



Women and Leadership: a review of literature from the education sector

Anthony Thorpe

SWF Published Papers reference:

Part 03 / Chapter 01 / Article 02

This article was produced for the Susanna Wesley Foundation, part of the University of Roehampton. Further SWF published papers are available from our website: www.susannawesleyfoundation.org

020 8392 4462
SWF@roehampton.ac.uk

Southlands College
80 Roehampton Lane
London SW15 5SL

Women and Leadership: a review of literature from the education sector

Table of Contents

1. Introductory summary
 2. Methodology and methods
 3. Overview of studies
 - 3.1 Introduction
 - 3.2 Arguments for equality, diversity and inclusion in the education workforce
 - 3.3 Equality, diversity and inclusion in educational leadership
 - 3.4 Normative views of leadership and the place of intersectionality
 - 3.5 Leadership development opportunities and gender
 4. In-depth analysis
 - 4.1 Introduction
 - 4.2 Women as different and better leaders in education
 - 4.3 The intersection of gender, identity and educational leadership
 - 4.4 Commercialization, carelessness and gender in educational leadership
 - 4.5 Power and equity within school culture
 - 4.6 Women and the leaderist turn in education
 5. Findings and recommendations for further research
 - 5.1 Findings
 - 5.2 Further research
- References

1. Introductory summary

There is much shared history between churches and educational institutions including the people who work in them, those for whom they have a special concern and their missions to serve the wider community and promote social cohesion. Many Christian organizations, including the Methodist Church, have indicated a wish to look further at women in leadership in the church and the issue of under-represented groups in leadership (for example, Green, 2014; Jones, 2015; Methodist Church, 2002, 2003, 2005), and the education sector has been concerned with this matter with increasing interest over the past couple of decades (Coleman, 2012; Ozga, 1993). Yet whilst reports from both sectors contain exhortations to ‘make things better’, ways forward seem less easy to implement and the same experiences and frustrations often re-emerge in research across the decades (Coate et al., 2015).

This review of the literature mainly from education settings explores the terrain of women in leadership and management in order to extract useful insights. It asks what thwarts these good intentions and how a more inclusive leadership might be achieved by exploring four major themes:

- i) The representation of women within the leadership structures,*
- ii) Where women are represented within the structures,*
- iii) How leadership is exercised by women,*
- iv) The place of leadership development.*

2. Methodology and methods

The methodological approach used insights from two major approaches that:

i) drew upon the insights of intersectionality which argue that the position of women in society cannot be understood by reference to gender alone but must instead take account of other factors such as ethnicity, ability, class, age and sexuality (Arnold and Brooks, 2013 ; Martinez Dy, Martin and Marlow, 2014), and,

ii) sought to move beyond surface level experiences and to identify the underlying events and mechanisms that generate these experiences within specific contexts (Scott, 2010).

This review does not claim to be a systematic one but does draw upon a number of the method's characteristics (Nind, 2006; Nind et al., 2004). A search using the Education Research Complete database was undertaken. Over 222,000 works were identified through the key terms of leadership, management and education which reduces to 81,053 when the search term gender is added and 80,996 when 'school' is added. Of those works, the majority were published in the last 10 years (46,358) indicating that increasing interest in the topic (compared with 10,315 published between 2000-2005). Two articles were identified when the final term of 'church' was added (Arnold and Brooks, 2013; Griffiths, 2009). Most publications come from writers based in the UK, USA and Australia. Five studies were included in the in-depth review¹.

¹ A more detailed explanation of the methodology and the criteria for inclusion of the literature is available in an expanded version of the report.

3. Overview of studies

3.1 Introduction

After outlining some of the arguments to support greater equality, diversity and inclusion in the workforce, a number of issues specific to educational leadership are explored before considering normative views of leadership, the place of intersectionality, and leadership development opportunities.

3.2 Arguments for equality, diversity and inclusion in the education workforce

The ideas within the phrase 'equality, diversity and inclusion' go beyond the promotion of equal opportunities. Oswick and Noon (2014) uncover the 'cycles of popularity' in the use of the terms diversity, equality and inclusion. The factors involved include, for example, gender, ethnicity, age, disability, religion, social class, and sexual orientation to name a few. Some forms of discrimination are outlawed by disability discrimination legislation in the UK (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2015).

There are, at least, four arguments put forward to support equality, diversity and inclusion in the workforce and wider society including:

a) The Democratic argument: that equality is an 'aspiration in a democratic society' (Bush and Middlewood, 2005:92) linked to ideas of entitlement to fair and equitable treatment for all.

b) The Economic argument: that everyone in society must be involved in making the nation economically productive and should not act as an unnecessary drain on resources through either economic inactivity or anti-social behaviour (Wolf, 2002).

c) The Intrinsic argument: that equality and inclusion is a human right and does not need a further, extrinsic justification (DCA, 2006; United Nations, 1948). That humans are made equal by virtue of all being God's children and being one in Christ (Galatians 3:28) is another intrinsic argument which might have a particular resonance within the church and church schools.

d) The Educational argument: that the education workforce should be a visible embodiment of equality, diversity and inclusion which the students see in the roles people hold and how they carry them out (Soler, 2011).

Debates circulate around whether there is one organizational model or leadership style that promotes equality, diversity and inclusion particularly well (Bush, 2010; Davies, 2009) and how these styles and models might themselves intersect with gender (Gatrell and Swan, 2008). Whilst 'school management should be focusing on relationships in which all people are

valued, not systems' (Bush and Middlewood, 2005: 97), this focus should not assume 'a universality of imperatives for motivation and satisfaction' (Bush and Middlewood, 2005: 85). There is no single way to do these things so 'continuity and conflict must be embraced' (Middlewood and Lumby, 1998:96) because difference will persist and commonality cannot be assumed.

3.3 Equality, diversity and inclusion in educational leadership

A number of points arise around barriers for women including experience of sexism, discrimination, stereotyping (Billing, 2011), and the extent to which women's work-life balance might be more deeply affected (Barrett and Barrett, 2011). Most teachers in UK schools are female but most heads of secondary schools are male and the proportion of male heads in primary schools is large in comparison with the overall number of women in primary teaching (Coleman, 2005; Fuller, 2013). However, the proportion of female headteachers and deputies is growing².

Homosociality leads to the exclusion of women and those from minorities from senior posts in education in a number of ways (Blackmore et al., 2006; Devine et al., 2011; Grummell et al., 2009b; Lumby with Coleman, 2007). Whilst stereotypical male styles are perceived to be preferred by governing bodies and appointment panels, stereotypical female styles are increasingly seen by researchers as preferable (Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011). One view within the general leadership literature identifies women as practising a different, and better, form of leadership from men with a distinctive emphasis on people management and collegiality (Binns and Kerfoot, 2011; Griffiths, 2009; Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011; Helgsen, 1990; Rosenner, 1990).

Possible actions to address problems suggested by research and reports include:

- enacting legislation at national level,
- devising and implementing institutional policy in schools, colleges and universities which recognises difference and challenges inequality,
- improving the practice of leadership and management and the institutional culture,
- developing leadership development programmes and opportunities including mentoring and role models,
- considering other disadvantaged groups and groupings.

(see Ali, 2008; Beddington, 2009, 2012; Bush et al., 2005; Coate et al., 2014; Coleman, 2005; McKenley and Gordon, 2002; O'Dwyer and Thorpe, 2013; Thorpe and Bennett-Powell, 2014).

² Beddington (2009, 2012) makes many similar points for the UK university context of leadership and diversity.

3.4 Normative views of leadership and the place of intersectionality

Many writers identify that a normative view of leadership as a male pursuit inevitably impacts on women who seek, and those who access, leadership positions. Half the English women head teachers surveyed in 2004 'were aware of resentment and/or surprise from peers, colleagues and others in finding a woman in the position of headteacher' (Lumby with Coleman, 2007: 46). Furthermore, there is a stereotype of hegemonic masculinity that consciously and unconsciously influences our expectations of what a leader 'should be'. The "think leader, think male" perspective was uncovered by organizational culture writers in past decades (see Schein, 1973) and recent research suggests these stereotypes are still prevalent in the workplace making it doubly difficult for women to indicate a wish for career development whilst keeping within social norms for female behaviour.

As a result, women, and others who do not correspond to the normative leader stereotype may feel, and be regarded by others, as outsiders in a leadership role (Coleman, 2012; Lynch and Feeley, 2009; Reynolds, 2002). Managers may perceive women as having lower levels of career motivation in comparison to men because agentic, achievement oriented traits associated with career-related motivation are often ascribed to males. When women exhibit these behaviours, they find themselves judged negatively in contrast with men for whom such behaviour is more socially acceptable (Heilman and Okimoto, 2007; Hoobler et al., 2009; Hoobler et al., 2014; Jago and Vroom, 1982; Sools, Van Engen, and Baerveldt, 2007). These social expectations also influence relationships between women (Mavin, Grandy and Williams, 2014). Other writers identify a need to challenge and disrupt those idealisations of leadership which support continuing inequity (Blackmore, 2010; Niesche and Keddie, 2011).

The so-called 'opt-out phenomenon' refers to women being successful in obtaining qualifications and securing their first posts in many professions in the western world, including education, but then not appearing in such numbers in the upper echelons of the organizational hierarchy. This disparity has been put down to the individual choices of women to 'opt out' as a rejection of masculine work values; or a preference for other ways of working which are family friendly such as part time work or small- business ownership; or that they see ambition and achievement as masculine not feminine desires (Belkin, 2003; Catalyst, 2004; Lyness and Judiesch, 2001).

However, other research posits that women and men are equally likely to be interested in challenging work, but often out of a 'benevolent sexism' which seeks to 'protect' them, they are given work which is less challenging and less

likely to help them achieve higher positions (Galinsky et al., 2003; King, 2008; King et al., 2012; Moya, Glick, Expósito, de Lemus, and Hart, 2007; Ng, Eby, Sorenson and Feldman, 2005). This benevolent sexism acts to thwart women's aspirations especially as it is suggested that women may often need more explicit support than men before applying for promotions or taking on higher level work likely to lead to advancement (Hoobler et al., 2014).

A question often raised asks whether a group specific approach or a generic approach to equality, diversity and inclusion is preferable. A focus on a specific group such as women provides an in-depth understanding of the views and needs of those within the group not otherwise heard or identified in generic approaches when considering diversity. However, looking at a single group can essentialise that group and prioritise its needs in a manner which improves the situation for neither all in the workforce nor all of those in the single group. Rather than society becoming more equal overall, the balance of power just shifts from one group (or sub-group) to another. The use of intersectionality in research can embrace both the specific and generic approaches avoiding setting up competing pressure groups and seeking instead improvement for all (Lumby with Coleman, 2007; Shakeshaft, 2010).

3.5 Leadership development opportunities and gender

The importance of leadership development opportunities, including mentoring, emerges from the literature. Such opportunities have been shown to be especially important for women (Dever et al., 2008; Ibarra, Carter and Silva, 2010; Lyness and Thompson, 1997, 2000; Ragins and Cotton, 1999; Tharenou, 2001; Van Velsor and Hughes, 1990). Griffiths (2009) places particular emphasis on the importance of coaching and action sets suggesting women only groupings may also provide the necessary space for support and encouragement. The significance of support from senior managers and also other women as role models are other important findings (Coate et al., 2015; Hoskins, 2012). Showunmi et al. (2015) examine the intersection of ethnicity, gender and class in school leadership identifying the need for more dialogue and a re-appraisal of leadership development programmes.

One perspective from the United States argues that organizations must develop and take advantage of all employees' capabilities by creating conditions that give leaders of both sexes an equal chance to succeed (Powell, 2011). However, the 'benevolent sexism' mechanism may also be operating against women accessing leadership development opportunities so highlighting 'the critical role of biased manager perceptions on women's

career development opportunities and career aspirations' (Hoobler et al., 2014:725). This 'well-intended benevolent and/or paternalistic discrimination' occurred regardless of the manager's gender so adding to the list of 'ambiguous, subtle discrimination that women face in the workplace, such as micro-inequities in interpersonal treatment' (Hoobler et al., 2014:706).

4. In-depth analysis

4.1 Introduction

The previous section outlined identified some key issues and provided an overview of studies concerned with leadership and education. This section reviews in greater depth five works which have been published within the last five years. The writers (all women and all White) come from settings in the United Kingdom (Fuller, 2013; Lumby, 2012; Morley, 2013), the United States of America (Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011) and the Republic of Ireland (Lynch et al., 2014). Most are focused on schools but one has a specific concern with higher education (Morley, 2013).

4.2 Women as different and better leaders in education

Grogan, M. and Shakeshaft, C. (2011) Women and Educational Leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Margaret Grogan and Charol Shakeshaft, from the USA, argue that women are different and better leaders³. They contend that women's qualities, preferences and their approaches to educational leadership differ from traditional heroic notions of leadership, whether the traditional leader is a woman or a man, to embrace a collectivist view of leadership promoting social justice through facilitating the members of the organization in their work.

From their rich data, the authors identify five approaches and claim that 'enough women draw upon some or all of them to make us comfortable in identifying them as the five most common approaches among women to date' (p.2). Relational leadership is the first approach that conceives of 'power with' others (and shared) rather than 'power over' others seeking to control (Hartsock, 1983; Hurty, 1995; Kreisberg, 1992). This idea of power leads to change.

³ see Binns and Kerfoot (2011), Helgsen (1990), and Rosener (1990) in generic literature and Coleman and Pounder (2002) for an earlier consideration of this in an education context.

Because many women see themselves in relationships with others instead of in charge of others, relational leadership generates political power. When this kind of leadership is grounded in purpose, relationships build the capacity that can be harnessed to make change. (p.46)

In contrast to the 'top-down approach', this approach develops a collegial sense of community enabling positive change and involves a deliberate promotion of diversification because change comes 'by garnering input from a variety of sources and promoting initiative throughout the organization' (p.65). However, leaders have both to create and allow time for these diverse groups to collaborate with one another in a constructive and productive way to let this sense of community emerge. In contrast, Hoobler et al. (2014) take a less positive view from a commercial context about the tendency of females to be relational seeing it as leading them to aspire to posts with less power and lower prestige.

The second way is that of leadership for social justice as 'women, more than men, identify educational careers as social justice work, even if they don't use that explicit language' (p.11). This approach links to the third way identified as spiritual leadership: 'if change to bring about greater social justice is the end product for many women, then hope, spirituality, and belief in God is the motor that propels many of them to change the system'; (p.13) which opens up the possibilities of exploring the intersection between gender and the religious and/or spiritual beliefs.

The fourth way of leadership for learning relates to the importance women place on the practice of teaching and education compared with those leaders who see schools as a site for developing their power over others and view teaching as something to be endured briefly before rising to positions of power (see also Brunner and Grogan, 2007). Balanced leadership is the fifth way which celebrates the experience and skills involved in caring for a family and running a house, so often categorised as women's work, as bringing a positive dimension to women making them better leaders. Rather than characterising caring as a distraction, the balance women seek in their work-related and home-related responsibilities becomes a positive part of leadership as, 'Although women leaders in the twenty-first century are clearly free to choose to concentrate on work in the same way a man does, many prefer to attain a balance between their work lives and their family lives' (p.23).

The authors acknowledge a debate which wonders if women are forced, as opposed to choosing, to use collaborative and shared ways of leadership because of a 'lack of power' relative to that accorded to the male gender. Yet

they conclude that women school leaders do not have to ape the traditional male leader stereotypes and that, in order to be truly successful in promoting education and social justice, they can be true to themselves.

4.3 The intersection of gender, identity and educational leadership

Fuller, K. (2013) Gender, Identity and Educational Leadership.

London: Bloomsbury Press.

Kay Fuller explores 'how head teachers' social identities – particularly pertaining to gender, social class and ethnicity – influence their leadership of diverse populations of pupils and staff' (p.1). Through interviews with 18 secondary school headteachers from the United Kingdom, she links their social identities through their personal and professional histories; and then to their perceptions of diversity amongst the children, young people, staff and the wider communities they serve.

Fuller sees 'gender as a complex and fluid performance that challenges the notion of embodied gender or sex' (pp. 2-3). She draws on Bourdieu's 'thinking tools', with his concepts of 'habitus,' 'field', 'forms of capital', 'misrecognition' and 'symbolic violence' to explore how the women in her sample became head teachers and how they see their values and practice in the complex social sites of schools.

Two key ideas in the book are those of 'awareness' and 'misrecognition'. She makes a distinction between those who are 'aware' and those who are 'unaware' of gender, race and class differences, for example,

Class aware headteachers were also more likely to value the social capital of collaborative working with other local schools. They sought flattened hierarchical structures and described leadership team working more than class unaware headteachers in the main....Class unaware headteachers have not been without power; they might be less conscious of using it. (p.138)

The idea of 'misrecognition' of unequal relations in schools follows on from this awareness or recognition. Her use of the insights of intersectionality allows her to identify the tensions between agency and structure which exist in any context regardless of the mind-sets of individual teachers.

To see individuals and families as wholly agential is to misrecognise the impact of societal and institutional racism. Misrecognition is not confined to White headteachers. (p.167)

Fuller concludes that headteachers who themselves have been 'misrecognised' or misrepresented in their past are better leaders for this. Her book makes an important contribution in exploring the way connections are

made between intersectionality and leadership, and the particular context and concerns of schools. Addressing issues around women and leadership outside of specific contexts makes little sense nor will it contribute to moving matters forward to promote equality, diversity and inclusion.

4.4 Commercialization, carelessness and gender in educational leadership

Lynch, L., Grummell, B., and Devine, D. (2012) New Managerialism in Education: Commercialization Carelessness and Gender. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kathleen Lynch, Bernie Grummell and Dympna Devine (2012) identify the operation of neoliberalism and mechanisms of audit culture within Ireland. Drawing on their earlier work showing the importance of affective structures in social changes, the authors go beyond seeking psychological feelings or understandings (Grummell et al., 2009a; Lynch, 2010; Lynch et al., 2009). A focus on 'the production and reproduction of gender inequalities in the workplace' enables a critical examination of how new managerialism functions in the lives of leaders in schools particularly those with primary care responsibilities.

The book outlines how neo-liberal ideas and policies are integrated within the new managerialist approach leading to the reconstruction of education leaders in Ireland. The new culture places a great importance on long work hours, strong competitiveness, and intense organizational dedication in a way that militates against those with caring commitments particularly women and men with primary care responsibilities.

The neo-liberal citizen is one who is careless and commercially ever ready to make an investment with a view to personal profit, in short, the 'competitive man' and 'the cosmopolitan worker built around a calculating, entrepreneurial, detached self... unencumbered by care responsibilities [who] is free to play the capitalist game (p. 83). The neo-liberal primacy of transactions around profitmaking and financial investment means that the unpaid labour in families and communities is not seen to count and so misrecognised as a burdensome and irritating cost. The distinction made between profit and investment of that profit leaves money spent on public services to be characterised as wasteful and draining.

The 'new managerialist' approach is concerned with producing correct action on a continual and all-consuming basis involving, in the case of education, leaders and managers implementing changes to 'effectively' promote the neo-liberal project by repositioning education as a 'marketable service'

coupled to 'the glorification of the 'consumer citizen' construed as willing, resourced and capable of making market-led choices' (p.14). Such an approach is in contrast to the notion of education as being, at heart, about 'caring' rather than 'profit', with a workforce which contains a larger number of females; hence,

Neo-liberalism embeds not only a unique concept of the learner in education, it also maps on a new set of goals to education that do not sit easily with education's purpose as a key institution in protecting people's human rights. (p.14)

The leaders interviewed spoke of discourses around 'control and regulation' and also that of 'competitive survival'. Women in particular found it difficult to reconcile the sense of community and caring within education to these new discourses, leading to a sense of isolation and a feeling that they were not being taken seriously as leaders. However, often (though not only) the religious aspect of many schools in Ireland appeared in some ways to counter the neoliberal orientation, challenging the new managerialist project through the complexity introduced by the intersection of the identity of the school and those within the school's community.

They note that many solutions to gender discrimination in schools are those that do not change the way schools work or challenge the existing power relations which often have led to that discrimination. So whilst it appears that the powerful are listening carefully to the calls from below, the reality is somewhat different. Those positions which are seen by the dominant group as having the greatest power and prestige may be held by fewer women whilst the positions women do hold are either ones with considerably less power and prestige or else once prestigious posts now transformed into less powerful ones, such as the head teacher of a primary school in an academy chain or the secondary school head of department re-titled as a curriculum leader.

4.5 Power and equity within school culture

Lumby, J. (2012) Leading Organizational Culture: Issues of Power and Equity Educational Management Administration & Leadership 40(5): 576-591.

Though not solely focusing on gender, Lumby's engagement with issues of power and equality in leading organizational culture highlights some of the challenges around women and leadership as well as why attempts to address these have been less than successful to date. She urges those in leadership positions to engage with culture as 'a fundamental shaping and disciplinary

force on which organizations depend' (p.581) because a 'greater understanding of culture may be the most sustainable tool to enable leaders to make persistent adjustments more authentically to relate to the cultures in their organization' (p.587). Drawing on Bates (2006), she argues 'a further imperative to consider culture is the premise that it is deeply implicated in the different and unequal experience of learners and consequently strongly related to a goal of educational leadership, contributing to social justice' (p.577).

Lumby recognises the pressures on leaders in UK schools only to value knowledge and understanding which appear to provide a quick impact and notes that it is not easy for them to engage with culture, as 'the deeper and more critical the analysis, the more paralysing the results appear to be' (p.586). Combining Sailes's (2008) illustration of how teaching is culturally laden with Bates (2006), Lumby critiques the move to a corporate culture developed in the 1980s and 1990s in which leaders and managers are encouraged to see 'culture' in simplistic ways involving them in creating a mono-lithic culture within their organizations (see Kotter and Heskett, 1992; Peters and Waterman, 1982), something which 'has been taken up enthusiastically in education' (p.580).

Yet culture is much more complex and far less controllable than those corporatist writers suggested, particularly when leaders are seeking to promote greater equity and social justice. It involves recognising four levels of cultural activity; namely, the cultural context created by global phenomena, the cultures of local communities, the organizational culture, and the sub- and counter-cultures of staff and student groups. The different levels uncover implicit and tacit aspects of culture which go beyond those more visible and explicit manifestations of culture which have the allure of being something seemingly that a leader can shape through his (or her) own agency (Archer, 2005; Hofstede, 1984; Schein, 2001).

This distinction helps to illuminate two major ways that educational leaders have been ill-served by naive and corporatist presentations of culture. The first that cultural competence 'is much more often interpreted as related to ethnicity issues and not to the much wider range of cultural issues' (p.585) and second the falsehood that 'assumes that organizations can unite behind a single culture that is benign and supports the interests of learners' (p.580).

Seeing culture as a whole in a school distracts leaders from analysing the different components of their organizations which would lead to useful

insights. Such integrationist perspectives are more likely to support the continuance of inequities in education than seek to remove them.

The integrationist perspective assumes that organizations can unite behind a single culture that is benign and supports the interests of learners... [yet]...the dominant culture is likely to be working in each school or college in favour of some and disadvantaging others. In other words, culture is implicated in the modulation of power. (p.580)

The goal should be that of changing oneself, rather than others, by recognizing that the culture is beyond the control of leaders but open to their influence and 'understanding more fully one's own culture and its relationship with the alternative and oppositional cultures that exist in each organization' (p.587). School leaders should be searching 'for evidence within their organization that reflects the prevalent global valorization of competition, efficiency and standardization' (Luke and Luke, 2000)' (p.582) as they face the moral challenge of deciding upon a direction for the organization.

4.6 Women and the leaderist turn in education

Morley, L. (2013) The rules of the game: women and the leaderist turn in higher education. Gender and Education 25(1), 116-131.

Louise Morley, based at the University of Sussex, is concerned with how 'gender and power interact with leadership in higher education'. This has importance for all sectors of education in that it goes beyond those 'pipeline' explanations for the absence of women from leadership positions which simply state that waiting will improve things. After outlining how leadership in educational organizations 'has developed into a popular descriptor and a dominant social and organisational technology' (p.116), she considers how the 'rules of the game' operate to marginalise women's practice and aspirations within these institutions.

O'Reilly and Reed (2010, 2011) characterise the new managerialist re-orientation of public services towards the consumer-citizen as being undertaken through the appropriation and reconstitution of 'leadership' as a social and organisational technology. They give the name 'leaderism' to this 'organisational panacea'. Morley stresses that 'the leaderist turn is not innocent' but the emphasis on the individual leader seeks to divert attention from the commercial and value shift.

The norm-saturated narratives of how certain people are identified or identify themselves as legitimate and intelligible leaders are open to further investigation. There is an assumption that individual agency, unimpeachable characteristics and structural positions will result in some organisational members being authorised to exert and display leadership power. (p.117)

Morley sees this shift as creating a new 'script of leadership as an all-consuming activity' (p.124) (see Alvesson, Lee Ashcraft, and Thomas, 2008) accompanied by a dissonance 'for leaders coalescing or colliding with normative gender performances' (p.117) through themes of global competition, audit and austerity. The 'carelessness' of new managerialism uses gendered divisions of labour to place the moral imperative to care upon women (Guillaume and Pochic, 2009; Lynch et al., 2009; Lynch et al., 2012; O'Brien, 2007; Runte and Mills, 2004), which helps to explain how women can be punished as well as rewarded through leadership positions in that 'there is often a morality that captures women; for example, the suggestion that leadership is the turn-taking, sacrifice' (p.118).

Like Fuller (2013), Morley deploys examples of misrecognition and gender bias 'in the way in which wider society offers demeaning, confining or inaccurate readings of the value of particular groups or individuals' (p.123). Her analysis draws on Diana Leonard's work (1980, 2001) to show how 'the managerial university had reinforced constructions of masculinity that were unhelpful to feminism.... and how masculine hegemonies exist despite women leaders' (p.123). She eschews suggestions of the 'female advantage' and innately gendered leadership dispositions as such talk 'essentialises and homogenises male and female characteristics' (p.124) (See also Billing and Alvesson, 2000; Delphy and Leonard, 1992). Instead, she sees these 'propositions' as creating 'binds for women who do not 'fit' the gender script' (p.124), hence her concern that seeing women and leadership as about motherhood and leadership fails to 'account for why some women who are single or child-free are also absent from HE leadership... [so ignoring]... differing cultural and social capital relating to social class, age, sexualities, disabilities and ethnicities' (p.122).

Morley is wary of formal programmes and informal mentoring which may be offered to 'fix the women' (Schiebinger, 1999) and operate to continue and reinforce the current situation (Colley, 2001; Devos, 2008; McKeen and Bujaki, 2007). The concept and practice of leadership in its leaderist form and the leaderist turn in educational organizations needs challenging. She calls for the unmasking of these rules of the game and identifying the 'metaphors of entrapment' such as 'glass ceilings', 'leaky pipelines', and 'victimhood', as 'the relentless misrecognition of women's leadership capacities and suggests the need for an expanded lexicon of leadership with which to move into the university of the future' (p.116).

5. Findings and Recommendations for Further Research

5.1 Findings

Though 'good' intentions appear in the education sector, the concerns and problems previously identified seem not to have gone away despite the implementation of a number of 'technical solutions'.

Theme 1: The representation of women within the leadership structures.

In the education sector, an increasing number of women are represented within leadership structures. However, they remain disproportionately small in number compared to those in the overall workforce. Solutions and initiatives in encouraging and supporting women to take up such positions seem to have some success. Yet relying on the 'pipe line' approach, which suggests numbers will come right with time, does not appear likely to bring around substantial change. Exploring issues around how women are represented within structures and how they exercise, or are allowed to exercise, leadership may well be more fruitful in addressing representation. The lack of concern with intersectionality and with placing women and leadership within the wider context of equality and diversity may well be hiding other injustices and examples of inequity (Coate et al., 2015; Lumby, 2012; Morley, 2013; Shakeshaft, 2010; Showunmi et al., 2015).

Theme 2: Where women are represented within the structures.

Women's representation within these structures often appears to be in limited positions of power and prestige and, in particular circumstances, often when the positions are being degraded by wider social changes and agendas. It is also influenced by ideas about what counts as 'work' and what 'work' is deemed most valuable; particularly as those positions defined as powerful, responsible, and prestigious are more likely to exclude care and less likely to be held by women.

Themes emerge around the gendered divisions of labour, gender bias and misrecognition, management and masculinities, and the concept of the 'greedy organisation'. Those thwarting mechanisms appear within the dominant language of leadership and within understandings and appreciations of culture in organizations and wider society. Undertaking an audit of these values and examining those globalised assumptions and policies which are 'valorised' (Lumby, 2012) is something on which a Christian organization might wish to embark, especially to identify how far, or otherwise, they are in tune with the Christian message.

Theme 3: How leadership is exercised by women.

How leadership is exercised by women is often a contested area with expectations placed upon the individual either as an incumbent or as a seeker of formal leadership positions. Yet much of the literature points to a concern around what leadership is and that it is neither value-free nor immutable. Instead the 'leaderist turn' with its links to the neo-liberal project and new managerialist (leaderist) approach raises serious questions for an educational sector which has placed, in the past, a particular emphasis upon care, nurture and community rather than on profit and investment for personal advancement (Grogan, 2014; Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2012; Lynch et al., 2012; Morley, 2013). Simply increasing the numbers of women in educational leadership does not address the deeper problem and bring about a substantial change.

Theme 4: The place of leadership development.

The place of development opportunities, including mentoring, emerges as a crucial but contested area which goes to the heart of the enterprise of leadership and organizational culture. A mechanism of 'well intended benevolence' may be operating in who is offered leadership development opportunities and what those opportunities are, with repercussions for women's promotion to leadership positions (Hoobler et al., 2014). Development programmes may effectively be mechanisms for 'fixing' the participants so becoming a 'safe' solution that avoids the need to implement substantial change. There are further implications for the aims and content of development opportunities in the call for greater cultural competence of educational leaders (Lumby, 2012; Morley, 2014).

5.2 Further research

Faith communities and educational organizations can learn from each other's working practices, structures and models. Yet whilst there is much to be learnt and considered from the educational sector, the Church might be wise to consider carefully how it should conceive and exercise 'leadership' and what might be its potential to promote greater equality in its appointments and exercise of power and prestige.

Understanding how head teachers and others in formal positions of responsibility become designated as leaders through the 'leaderist turn' illuminates how leadership has developed into 'a popular descriptor and a dominant social and organisational technology' (Morley, 2013: 116). Establishing a set of leaders who are differentiated from other members of the staff within a school or educational organization is neither a necessity nor necessarily desirable. Considerable scepticism around the discourses of 'leaders' and 'leadership' might be exercised not only in the education sector

but also by the Church as it asks what should count as 'real leadership' and what the appropriate rules of the game are.

These discussions are linked to the question of what counts as education. If paying for teachers is a drain and a burden, then, by implication, what counts as education could be seen to lie in the terminology of 'investments', 'outputs', and 'efficiency', resulting in a 'carelessness' (Lynch et al., 2012; Massey, 2013). Such carelessness might appear contradictory to the values found in Christian teaching. It may well be significant that it was in the religious schools that the neoliberal orientation of the ideal 'citizen' engaging in competitive survival was countered more often (Lynch et al., 2012).

Some of the concerns raised in the education sector about 'greedy organizations' and how these affect women may have particular resonance within the Church, which holds the idea of sacrifice for others in high esteem. Yet this raises the question of what is worthy of sacrificing oneself for.

Further research is needed in identifying challenges and then exploring the enabling, delimiting and frustrating mechanisms and structures in addressing them. This research might involve empirical projects including:

- Taking gender seriously in education contexts and elsewhere.
- Looking at leadership practice in less formal and informal settings.
- Drawing on insights from the intersections between church and schools and between leaders and their religious and spiritual lives.
- Identifying the 'micro-inequities' by which discrimination operates.
- Uncovering the complex relationship between agency and structure.
- Tackling assumptions including those that might appear well-intentioned and those 'safest possible solutions' that fail to question the suitability of the basic modes of operation of organizations and their existing power relations.
- Exploring awareness by leaders of culture at micro, meso and macro levels.
- Imagining how current leadership development might be reconfigured including seeing thinking deeply about culture as a leadership skill.
- Investigating issues around the distribution of power and influence, and analysing how far current solutions address the power balance.
- Identifying the extent to which religious schools in Britain are challenging and providing alternatives to neo-liberal discourses of carelessness.
- Asking what a leadership with an expanded lexicon might look like.

References

- Ali, L. (2008) *A Guide to achieving Equality and Diversity in School and Children's Centre Leadership*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Alvesson, M., Lee Ashcraft, K., and Thomas, R. (2008) Identity matters: Reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organization studies. *Organization* 15(1), 5-28.
- Arar, K. and Abramovitz, R. (2013) Teachers' attitudes toward the appointment of women as school leaders: the case of the Arab education system in Israel. *Management in Education* 27(1), 32-38.
- Archer, M.S. (2005) Structure, culture and agency. In Jacobs, M.D. and Hanrahan, N.W. (eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell, 17-34.
- Arnold, N. and Brooks, J. (2013) Getting Churched and Being Schooled: Making Meaning of Leadership Practice. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership* 16(2), 44-53.
- Barrett, L. and Barrett, P. (2011) Women and academic workloads: Career slow lane or Cul-de- Sac? *Higher Education* 61(2), 141-155.
- Bates, R. (2006) Culture and leadership in educational administration: a historical study of what was and what might have been. *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 38(2), 155 -168.
- Beddington, D. (2009) *Diversity in higher education: leadership responsibilities and challenges. Final Report*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Beddington, D. (2012) Revisiting diversity in leadership. *In Practice*, Issue 31. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. www.ifhe.ac.uk
- Belkin, L. (2003) The opt-out revolution. *New York Times Magazine*. October 26: 42-49.
- Billing, Y. (2011) Are women in management victims of the phantom of the male norm? *Gender, Work and Organization* 18(3), 298-317.
- Billing, Y.D., and Alvesson, M. (2000) Questioning the notion of feminine leadership. A critical perspective on the gender labelling of leadership. *Gender, Work & Organization* 7(3), 144-157.
- Binns, J., and Kerfoot, D. (2011) Editorial: Engendering leadership: Dedicated to the spirit and the scholarship of the late Joan Eveline. *Gender, Work and Organization* 18(3), 257- 262.
- Blackmore, J. (ed.) (2010) Special issue: Disrupting notions of leadership from feminist post-colonial positions. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 13(1), 1-6.
- Blackmore, J., Thomson, P., and Barty, K. (2006) Principal Selection: Homosociability, the Search for Security and the Production of Normalized Principal Identities. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership* 34(3), 297-317.
- Brunner, C.C., and Grogan, M. (2007) *Women leading school systems: Uncommon roads to fulfillment*. Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

- Bush, T. (2010) *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* (4th edition). London: Sage.
- Bush, T., Glover, D., Sood, K., Cardno, C., Moloi, K., Potgeiter, G. and Tangie, K. (2005) *Black And Minority Ethnic Leaders: Final Report to the National College for School Leadership*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Bush, T., and Middlewood, D. (2005) *Leading and managing people in education*. London: Sage.
- Catalyst (2004) *Women in corporate leadership 2003*. New York: Catalyst.
- Coate, K., Kandiko Howson, C.B., and de St Croix, T. (2015) *Mid-career academic women: Strategies, choices and motivation*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Coleman, M. (2005) *Gender and headship in the 21st Century*. Nottingham: NCSL. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalcollege.org.uk/docinfo?id=17191&filename=gender-and-headship-in-the-21st-century.pdf>
- Coleman, M. (2012) Leadership and Diversity. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 40(5), 592-609.
- Coleman, M., and Pounder, J. (2002) Women- better leaders than men? In general and educational management it still "all depends". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 23(3), 122-133.
- Colley, H. (2001) Righting rewritings of the myth of Mentor: A critical perspective on career guidance mentoring. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 29(2), 177-197.
- Cortina, L.M. (2008) Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 33(1), 55-75.
- Davies, B. (ed.) (2009) *The Essentials of School Leadership*. 2nd edition. London: Paul Chapman.
- DCA (2006) *A Guide to a Human Rights Act* (3rd ed.). Department of Constitutional Affairs. <http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/act-studyguide.pdf>
- Delphy, C., and Leonard, D. (1992) *Familiar exploitation: A new analysis of marriage in contemporary western societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dever, M., Boreham, P., Haynes, M., Kubler, M., Laffan, W., Behrens, K., and Western, M. (2008) *Gender differences in early post PhD employment in Australian Universities: The influence of PhD experience on women's academic careers*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Social Research Centre (UQSRC).
- Devine, D., Grummell, B. and Lynch, K. (2011) Crafting the elastic self? Gender and identities in senior appointments in Irish education. *Gender, Work and Organization* 18(6), 631-649.
- Devos, A. (2008) Where enterprise and equity meet: The rise of mentoring for women in Australian universities. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 29(2), 195-205.
- Equality and Human Rights Commission (2015) website. <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/Pages/default.aspx>
- Fuller, K. (2013) *Gender, Identity and Educational Leadership*. London: Bloomsbury Press.

- Galinsky, E., Salmond, K., Bond, J.T., Kropf, M.B., Moore, M., and Harrington, B. (2003) *Leaders in a global economy: A study of executive women and men*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Gatrell, C., and Swan, E. (2008) *What do we mean by Gender and Diversity in Management: a concise introduction*. London: SAGE.
- Green, S. (2014) *Talent Management for Future Leaders and Leadership Development for Bishops and Deans: A New Approach*. Report of the Lord Green Steering Group. Church of England. Accessed from <https://www.churchofengland.org/media/2130591/report.pdf>
- Griffiths, V. (2009) Women Managers in Higher Education: Experiences from the UK. *International Journal of Learning* 16(10), 397-405.
- Grogan, M. (2014) Educational leadership and social justice in the United States. *Bildung und Erziehung* 67(3), 299-312.
- Grogan, M., and Shakeshaft, C. (2011) *Women and Educational Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Grummell, B., Devine, D., and Lynch, K. (2009a) The careless manager: Gender, care and new managerialism in higher education. *Gender and Education* 21(2), 191-208.
- Grummell, B., Devine, D., and Lynch, K. (2009b) Appointing senior managers in education: Homosociability, local logics and authenticity in the selection process. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership* 37(3), 329-349.
- Guillaume, C., and Pochic, S. (2009) What would you sacrifice? Access to top management and the work-life balance. *Gender, Work & Organization* 16(1), 14-36.
- Hartsock, N. (1983). *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*. New York: Longman.
- Heilman, M.E., and Okimoto, T.G. (2007) Averting penalties for women's success: Rectifying the perceived communality deficiency. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(2), 81-92.
- Helgesen, S. (1990) *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Hofstede, G. (1984) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Hoobler, J.M., Lemmon, G., and Wayne, S.J. (2011) Women's underrepresentation in upper management: New insights on a persistent problem. *Organizational Dynamics* 40(3), 151-156.
- Hoobler, J.M., Lemmon, G., and Wayne, S.J. (2014) Women's Managerial Aspirations: An Organizational Development Perspective. *Journal of Management* 40(3), 703-730.
- Hoobler, J.M., Wayne, S.J., and Lemmon, G. (2009) Bosses' perceptions of family-work conflict and women's promotability: Glass ceiling effects. *Academy of Management Journal* 52(5), 939-957.
- Hoskins, K. (2012) *Women and Success: professors in the UK academy*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books.

- Hurty, K. (1995) Women principals – leading with power. In Dunlap, D. and Schmuck, P. (Eds.) *Women Leading in Education*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press, 389-406.
- Jago, A.G., and Vroom, V.H. (1982) Sex differences in the incidence and evaluation of participative leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67(6), 776-783.
- Jones, M. (2015) Women in Leadership in Methodism: a historical approach. SWF published papers Part 02/Chapter 02/ Article 01. Available at <http://susannawesleyfoundation.org/>
- King, E.B. (2008) The effect of bias on the advancement of working mothers: Disentangling legitimate concerns from inaccurate stereotypes as predictors of advancement in academe. *Human Relations* 61(12), 1677-1711.
- King, E.B., Botsford, W., Hebl, M.R., Kazama, S., Dawson, J.F., and Perkins, A. (2012) Benevolent sexism at work: Gender differences in the distribution of challenging developmental experiences. *Journal of Management* 38(6), 1835-1866.
- Kreisberg, S. (1992) *Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment and Education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Ibarra, H., Carter, N.M. and Silva. C. (2010). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard Business Review* 88(9), 80–85.
- Leonard, D. (1980) *Sex and generation: A study of courtship and weddings*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Leonard, D. (2001) *A woman's guide to doctoral studies*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Luke, A., and Luke, C. (2000) A situated perspective on cultural globalization. In Burbules, N.C., and Torres, C.A. (eds) *Globalization and Education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 275-297.
- Lukes, S. (2002) From power: a radical view. In Haugaard M (ed.) *Power: A Reader*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 41–57.
- Lumby, J. (2012) Leading Organizational Culture: Issues of Power and Equity *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 40(5), 576-591.
- Lumby, J., with Coleman, M. (2007) *Leadership and Diversity: Challenging theory and practice in education*. London: Sage.
- Lynch, K. (2010) Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education CHEER/ ESRC seminar series 'imagining the university of the future'. Seminar 2: What are the disqualified discourses in the knowledge society? Centre for Higher Education and Equity Research (CHEER), University of Sussex. <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/education/cheer/esrcseminars/seminar2> (accessed September 12, 2012).
- Lynch, K., Baker, J., and Lyons, M. (eds.) (2009) *Affective Equality: Love Care and Injustice*. London: Palgrave.
- Lynch, K., and Feeley, M. (2009) *Gender and education (and employment): gendered imperatives and their implications for women and men: lessons from research for policy makers*. Brussels: European Commission. <http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports/gender-report-pdf>

- Lynch, L., Grummell, B., and Devine, D. (2012) *New Managerialism in Education: Commercialization, Carelessness, and Gender*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lynch, K., and Lodge, A. (2002). *Equality and power in schools*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Lyness K.S., and Judiesch, M.K. (2001) Are female managers quitters? The relationships of gender, promotions, and family leaves of absence to voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(6), 1167-1178.
- Lyness, K.S., and Thompson, D.E. (1997) Above the glass ceiling? A comparison of matched samples of female and male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(3), 359-375.
- Lyness, K.S., and Thompson, D.E. (2000) Climbing the corporate ladder: Do female and male executives follow the same route? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85(1), 86-101.
- Kotter, J.P., and Heskett, J.L. (1992) *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Martinez Dy, A., Martin, L., and Marlow, M. (2014) Developing a Critical Realist Positional Approach to Intersectionality. *Journal of Critical Realism* 13(5): 447-466.
- Massey, D. (2013) Vocabularies of the economy. In Hall, S., Massey, D., and M. Ruskin (eds.) *After neoliberalism: The Kilburn manifesto*. London: Soundings, 1-35. Available at <https://www.lwbooks.co.uk/soundings/kilburn-manifesto>
- Mavin, S., Grandy, G. and Williams, J. (2014) Experiences of Women Elite Leaders Doing Gender: Intra-gender Micro-violence between Women. *British Journal of Management* 25(3), 439-455.
- McKeen, C., and Bujaki, M. (2007) Gender and mentoring. In Ragins, B.R. and Kram, K.E. (eds.) *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*. Los Angeles: Sage, 197- 222.
- McKenley, J., and Gordon, G. (2002) *Challenge Plus: the experience of black and minority ethnic school leaders*. Nottingham: NCSL.
<http://www.nationalcollege.org.uk/docinfo?id=17115&filename=challenge-plus-experience-of-bme-leaders-full-report.pdf>
- Methodist Church (2002) *Leadership in the Methodist Church*. A report to Conference from the Methodist Council. <http://www.methodist.org.uk/conference/conference-reports/selected-reports-from-2004-and-earlier>
- Methodist Church (2003) *Leadership in the Church*. A report to Conference from the Methodist Council. <http://www.methodist.org.uk/conference/conference-reports/selected-reports-from-2004-and-earlier>
- Methodist Church (2005) *The Nature of Oversight*. A report to Conference. <http://www.methodist.org.uk/conference/conference-reports/2005-reports>
- Meyerson, D.E., and Fletcher, J.K. (2000) A modest manifesto for shattering the glass ceiling. *Harvard Business Review* 78, 126-136.
- Middlewood, D., and Lumby, J. (1998) *Human Resource Management in Schools and Colleges*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Morley, L. (2013) The rules of the game: women and the leaderist turn in higher education. *Gender and Education* 25(1), 116-131.

Moya, M., Glick, P., Expósito, F., de Lemus, S., and Hart, J. (2007) It's for your own good: Benevolent sexism and women's reactions to protectively justified restrictions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33(10), 1421-1434.

NCSL (n.d) *A Strong Leadership Culture Emanating from a Clear Vision*. Nottingham: NCSL. Available at: <http://www.nationalcollege.org.uk/docinfo?id/153521&filename/prepared-to-lead-how-schoolsgrow-education-leaders.pdf>

Ng, T.W.H., Eby, L.T., Sorensen, K.L., and Feldman, D.C. (2005) Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology* 58(2), 367-408.

Niesche, R., and Keddie, A. (2011) Foregrounding issues of equity and diversity in educational leadership. *School Leadership & Management* 31(1), 65-77.

Nind, M. (2006) Conducting systematic review in education: a reflexive narrative. *London Review of Education* 4(2), 183 -95.

Nind, M., and Wearmouth, J. with Collins, J., Hall, K., Rix, J. and Sheehy, K. (2004) *A systematic review of pedagogical approaches that can effectively include children with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms with a particular focus on peer group interactive approaches*. London, Teacher Training Agency.

Peters, T., and Waterman, R. (1982) *In Search of Excellence: Lessons From America's Best-Run Companies*. New York: Warner.

O'Brien, M. (2007) Mothers' emotional care work in education and its moral imperative. *Gender and Education* 19(2), 159-177.

O'Dwyer, A., and Thorpe, A. (2013) Managers' understandings of supporting teachers with specific learning disabilities: macro and micro understandings in the English Further education sector. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 43(1), 89-103.

O'Reilly, D., and Reed, M. (2010) 'Leaderism': An evolution of managerialism in UK public service reform. *Public Administration* 88(4), 960-78.

O'Reilly, D., and Reed, M. (2011) The grit in the oyster: Professionalism, managerialism and leaderism as discourses of UK public services modernization. *Organization Studies* 32(8), 1079-101.

Oswick, C. and Noon, M. (2014) Discourses of Diversity, Equality and Inclusion: Trenchant Formulations or Transient Fashions? *British Journal of Management* 25(1), 23-39.

Ozga, J. (1993) *Women in Educational Management*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Powell, G.N. (2011) The gender and leadership wars. *Organizational Dynamics* 40(1), 1-9.

Ragins, B.R., and Cotton, J.L. (1999) Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(4), 529-550.

Reynolds, C. (ed.) (2002) *Women and School Leadership: International Perspectives*. Albany: State of New York University.

- Rosener, J.B. (1990) Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review* 68(6), 119–25.
- Runte, M., and Mills, A.J. (2004) Paying the toll: A feminist post-structural critique of the discourse bridging work and family. *Culture and Organization* 10(3), 237–249.
- Sailes, J. (2008) School culture audits: making a difference in school improvement plans. *Improving Schools* 11(1), 74–82.
- Schein, V.E. (1973) The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57(1), 95-100.
- Schein, V.E. (2001) A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4), 675–688.
- Schiebinger, L. (1999) *Has feminism changed science?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, D. (2010) *Education, epistemology and critical realism.* London: Routledge.
- Shakeshaft, C. (2010) *Gender and Educational Change.* In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M., and Hopkins, D. (eds.). *International Handbook of Educational Change.* Dordrecht: Springer, 969-983.
- Showunmi, V., Atewologun, D., and Bebbington, D. (2015) Ethnic, gender and class intersections in British women's leadership experiences. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, first published on August 28, 2015 doi:10.1177/1741143215587308.
- Soler, M. (ed.). (2011). Education for social inclusion [Special Issue]. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21(1), 1-90.
- Sools, A.M., Van Engen, M. L., and Baerveldt, C. (2007) Gendered career-making practices: On “doing ambition” or how managers discursively position themselves in a multinational corporation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 80(3), 413-435.
- Tharenou, P. (2001) Going up? Do traits and informal social processes predict advancing in management? *Academy of Management Journal* 44(5), 1005-1017.
- Thorpe, A. (2014) Why the leadership and management divide matters in education: the implications for and schools and social justice. *International Journal of Education for Social Justice (REIJS)* 3(2), pp.199-212.
- Thorpe, A. and Bennett-Powell, G. (2014) The perceptions of secondary school middle leaders regarding their needs following a middle leadership development programme. *Management in Education* 28(2), 51-56.
- United Nations (1948) The Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html>
- Van Velsor, E., and Hughes, M.W. (1990) *Gender differences in the development of managers: How women managers learn from experience* (Technical Report No. 145). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Wolf, A. (2002) *Does Education Matter? Myths about education and economic growth.* London: Penguin Press.