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In this chapter I identify and elaborate, from a feminist perspective, upon the theoretical shifts and key concepts that inform sociological analyses of gender and educational organizations.

Gender inequalities are embedded in the multi-dimensional structure of relationships between women and men, which, as the modern sociology of gender shows, operates at every level of experience, from economic arrangements, culture and the state to interpersonal relationships and individual emotions.

(Connell, 2005: 1801)

Even naming this a sociology of gender and organizations is problematic. Many sociologists consider gender as a key sociological concept, but not necessarily from a feminist perspective. Feminism is a multidisciplinary, transnational movement that ‘focuses on the relationship between social movements, political action and social inequalities’ (Arnot, 2002: 3) and on the everyday experiences of women and girls and how they translate into social and structural ‘ruling relations’ (Smith, 1988). Feminism takes on multiple trajectories and imperatives in different cultural contexts, although with familial resemblances, most particularly the shared objective of equality for women and girls. Education as a primary institution of individual and collective mobility and social change, but also social and economic reproduction, has long been a focus of feminist theory and activism. So a feminist sociology needs to address this complexity of feminist sociological ‘encounters’ with gender and organizations.

Gendering organizations

Within the field of sociology of education there are multiple perspectives about how gender is understood in relation to organizations, both informing but also informed by feminist theories and activism. Each perspective, itself a product of particular historical conditions, draws on particular notions of the relationships between structures, agency and social change.
Organizations as gender neutral

Sociologists regard education and the family as the primary socialization institutions. A dominant perspective embedded in sociology, characterized by large-scale statistical analyses, is that gender is a ‘fixed category’, one of multiple input or output factors such as class, race and ethnicity that can be ‘controlled’ statistically to determine their ‘effects’ in causal relationships; for example, controlling for class and race to measure the differential effects of gender on educational achievement. Within this frame, organizations such as schools and universities tend to be treated as culturally and gender neutral ‘black boxes’. The pedagogical frame is developmental and psychological, premised upon the notion of the formation of the unitary individual who emerges fully formed. Power works through hierarchy and structures, and knowledge derives out of well-defined Enlightenment disciplines that privilege ‘hard’ science over the ‘soft’ humanities, with an implicit masculine/feminine binary.

Well into the twentieth century, organizations were seen to have functional relationships in relation to the wider economy and society, responding to external social, economic and political pressures. Human relations and marketing were marginal concerns of executives. Education remained a relatively distinctive field of policy, practice and professionalism, offering secure careers for men and later women. Schools and universities were viewed as discrete units, tightly or loosely coupled, respectively, to centralist and hierarchical government bureaucracies with a strong public service orientation. Wider socio-economic contexts tended to be either ignored or treated as backdrops. Class was equated to occupational status, and women’s class was linked to a male relative. Within the reproductive framework of socialization into sex roles, the gender division of labour in educational organizations in which men lead and women teach is ‘normalized’ because it replicates the ‘natural’ gender division of labour within the family and society. Gender difference is either equated to biologically determined sex- and gender-specific psychological attributes, or gender is ignored altogether through the universalizing discourse of the neutered ‘individual’. Such perspectives provide little capacity to understand social, organizational or gender change.

This notion of organizations as gender neutral meant gender emerged analytically as either an individual psychological attribute or a statistical variable explaining differential outcomes. It continues in much contemporary school effects, school improvement and school effectiveness literature. Gender neutrality is embedded in the corporate and human resource management literature of the new public administration, which penetrated public services during the 1990s, supported by human capital theory, which underpins contemporary education policy. Discourses of school choice and lifelong learning, for example, presume individuals are self-maximizing autonomous choosers, ignoring how ‘human capital’ is embodied and mobilized within unequal power relations (Leathwood and Francis, 2006). Women quickly find out in the workplace that they are less rewarded than men for equivalent if not greater educational achievement. Equal opportunity policies within this frame seek, through procedural justice, to gain for women and girls equal access to male-dominated organizations. The under-representation of women in leadership is treated as an issue of workplace planning and structural barriers, the lack of a pool of eligible women, or women’s lack of skills or career aspirations. Upskilling women is the solution. The focus of this perspective is on problem solving from within the frame of the status quo of organizations, whether bureaucratic or corporate.

The sociocultural turn

The new sociology of education informed by and informing critical and feminist theory emerged from the social movements of the 1970s. Sociocultural perspectives argue that knowledge,
organizations and gender are socially constructed. Gender identity is therefore not physically or epistemologically predetermined, thus moving beyond the biological determinism of sex role and socialization theory. From this perspective, gender, as race in critical race theory, is no longer 'fixed', but is constitutive of identity, wider societal relations and organizational life (Ladson Billings, 2004). Organizational structures, knowledges and practices, are socially constructed in ways that, because of historical power inequalities, disadvantage most women and advantage most men. This shift from individual and structural factors to sociocultural accounts of organizations focuses on culture, collective identity, values and the symbolic. Notions of organizational culture inform change theory and explain why policies do not produce the effects intended. But culture within conventional educational administration is presumed to be unitary and homogenous, encapsulated in the notion of 'the way we do things around here', something that could be measured, created, manipulated and managed by leaders and aligned with organizational ends (Blackmore, 1999). Gender, race and other forms of difference are ignored, marginalized or to be assimilated.

Feminist sociocultural theories of organization arose out of the 1980s' politics of identity, when marginalized groups sought recognition. Schools and universities are seen to be sites of collective and individual identity formation and contested cultural meaning, with dominant and subjugated knowledges. Earlier critiques link patriarchy to capitalism and analysed how bureaucracies subjugated women's knowledge and experience. Feminist standpoint theory (Smith, 1988) continues to analyse, from the position of women, the unequal 'ruling relations' of power/knowledge/gender embedded in organizational practices, texts and structures, as indicated by who does what work, how it is valued and who gets rewarded. This analytical focus on the sociocultural explains the ongoing resistance of men and of organizational practices to gender equity reform, because gender works through the relationships, symbols, values and artefacts of organizational life. It explains the real and symbolic power of masculinist cultures and images of leadership and the ongoing endurance of particular notions of leadership (Blackmore, 1999; Shakeshaft, 1987). The notion of dominant, marginalized or subordinate subcultures explains why women feel excluded, for example, from leadership, but also recognizes that there are spaces of resistance to the dominant by subcultures of students, women and ethnic/linguistic minorities.

Sociocultural accounts focus on the social relations of gender explicated by Connell (1987), who argues that, in each site, there are patterns of social relations, structures and practices that are gendered and ‘systematically important’ to organizations.

Compact formal organizations like schools perhaps have particularly clear gender regimes, but others have them too. Diffuse institutions like markets, large and sprawling ones like the state, and informal milieux like street corner peer-group life also are structures in terms of gender and can be characterised by their gender regimes.

(Connell, 1987: 120)

Thus different masculinities and femininities are constituted in relation to each other – hegemonic masculinities (managerial, working class) maintain their hegemonic power in particular organizational contexts by positioning as weaker and lesser other masculinities (homosexual) and all femininities (emphasized, butch ...). Hegemonic masculinities are mobilized, for example, around notions of the rational, unemotional and strong leader, while depicting women leaders as irrational, emotional and lacking in the capacity to make hard decisions. This institutionalized gender regime within schools and universities is reinforced by
the gender order of society and other institutional practices, including the family, religion and the state (Connell, 1987: 137–139).

Understanding organizations as contested cultures and products of the historical legacy of male heterosexual privilege provides more nuanced understandings about the failure of imposed organizational reforms, including gender equity. It explains how resistance to gender reform by many men and some women derives from their personal and collective investments in particular gender identities that provide a secure sense of self and that benefit from the existing gender regime. For example, men are usually advantaged in the workplace by women's part-time work in the caring professions and the devaluing of unpaid domestic labour. A sociocultural perspective recognizes that multiple versions of organizational life and subjugated knowledges exist that differ from the dominant corporate story and prescriptive gender scripts. Equity policies from this frame seek to make the cultures of educational organizations more inclusive, not only through greater representation of women but also by changing practices and values.

**Postmodern organizational complexity and gender subjectivities**

The context of educational organizations during the 1990s was one of rapid and radical change, restructuring, neo-liberal ideologies and a growing sense of precarious employment. The political and epistemological context was that of the politics of difference which highlighted the intersectionality of difference – gender, race, class and ethnicity – as Black feminists challenged White middle-class feminists' privileging of gender (Mirza, 1993). Post-structuralism posits the view that gender, as race and class, is part of a wider set of discursive relations that position individuals in particular ways within specific contexts. The self is here constituted as multiple subjectivities, in a constant state of being and becoming. Contradiction, dissonance and ambiguity are the norm both within oneself, but also within organizations and life in general. Notions of 'positionality' and 'subjectivity' foreground the complexity, for example, of being female, Black and an educational leader (Davies and Harré, 2000). The unitary developmental subject of modernist educational discourses is thus supplanted by forms of subjectivity that are fluid and hybrid, in a state of ongoing production through biography inflected by race, class, gender, culture and sexuality (McLeod and Yates, 2006).

Educational organizations are therefore seen to be part of a process of subjectification that provides both constraints and possibilities, as no outcomes are closed. Schools, universities and other educational organizations such as technical institutes and workplace training are sites where gender and other forms of difference are (re)constituted through multiple, often contradictory discourses (women are now equal but individual women do not feel that, girls' success and boys' underachievement) and texts (assessment, curriculum, promotion, equal opportunity policies) that mediate social relations (Skelton and Francis, 2004). Organizational life is seen to be open to flows of meaning, bringing a sense of ambiguity, ambivalence and uncertainty. How difference works in and through organizations is highly 'situated', with institutional and cross-sectoral differences. Gendered subjectivities are constantly remade through discourse that positions individuals differentially. Sometimes race, sometimes language and sometimes gender are foregrounded. Power works in organizations, from this perspective, in a decentralised and diffuse manner through discourse, in ways that are both productive and oppressive of particular gendered subjectivities. Thus, women in leadership can feel simultaneously powerful and powerless. Post-structuralist perspectives see women and girls having agency owing to their capacity to mobilize particular discourses to their own benefit, while not ignoring their vulnerability and 'othering' due to wider power/knowledge relations. Here organizational change is depicted as
unpredictable, chaotic and multifaceted. It also means that individual and group narratives of organizational life are always partial, as is the corporate meta-narrative produced through policy, strategic plans and mission statements.

Post-structuralist analyses of organizations also highlight the discursive and performative aspects of organizational life arising in the context of devolved modes of governance, marketization and managerialism (Blackmore and Sachs, 2007). They explore how the ‘performative’ is reworking the social relations of gender to (re)produce new entrepreneurial, transnational masculinities and self-managing worker-identities (Connell, 2005). Critical perspectives focus on the multiple representation of the body and how organizations are sites of competing sexualities, thus critiquing organizational theory for its dominant (white) heterosexuality (Young and Sklra, 2003).

Gendered organizations thus do not ‘exist’ as such; rather they are performed moment by moment through the communicative practices of their members. While such performances usually do not unfold capriciously, but rather, follow well-established scripts, it is still only in the doing – the performing – that such scripts are produced, reproduced, resisted, and transformed.

(Aschraft and Mumby, 2004: 116)

Power is decentred and diffuse as it works through discourse. And feminists themselves can produce normative policy discourses that are counterproductive. For example, essentializing discourses about women’s styles of leadership denies political, racial, ethnic or linguistic differences among women (Reay and Ball, 2000). Backlash discourses about recuperative masculinities meanwhile position women as advantaged (Lingard, 2003). Furthermore, studies of educational restructuring and organizational reform identify how embedded practices (redeployment, restructuring, outsourcing, downsizing) produce structural backlash (Blackmore, 1999). The message here is that ‘gender inequalities can be subtle, elusive, and normalized via everyday practices such as networking and the construction of identities and opportunities’ (Husu and Morley, 2000: 2).

Diversity and difference: hybridity and boundaryless organizations

Post-colonialism now troubles West-centric ways of thinking post 9/11. The global context is one of rapid flows of people, goods, ideas, money and images, producing greater cultural diversity in student populations, a diversity not represented in the dominant ‘whiteness’ of the education workforce and leadership. The context is of heightened uncertainty, high risk and low trust organizations, with schools and universities constantly restructuring to address market forces. Post-colonial theory views educational organizations within Western colonizing and settler nation-states (UK, USA, Australia, Canada and New Zealand) and post-colonial nation-states (e.g. India, Mexico) as sites reconstituting, through the processes of assimilation/internationalization/entrepreneurialism, neo-colonial relations in ways that simultaneously protect/reinvent/destroy traditional cultures. Neo-colonialism is also linked to the commodification of educational goods and services through the processes of westernization/internationalization, both desired and resisted in post-colonial states and by international students, such as the universalizing, seemingly neutral curriculum of the International Baccalaureate. Post-colonial theorists interrogate the Eurocentrism and whiteness embedded in organizational theory and promoted by transnational management experts in terms of theories of change, motivation.
and values. They unpack the discourses that view non-Whites as 'the other' (Prasad and Prasad, 2002). Meanwhile, diasporic communities in Western nation-states seek to transplant/reinvent/negotiate traditional cultures locally, mobilizing through neo-liberal policies of privatization and school choice a trend towards institutionalizing difference (gender, class, religion, ethnicity) through schooling.

These processes of internationalization and entrepreneurialism are also gendered. On the one hand, sociologists focus on the hybridity of culture and cosmopolitan identities in the context of multiple organizational formations and public/private mixes, and in so doing frequently assume the gender-neutral subject (Stromquist and Monkman, 2000). On the other hand, women are seen to carry culture symbolically in their daily lives and transnationally, as well as within and between educational organizations (Mabokela, 2007). Protecting women is readily equated to protecting tradition and culture, as if gender and culture are fixed. Certainly, for many indigenous and ethnic minority women in White-dominated educational organizations, gender is less significant relative to race, ethnicity or religion (Optlaka and Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2006). Such women leading educational organizations are positioned within multiple contradictions: due to their lack of whiteness in White-dominated environments and the expectation that they represent traditional culture, or that they 'bridge' two cultures between White and 'the other', between school and community (Fitzgerald, 2006). Indigenous feminists point to how Western notions of leadership fail to address the mutuality of two-way learning or connectedness to land, and how organizational structures refuse to provide more than symbolic partnerships with community (Ah Nee-Benham, 2002; Battiste, 2005). Muslim feminists point to how religion and gender interplay to maintain traditional masculinities within diasporic communities, and highlight the complexities for women leaders in religious states, universities and schools where faith is central to education (Shah, 2006). For women in more traditional societies, gender dominates (Luke, 2001). For Western feminists, there is also a warning. The 'civilising overtones . . . selfless and disinterested project of Western (neo)colonialism' is seen to be about 'rescuing women from particular cultural practices' with an assumed moral and cultural superiority (Prasad and Prasad, 2002).

Post-colonialist approaches of organizations therefore unpack the intersecting and contradictory but changing social relations of religion, culture, gender, race and class and how they 're)constitute the binaries of good/evil, black/white, active/passive, centre/margins, masculine/feminine, scientific/superstitious, and secular/religious' in patterned ways that produce gender inequality (Prasad, 2002: 124).

Gender is constitutive of organization; it is omnipresent, defining feature of collective human activity, regardless of whether the activity appears to be about gender . . . the gendering of organization involves a struggle over meaning, identity and difference . . . [and] such struggles reproduce social realities that privilege certain interests.

(Ashcraft and Mumby, 2004: xv)

**Contemporary issues**

Any analysis of educational organizations therefore needs to consider multiple dimensions to understand the interplay of the unequal social relations of power/knowledge that articulate through context, discourse and practice: the spatial (who gets to use what spaces), temporal (how time is used), material (distribution of resources), symbolic (representations of what is
valued), semiotic (language and vocabulary mobilized), cultural (narratives about who we are), aesthetic (what constitutes beauty) and the technological (who benefits). But a feminist analysis foregrounds particular issues in any organizational analysis, as indicated below.

**Dualisms**

Feminist perspectives explore how Enlightenment dualisms between mind/body, rational/emotional, active/passive, science/humanities and masculine/feminine continue to be reinvented in contemporary organizations through the changing social relations of gender, despite shifts in discourses and theories of gender and organizations. Organizations embody social relations, producing gendered, racialized and sexualized distinctions. The body and discourse are inseparable, as the body incorporates the rules of organizations, in terms of how individuals dress, relate, use space and time and mobilize particular gender subjectivities. Leadership foregrounds the body in terms of its sexuality, the performative aspects of organizations, as well as self-presentation. The imagery of the well-groomed (White heterosexual) male (and now female) leader who ‘fits’ the organizational image remains the norm against which all contenders are measured. The body is therefore central to any analysis of the disciplinary power of organizations over individuals (e.g. lesbian leaders) and populations (disabled), and how such power produces particular institutionalized and performative practices.

Furthermore, feminists have long rejected any emotional/rational distinction, arguing that leadership and teaching demand emotions such as compassion in order for decision-makers and professionals to be fully human and indeed rational. Critical management and feminist organizational theory views organizations as emotional arenas, where rapid and radical change produces the full range of emotions: grief, anger, greed, envy, frustration, fear and anxiety (Fineman, 2000). Mainstream educational theory no longer treats emotions as pathologies, feminized and something to be eradicated, having recognized the reliance in knowledge-based economies on ‘human’ capital and on individual and collective emotional investment(s) and social relations that oil productivity. Marketing and human relations are central executive areas of control. Emotional literacy or intelligence is now presented as another skill for leaders to acquire. Now, emotional labour and educators’ passion for teaching and research are being depoliticized (Boler, 1999) and co-opted through discourses of quality by management for organizational ends (Blackmore and Sachs, 2007; Morley, 2003). But gendered emotion scripts prescribe who does what types of emotional management and how emotional displays such as crying or anger are judged differently.

Finally, educational organizations are also historically constructed around knowledge hierarchies that privilege particular versions of science over the humanities and the social, whether in school subjects or research (Brooks and MacKinnon, 2001). These gendered knowledge hierarchies continue to be reinvented through the disciplinary technologies of accountability that determine what counts, what gets counted, what gets taught and assessed, and who benefits (Morley 2003).

**Context**

Gender has largely been addressed in mainstream sociologies of education as an individual or group characteristic rather than as a primary organizing principle of society and the economy and the relations of ruling at the global, international, national, regional, local and institutional level. Context shapes both organizational and leadership possibilities. The nature and purpose
of education are fundamentally changing under the conditions of education capitalism; at the same time, wider structural relations of national economies and markets impact on the career possibilities and work conditions in gendered ways (Deem, 1996). In educational organizations, market discourses and practices now penetrate organizational structures, cultures and values, as well as priorities. Such contexts inform institutional discourses as leaders in middle management, many of them now women, mobilize discourses of survival to gain collegial consent, often becoming reluctantly complicit in the new work order. Responsiveness to international and local education markets requires significant institutional flexibility. Accumulating evidence is charting the feminization and casualization of academic and teachers’ work arising from devolved systems of educational governance and deregulated international education markets (Brine, 1999).

These trends cannot be disentangled from how education professionalism is being redefined and judged through national and international professional-standards movements and escalating national and international accountability demands for comparison. The nature of educational organizations and leadership is also under revision. Discourses of lifelong learning have encouraged a seamlessness between educational sectors to facilitate smooth pathways for students. Educational organizations are part of a ‘constellation of sites, spaces and opportunities for learning’ (Arnot, 2002: 258), with multiple configurations locally (multi-site campuses and community and industry partnerships) and internationally (offshore campuses). So, as education as a field is increasingly subject to markets and the economy, the profession is losing autonomy. Global relations have shifted the locus of power upwards and outwards from educational organizations owing to externally driven demands for accountability and market forces.

**Reconstituting the gender division of labour: public/private**

The separation of public life (masculine domain) and the private lifeworld of family and community (female domain) was a premise of the modernist educational organization (David, 2003). Historically, teaching has been positioned as the naturalized extension of mothering and therefore women’s work, with ‘the importing through embodied social practice over time, of cultural metaphors of domesticity from a narrowly conceived private sphere into the apparently public world of work’ (Acker and Dillabough, 2007: 298–299). Teaching is recognized as feminized, but not as White. This continues with institutionalizing policies exhorting parents (women) to be partners as quasi-literacy teachers, fundraisers or governors. Now self-managing schools and universities, public and private, seek to blur the public/private distinction in order to gain greater flexibility by transferring educational labour into the home through technologies or outsourcing educational work under contractualism. So, as educational organizations move into new public/private configurations, women are more vulnerable, as they are without the mobility and flexibility of their male counterparts.

**Equity**

Organizational texts (policies, mission statements, performance management protocols, performance indicators, curriculum, assessment) are gendered in terms of their implications for workplace arrangements (time at work, continuity of employment) and which discourses get privileged (efficiency or equity). Devolved governance in education has meant policy is now the means by which governments and executives steer from a distance. Policy is one link in the cycle of
performativity arising from the accountability regimes focusing on outcomes. Meanwhile, contemporary individualizing discourses of diversity that have supplanted equal opportunity weaken claims of historical group, structural and cultural, gender inequality (Bacchi, 2000).

Critical feminist policy sociologists (Marshall, 1997) identify multiple tensions around how equity policies will work. Equity practitioners in organizations still rely on the state and executives for equity policies to provide legitimation for their activities, raise expectations for changes in behaviour and offer a language for action. Already, backlash discourses cite the existence of equity policies to argue that women and girls have equality or are advantaged in education. Recognition of one form of disadvantage (class, race) does not necessarily flow over to equality of gender. Each form of disadvantage has different legacies (slavery, colonialism) and power relations. Gender equity cuts across racial, ethnic and class difference because it challenges personal and power relationships at work and in the home.

Contemporary dilemmas for feminists

Coming from a focus on gender leads to different assumptions, questions and conclusions, but also produces ongoing dilemmas for sociologists of gender and educational organizations.

Category problem

Gender continues to be a problematic sociological concept in terms of what it supplants, such as a focus on women and girls, and what it ignores, in terms of sexuality. The feminist dilemma with regard to category has been that focusing on women as a sociological concept and policy strategy has positioned women as having to change or to initiate change, while essentializing women as a group (Bacchi, 2000). It thus diverts policy and sociologists' attention away from how the social relations of gender are embedded in the structures, cultures, identities and power configurations in educational organizations, on how leadership is understood and practised, how context and culture shape organizational practices and in turn how organizations (re)constitute gender, class and race and identities. At the same time, the focus on the social relations of gender and/or gendered subjectivities means attention reverts back to men as the 'dominant' or to the individual in ways that ignore structural and cultural factors. Both facilitate the appropriation by mainstream theory of those aspects of feminist research and discourse that do not undermine its normative frame.

The politics of gender research

With the focus on text, discourse and the rejection of modernist meta-narratives, post-modernist accounts of organizations localize the politics of gender, focusing on the processes of reflexivity and individualization that can be readily appropriated by neo-liberal discourses of the gender-neutral individual (Bauman, 2005). Materialist accounts consider this refusal to universalize endangers the feminist political project of social justice (Unterhalter, 2006). Post-structuralism's focus on situated gendered subjectivities, like the socio-cultural focus on women and leadership, has diverted attention away from the structural: that is, the reconstitution of gender relations occurring through the restructuring of educational organizations during the 1990s due to neo-liberal reforms of marketization and managerialism (Brine, 1999; Blackmore and Sachs, 2007).
A number of issues for inquiry arise from the above:

- How are shifts in educational governance from the bureaucratic to the corporate and now the networked organization impacting on women's capacity and/or desire to be leaders, policy actors or practitioners?
- How are the social relations of gender being reconstituted through the structures, processes, practices and cross-cultural relations of the networked organization, locally, nationally and transnationally?
- Are the global policy communities of the OECD, World Bank, UNESCO new sites for mobile transnational masculinities, while women remain as leaders of the domestic (national and local) in a reconfigured gender division of labour?
- Are men benefiting more from new public/private configurations, such as innovation centres in new knowledge economies and internationalization (Metcalfe and Slaughter, 2008)?
- How are neo-colonial masculinities in leadership – traditional and progressive – being reconstituted within different national contexts – religious nation-states, diasporic communities in Western nation-states?
- How to unpack and investigate the more ‘subtle gender differentiation’ that occurs in organizations and through discourses of individual choice and diversity?
- How to generalize across organizations owing to the complexities of articulation of gender, race, class and religion in specific institutional locations?
- As the role of the state changes with the emergence of regional polities and global policy communities, how will gender equity policy be mobilized, conceptualized and delivered in local educational organizations?
- What theoretical, ethical and methodological issues does this raise in terms of a feminist comparative sociology of organizations?

Conclusion

Discourses in Western societies are about post-feminism. Women and girls are disappearing as a sociological category of inequality in educational research and policy, with the focus on boys' underachievement and discourses of diversity. Yet women do not feel equal; either their progress into the executive level of organizations has stalled, or the locus of organizational power has moved beyond the organization. In developing nation-states, women and children are the losers owing to war, migration, unemployment, famine and global warming. Gender as a sociological category is increasingly complex in terms of how it relates to culture, context and educational organizations. So the question for feminist sociologists and policy activists is how to address this complexity of social and structural differentiation and patterned inequality.
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