as early as 1870). Liberal feminism offers a theoretical bridge across the three historical feminist waves in the U.S. (Donner, 1993). Central tenets of the framework include a commitment to equal opportunity, access, individual rights, liberty, and legislative equity (Donner, 1993; Wendell, 1987). Liberal feminists demand

...an end to de facto discrimination on the basis of sex,' enlisting the State in attaining that goal. Liberal feminists have the traditional liberal beliefs in the power of education as a means of social reform and its importance to human fulfillment. (Wendell, 1987, p. 66)

In 1989 at the Academy of Management meetings in Washington D.C. Marta Calás and Linda Smirchich presented a paper on the social consequences of organizational research. In their chapter Calás and Smirchich (1992) link the women’s management literature to liberal feminism, citing legislative victories for women in organization including sexual harassment policies, civil rights, and affirmative action as important feminist management trends. Ultimately, Calás and Smirchich argue for a more fundamental shift in management literature, which I will explore in the section on postmodern feminism. In their most recent edition, Bolman and Deal (2013) included gender in their discussion of the human resource frame. The human resource frame, which explores the interpersonal relationships in organization has the potential to be a springboard from “traditional” organization theory to a more critical or feminist framework.

Liberal feminism focuses on organizational morals and advocates a feminist ethic of care (Donner, 1993). An important distinction between liberal and radical feminist frameworks is the epistemological hope placed in organizations for potential healing and repair. While radical feminists posit that existing orders must be completely deconstructed (see below), liberal feminists, “assume that inequity is a consequence of ignorance or prejudice and thus something that gradually can be modified through enlightened educational programs and corrective policies such as affirmative action” (Thompson, 2003, p. 14).

Tancred-Sherrif and Campbell (1992) offer a liberal feminist hope that women will gradually begin to fill more roles in organizations, including leadership roles (e.g. principal and superintendent), which will in turn shift organizational perspectives and policies to those that are more inclusive and equitable. Adding women to existing structures through access and inclusive policies is a hallmark of liberal feminism. However, many theorists, even Tancred-Sherrif and Campbell (1992) admit that
adding women to existing organizations is a more retroactive (e.g. responding to a system that is not working) than proactive (e.g. creating a whole new system) approach to challenging oppression. It is for this reason, that radical feminism proposes a different approach for creating organizational change.

Radical Feminist Organizational Theory

Radical feminism, popularized in the late 1960s and 1970s posits that sexism—the oppression of women—is the oldest or root oppression (Crow, 2000; Morgan, 1977). Morgan (1977) writes,

*I believe that sexism is the root oppression, the one which until and unless we uproot it, will continue to put forth branches of racism, class, hatred, ageism, competition, ecological disaster, and economic exploitation.* (p. 9)

Radical ideology suggests that systems of power and oppression are so deeply ingrained in organizations that they must be completely deconstructed. In Lorde’s seminal speech she asserted that “the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house” (Lorde, 1979). There are many consequences of sexism as the root oppression, two directly relevant to organizations, including schools and districts: first, that all women—and by proxy most men, in their varied relationships to women—are impacted by sexism and second, that sexist oppression is often covert and normalized. Dixon (2000) writes, “All women suffer from economic exploitation, from psychological deprivation, and from exploitive sexuality” (Dixon, 2000, p. 73). Given this, radical organizational theorists propose new organizational structures that focus on gender equity. These structures must be new, not revisions because “the inferior position of women is of such long tradition that it has remained unquestioned even by radical thinkers” (Ware, 2000, p. 101). Radical feminism is deeply associated with the work of black feminists and lesbian feminists to disrupt not only patriarchy but also the homogenous, white rhetoric of second wave feminism (see especially, Cornwall, 2000; hooks, 2000; Lorde, 1979; Rich, 1980).

As an organizational framework, radical feminists support deconstructing existing hierarchies and organizational systems to create new organizations that place gender equity at the center of the organizational model. Joan Acker, a seminal gendered organizational theorist and Donald Van Houten (1992) contend that there is an inherent “sex power differential” within current organizations characterized by “a hierarchical ordering of jobs...as a result males generally have more power than females” (p. 16). Analogous with the radical feminist assertion that organizations need to be completely reconstructed in order to advance equity, Gibson Burrell (1984) argues for organizational desexualization. Burrell contends that, "there is no doubt that patriarchy and power are present in cross-gender interactions but this does not mean that it is impossible for the sexes to co-operate in the face of common problems" (p. 101).

The process of organizational desexualization requires reconstructing morality, ra-
tionality, and employee demands (Burrell, 1984). Albert Mills (1992) calls for a similar radical restructuring of organizations. He advocates “a woman-centered approach...as an alternative to existing, functionalist and interpretive, accounts of organizational culture” (p. 93). Radical gendered organizational theorists (such as those in this section) highlight the imbalance of power among men and women in patriarchal organizations. They support organized resistance to oppression, and call for new organizational structures that place gender equity in the center of their frameworks.

Postmodern Feminist Organizational Theory

Postmodern theorists explore a fluid perception of space/time, and truths (Halberstam, 1991). Postmodernism is “a way of seeing the human subject as decentered, polymorphous, and indeterminate” (Johnson, 1992, p. 1976). Postmodern feminist theory is differentiated from other theoretical traditions by its insistence that all social constructs can—and should—be contested and examined. Not only are gender, race, and human identities social constructs, within a postmodern feminist framework, language is also a pivotal social construct (Ebert, 1991; Johnson, 1992). These multi-layered understandings complicate and problematize all levels of organization and organizational analysis. Consider:

If we cannot define the word “woman,” how can we speak of “women’s oppression?” How can women be liberated or empowered if there is uncertainty about what the word "woman" means? Is the problem with particular definitions of "woman" or with the very attempt to define "woman" at all? Is there any definition that fits all women? Is it not precisely the ways in which the word "woman" has been restrictively defined by the patriarchy that have been oppressive? (Johnson, 1992, p. 1080)

Ebbert (1991) posits that theorists must employ resistance postmodernism to tackle these complex lines of questioning. Resistance postmodernism “views the relation between word and world, language and social reality or, in short, ‘difference,’ not as the result of textuality but as the effect of social struggles” (Ebert, 1991, p.887). Language is neither neutral nor natural; instead it is a construct of privilege and power. Postmodernism employs an intellectual uncertainty with status quo methods for interpreting human experience and organization (Flax, 1987; Halberstam, 1991).

Utilizing the critical and socially constructed framework for discourse, Hearn and Parkin (1992) analyzed major organizational theories for their perspectives on gender. In doing so, they found organizational theory marred by the absence of gendered and feminist discourse. Further, the few theorists who did address gender, tended to do so in a way that normalized patriarchy. Hearn and Parkin (1992) concluded, “the very way in which the idea of ‘organization’ is thought about in our everyday lives...leads to the conclusion that dominant notions of ‘organization’ are themselves pa-
triarchal” (pgs. 63-64). Sheppard (1992) studied women’s experiences within organizations in two qualitative studies, one with interviews with women managers in Canada and another with dual-career families. She found accepted definitions of organizations inadequate at capturing her participants’ feelings of isolation, the complex ways power played out within organizational life, and women’s experiences with work inside and outside of formal organizations (Sheppard, 1992). The inside/outside unequal division of labor was explored in length by (Hochschild, 2003) in her seminal book *The Second Shift* which explored the lived experiences of working women whose first shift happens in formal organizations and who then serve a second shift in the home. Calás and Smircich (1992) apply postmodern feminist views to organizational analysis in their call for organizational leaders to imagine new structures, discourse, and knowledge. Guiding questions for this analysis include:

What are women’s ways of ‘committing’? What shapes would ‘organizations’ take if they were based on a morality of care (‘committing’ to people) rather than a morality of rights (‘committing’ to rules)? Is it possible to conceive of other types of relationships between personas and organizations that do not have the necessary accomplice of immorality?...The work is never done: you have to keep on questioning who can be as you are today. (Calás & Smircich, 1992, p. 230-232)

Bearing these questions in mind, I turn to how gendered organizational theory can be applied to schools and districts. The practical suggestions listed below draw on all three frameworks: liberal feminism to improve policies from within existing structures, radical feminism to imagine new structures for schools and school leadership, and postmodern feminism to engage in the hope and questioning necessary to operationalize these new solutions and organizations.

**Applying Gendered Organizational Theory to Schools**

Schools and districts are committed to instilling learning within their organization. Learning is, after all, the central mission of K-12 school systems. As organizations, schools and districts are also learning through policy and leadership changes. Fry (2003) defines learning organizations as one in which "expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured and collective aspiration is set free... For the learning organization, developing, leading, motivating, organizing, and retaining people to be committed to the organization’s vision, goals, culture, and values are the major challenge." (p. 694). Translating these aims across school district missions, visions, and values of student support and achievement are essential for organizational theory in education (Bolman & Deal, 2010).

**School and Classroom Level**

Creating more equitable school districts requires an important reimagining of school organization. The following suggestions are guided by the feminist ethic of care (Gilligan, 1982)—a commitment to addressing human needs. I propose that an initial focus for equity work in schools begin by reconstructing and re-valuing the agency and the impact of individual teacher/leader pedagogy within class-
rooms. A report by Women in Academia pos- its that classroom teachers are uniquely suit- ed to address gender inequity (Beane, et al. 2014). Educational research suggests that teachers are the most important change agents in schools (The New Teacher Project, 2012). However, it is not enough to tell teach- ers to be change agents, even if this message is delivered compassionately. Instead, truly supporting teacher leadership requires a new imagining and distribution of power in schools. This power is met with building ca- pacity within the areas of emotional, materi- al, and professional support.

The human resource frame presupposes that people are the most valued resource within an organization and therefore effective organizations must emphasize care for per- sons (Bolman & Deal, 2013). In schools, this includes meeting both students and teachers’ basic needs and their higher-level social-emotional needs (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1997; Gilligan, 1982; Glasser & Gough, 1987). Liberal feminist organiza- tional theory would support consciousness raising in classrooms through service and civ- ic projects where students and teachers inves- tigate social issues and are encouraged to be advocates for justice. Additionally, liberal feminists have long advocated for equal op- portunity education such as initiatives that encourage girls to pursue advanced STEM classes (Wendell, 1987).

Radical feminist organizational theory pushes schools to reconstruct assumptions of students, classrooms, and teachers. MacDer- mid et al. (1992) wrote that feminist teaching requires connectedness first through student- to-teacher relationships, and second, between classroom content and students’ lives. Gen- dered organizational theory offers an equity lens to examine student, teacher, staff, and administrative experiences within schools. As mentioned earlier, sustaining change requires a true commitment by school leaders to im- plement new structures, rules, systems, and language if and when the existing system is not serving stakeholders within school organ- izations.

Postmodern feminist organizational theory charges educational leaders to deconstruct the language they use in their classrooms. This is no small task—the research suggests that even well-intentioned and thoughtful edu- cators hold implicit raced and gendered bi- ases (Beane, et al. 2014). “Sometimes... teach- ers need help learning to see injustices, as well as in making sense of the sociopolitical systems of which schooling is a part.” (Groenke, 2010, p. 86) Professional de- velopment support from school leaders may help teachers to see the hidden curriculum of schools, covert systems of oppression, and their own implicit biases. Further, radical and postmodern organizational theorists might imagine completely new classroom structures informed by multiple voices (students and teachers) and ways of knowing to provide relevant support and learning op- portunities (The New Teacher Project, 2012).

Following are a few suggestions for reimagining classrooms as sites for morality of care (Gilligan, 1982):

- Raise consciousness in classrooms through service and civic projects where students and teachers investigate social issues, and are supported in advocating for justice.
- Provide equal opportunity education such
as initiatives that encourage girls to pursue advanced STEM classes and leadership positions.

- Develop professional development for staff on connectedness through student-to-teacher relationships and, then, between classroom content and students’ lives.
- Create professional development for staff on implicit bias.
- Build task-forces on wellness and morality for students and teachers to address affective needs.
- Provide administrative emotional, material, and professional support for teacher leadership and shared leadership models.

Cultivating equity in schools requires a hope-based commitment to center the classroom as the pivotal space for decision making in schools. This is addressed in more detail in the decision making framework outlined in the following section. How leadership and agency is conceptualized in schools is inexorably linked to beliefs about equity, power, and possibility. Valuing students and teachers as critical leaders in school systems offers radically new opportunities for new kinds of schools, districts, and future leaders. “Schools provide a venue for addressing persistent gender leadership gaps by creating a pipeline of girls and young women who are interested in taking on future leadership roles” (Beane, et al. 2014 p. 2). This pipeline issue brings me to my next section on incorporating gendered organizational theory at the district level.

District Level

There are a multitude of equity issues to explore in examining school district organizations, for the purposes of this article I focus on only one: the leadership issue. In 1971, less than 1% of superintendents were women (Dopp & Sloan, 1986). In 2000, this number rose to 13% (Glass, 2000), and, in 2016, the number rose again to 23% (Superville, 2016). This is still a meager ratio is considering that women make up 72% of teaching faculty in PK-12 districts (Glass, 2000). In their study on women superintendents, Meier and Wikins (2002) suggest that women face a classic glass ceiling effect evidenced by the shrinking proportion of women at each level: teacher, assistant principal, principal, assistant superintendent and superintendent. In his list of recommendations for the School Superintendents Association, Glass (2000) offers a few potential solutions that echo the work of gendered organizational theory. These include legislative support (liberal feminism), reconstructing the superintendency (radical feminism) and reconceptualizing discourse around leadership, mentorship and organizations (postmodern feminism). Glass first calls for “changing the nature of the superintendency” (para 33) to a distributed leadership model such that more of the demands of the superintendency are shared across central-office administration. He contends that this would make the superintendency a more attractive position and that empowering more central office administrators would provide a pool of diverse candidates willing to take on the leadership role.

Glass (2000) recommends, “state-funded year-long superintendency internships... [with] carefully chosen mentors [who] might well be influential in attracting [diverse] superintendent interns into the profession” (para 38) Sanchez et al. (2009) also advocates for a mentoring pipeline. In this pipeline, promising women teachers and teachers of color would be mentored into principalships
and promising women and minority principals would be mentored into central office and superintendency positions. Aligned with this vision, earlier this year (2016) the school superintendents association (AASA) launched an initiative to find and support potential women superintendents through a mentor match program (Superville, 2016).

Gendered organizational theory provides a powerful platform for addressing the leadership gap in school districts and for ultimately changing the cultures of these organizations to promote greater equity. However, the effective implementation of new and more equitable frameworks in schools and districts will require additional resources, research, and training.

Decision Making Framework to Center Radical Hope in Schools

What follows is a new framework for equitable, hope-based decision making in schools. This model uses key concepts from gendered organizational theory (care, equity, hope, collaboration) to imagine a new decision making process in schools. The model is centered on hope, a universal form of resistant imagination. To hope is to believe that situations, circumstances, and practices can be better. This decision making framework centers hope by calling on educational leaders to consider how schools can create more equitable responses and practices to dynamic situations in schools. Taking a feminist, shared-leadership approach, the decision-making framework uses a series of values-based questions to support collaborative perspectives. These questions should be considered with teacher, student, and community leadership teams during any decision making process.

Figure 1: Decision Making Framework to Center Radical Hope in Schools

(Hope is adapted from Fishman-Weaver, 2016)

**Hope:** Are we considering new possibilities? Are we engaging in resistant imaginaries that allow for new solutions? Are we giving our community members the benefit of the doubt? Are we assuming positive intent?

**Learning:** What is our school community (classroom, school, district) learning? What is an individual stakeholder (student, teacher, support staff, administrator) learning? Are we safeguarding learning at high levels? How is this lesson pushing our school or district forward?

**Care:** Who needs support in this situation? How can we (as a class, school, or district) give support? What support would I want if I were on the other end of this decision?

**Communication:** How are we honoring our commitment to active listening? How will this decision and rationale be communicated to all stakeholders? What opportunities are there for teachers or students to have agency in the communication and implementation of this decision?

**Equity:** Are we fully considering the needs of this particular community (classroom, school, district) and/or community member (student/teacher/support staff/administrator)? Have we explored ways to ensure access? Have we considered the role that dif-
different lived experiences might play in this situation? Are we valuing diversity?

Leadership is often the art of decision-making, shared leadership models engage collaborative (rather than individual, top-down) decision making. The questions above provide a hope-centered protocol for imagining new and more equitable solutions in schools. This protocol can be used in a variety of dynamic situations with new and diverse leadership teams.

**Implications for Schools:**

**Where do we go from here?**

The calls to action in this paper are mutually dependent, meaning to create sustainable change scholars and educational leaders need to work on multiple fronts simultaneously. Scholars writing on gendered and feminist organizational theory raise important questions on equity issues within organizations. However, their scholarship is not yet integrated into the organizational theory cannon, including, in particular, organizational theory courses in graduate programs. In their 2002 study on gender in public affairs graduate programs, Mills and Newman found that fewer than 30% of colleges/universities responding to their national survey offered stand-alone courses exploring gendered issues (Burnier, 2003). Given gender inequity in organizations, including the underrepresentation of women leaders, and the underpaid status of women at all levels, gender must continue to be a focus in courses on organizations, particularly as the students taking such courses may well be our future leaders. I propose that graduate programs in educational leadership, policy, public affairs, and business, integrate and restructure their syllabi to meaningfully include the scholarship of critical and gendered theorists. I also support offering stand-alone courses on critical and feminist issues as special topics courses in organizational leadership particularly with a focus on equitable decision-making models for school leadership.

While this article has focused on gendered and feminist organizational theory, it would be remiss to not mention other critical perspectives also absent from the dominant literature and teaching of organizational theory. For example, critical management studies (CMS) which developed in tandem with gendered organizational theory provides another alternative to the positivist and male-dominated tradition of organizational analysis (Grey, 2004; Prasad & Mills, 2010). I believe it essential to create a critical model of organizational theory from the feminist, gendered, and critical traditions designed for schools and districts. Addressing and redressing the multiple perspectives and agency of marginalized groups through an ethical framework is essential if educational leaders want to move the needle on achievement, opportunity, and enrichment gaps in schools (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992).

In addition to the decision-based framework outlined above, I propose that educational leaders engage in equity audits to assess potential areas for growth and improvement. Equity audits have their origins in civil rights (Groenke, 2010). Often used to highlight the unequal distribution of fiscal and academic resources across race and class, equity audits have provided valuable information to organizational reformers in schools. A critical organizational theory equity audit for schools would include specific
indicators for critical social responsibility, feminist ethic of care, the social-emotional wellbeing of students (and teachers), school and classroom culture, safe spaces for diversity, and other ideals garnered from the gendered, feminist, and critical organizational theories (Acker, 1990; McWilliams & Siegel, 2001; Mills & Tancred, 1992). This information would provide a powerful platform for organizational reimagining at the PK-12 level.

In conclusion, gendered, feminist, and critical organizational theories offer powerful frameworks for current and future school leaders to address equity issues in schools. The task at hand is multifaceted: theorists must continue to develop critical organizational theory for schools; graduate and professional development programs must integrate such frameworks into their teaching; and educational leaders must practice the difficult reimagining and hope needed to make school systems more effective and equitable organizations where all stakeholders can thrive.
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