



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Educ Policy (Los Altos Calif). Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 June 14.

Published in final edited form as:

Educ Policy (Los Altos Calif). 2018 September ; 32(6): 755–796. doi:10.1177/0895904816673740.

Gender, Markets, and Inequality: A Framework

Huriya Jabbar¹, Wei-Ling Sun¹, Melinda A. Lemke², Emily Germain¹

¹The University of Texas at Austin, USA

²University at Buffalo, NY, USA

Abstract

A growing body of research examines the role of elite networks, power, and race in the advocacy for market-based reforms and their ultimate effects on students, teachers, and communities of color. Yet, less research explores how such reforms interact with gender in the workplace, especially how policies such as school choice, competition, and incentive-based pay impact female actors within K-12 schools (e.g., teachers, school leaders). The current research on marketization and privatization in education has largely overlooked the potential impact on women in schools. We review the literature on women in K-12 education and in the economy more generally, and organize it conceptually to identify areas for future inquiry. After synthesizing and summarizing themes across diverse bodies of literature, we contend that as schools privatize, we may see greater gender disparities in education leadership and teaching.

Keywords

educational policy; equity; gender; feminism; market-based reforms; neoliberalism; competition

In the past several decades, there has been a rise in market-based reforms in K-12 education in the United States (e.g., charter schools), including school-choice policies and teacher labor-market deregulation. These policies aim to bring market mechanisms of choice, incentives, and competition into public schools and to change existing governance structures (e.g., Chubb & Moe, 1990). A growing body of research examines the role of elite networks, power, and race in the advocacy for market-based reforms and their ultimate effects on students, teachers, and communities of color (e.g., Au & Ferrare, 2014; Buras, 2011; Buras & Urban South Grassroots Research Collective, 2013; DeBray-Pelot, Lubienski, & Scott, 2007; Kretchmar, Sondel, & Ferrare, 2014; Lipman, 2011; Scott, 2005, 2009). There are also numerous critiques of neoliberalism in education more generally, both in the United States and around the globe, because of its economic aims to deregulate government and eliminate social welfare safety nets (Apple, 2006; Giroux, 2008; Harvey, 2007). Such critiques have also focused on policy processes that aim to privatize, regiment, and control the public sphere, including, among other sectors, public education, knowledge production, and

Corresponding Author: Huriya Jabbar, University of Texas at Austin, 1912 Speedway, D5400, Austin, TX 78712, USA. jabbar@austin.utexas.edu.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

knowledge capital (Lubienski, Scott, & DeBray, 2011; Ross & Gibson, 2007; Stromquist, 2010).

However, little research examines the role of gender¹ in market-based reforms in K-12 education. For example, recently expanding policies such as teacher labor-market deregulation and school choice may have disparate impacts on women, who comprise the vast majority of teachers and school choosers—responsible for decisions related to their children’s education (e.g., André-Bechely, 2005; Cooper, 2007; National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2015; Power, 2006). As feminist scholars have argued, limited research in education policy attends to issues of gender equity (e.g., C. Marshall, 1999; C. Marshall & André-Bechely, 2008; Parsons & Ward, 2001; L. C. Tillman, 2002), although there is a robust literature on women in educational leadership and higher education more generally (e.g., Allan, Iverson, & Ropers-Huilman, 2010; Dillard, 1995; Martin, 2011; Shakeshaft, 2010; B. A. Tillman & Cochran, 2000; Young & Skrla, 2003). Yet, as educational organizations change under market pressures, with new roles and responsibilities for K-12 school leaders and teachers, there is a need to reexamine how policies influence gender equity and, in particular, the implications of market-driven reforms for women in education (David, 1997). Despite the gender-neutral presuppositions of market reforms, there is evidence from other fields that this is, in fact, not the case. As such, this article seeks to explore the ways in which educational marketization and privatization impact gender equity for teachers and school leaders working in public schools.

This article draws on research from several related fields, which use varied disciplinary and theoretical lenses, to deepen our understanding of the ways in which market-driven reforms affect female teachers and female school leaders in K-12 education contexts. This lack of attention on issues related to women is part of a larger gap in education policy research. Education policy has rarely invited or used feminist insights (Dillard, 2000; C. Marshall & Young, 2013). Employment trends reveal gender disparities in salary and percentages of women in various careers (C. Marshall & Young, 2013). There is a need to explore these dynamics further, especially in the context of changing organizational structures and incentives in K-12 settings. Some studies using organizational perspectives on women in schools have shown that women are often only afforded leadership positions with the sponsorship of men (Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006; J. Marshall, 1995; Ortiz & Marshall, 1998). However, few researchers have examined how macro-level policies, such as market-based reforms implemented at the federal and state levels, affect female teachers and female leaders (Dillard, 2000; C. Marshall & Young, 2013).

In recent years, some research has examined how choice and privatization impact women, such as how parental choice is a gendered practice (e.g., Cooper, 2007; Power, 2006), how charter schools have overenrolled girls (Corcoran & Jennings, 2015), and how privatization can limit women’s choices (C. Marshall, 1999). While advocates of school choice and parental involvement describe such efforts as gender neutral, they, in fact, are

¹Because *gender* is defined differently across these different fields, we clarify how we use the term throughout. When describing research that focuses on female participants, we use the term “gender” to denote differences found for subjects identifying as male and female. When reviewing research that is more conceptual in nature, from the field of feminist economics, for example, we use the term “gender” to refer to the gendered nature of markets (e.g., the “culturally masculine” characteristics of “rational economic man”).

not. Research has examined how market advocates use the language of “empowerment” in choice, targeting parents, especially mothers (Scott, 2013), and how parent advocacy, too, is gendered, with mothers rather than fathers bearing the burden of securing needed services for their children in current K-12 educational systems (e.g., Domínguez-Pareto, 2014). Yet, little research investigates how market-based reforms impact female actors *within* schools (e.g., teachers, school leaders), even though education has undergone dramatic shifts with new market-driven teacher pipeline reforms (e.g., Teach For America), revamping of teacher pay scales (e.g., performance pay), and new teacher evaluation systems (e.g., value-added), all of which have important implications for gender equity in a field that is historically feminized (e.g., Galman, 2012; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). School leaders, too, are expected to take on new roles in market-based systems, engaging in marketing and recruitment of students and staff (e.g., Oplatka, Foskett, & Hemsley-Brown, 2002). In this review, we focus on school-level actors, including teachers and leaders.

This article examines how patterns of gender inequity are reproduced or changed under market-based reforms and privatization. The deregulation and decentralization of education may provide both opportunities and constraints for female teachers and female leaders. In light of the thin literature on this issue in the field of education, we draw on research examining women in educational leadership; research on women in other public sectors that have experienced privatization, including higher education; and research analyzing how women fare in the private sector, which, as the U.S. educational system heads toward greater privatization, might provide insights into the potential impacts on female teachers and leaders. Feminist scholars have argued that the gender-neutral discourse in markets and the economy is problematic (Allan, 2010; Ferber & Nelson, 2003; Lynch, Grummell, & Devine, 2012; Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006). As Marshall and Young (2013) argue, a fundamental tenet of feminism is to always ask: “what is the effect on women and girls (and on other marginalized and silenced people) whose needs and values have been ignored?” (p. 207). Market-driven policies, which are not gender neutral in their impacts, cannot have gender-neutral remedies, and researchers must consider the intersectionality² of race, class, and gender in their design (Dillard, 2000; C. Marshall, 1999).

We review relevant literature, including research that takes an explicitly feminist stance, as well as research that does not. We summarize research from diverse conceptual perspectives about market-based reforms and their impacts on female teachers and female leaders, provide six specific propositions, and identify several essential guideposts for future study related to market-based reforms in education (see Table 1). In sum, we argue that as schools increasingly privatize, we should expect to see greater gender disparities in teaching and education leadership.

². While recent scholarship has increasingly highlighted the intersectional nature of gender, its inherent intersections with race and class, for example, we focus our review on issues pertaining to women, as this is the definition of gender assumed in much of the literature that we review, particularly in business and economics. For example, empirical research has consistently shown that women of color in professional positions report different treatments at work due to both their race and sex (e.g., Weber & Higginbotham, 1997). In education, studies have found similar results. Latina school leaders are often assigned to predominantly Latino schools, rather than being considered for a range of opportunities (Ortiz, 1982), and Asian American female educational leaders experience the glass-ceiling effect (Hymowitz & Schellhardt, 1986) as well as the model-minority stereotype. We acknowledge that our focus on gender is a relatively narrow view, but given the lack of research on this topic, we view this as an entry point. Therefore, we point to further research that might use intersectional approaches to uncover patterns associated with market-based reforms and their impacts.

Neoliberalism and Education

Since the late 1970s, the United States and other countries throughout the world have adopted the “social paradigm” of neoliberalism (Lipman, 2011, p. 6). Neoliberalism is built on the premise that increased privatization, coupled with decreased state intervention and funding of public services, best advances human well-being (Harvey, 2005). The theory prioritizes individualism, consumerism, competition, strong private–property rights, free markets, and free trade (Ball, 2007; Burch, 2009; Giroux, 2009; Harvey, 2005; Lipman, 2011; Trujillo, 2014). In this framework, the role of the state is diminished, except to create markets where they previously did not exist (e.g., education, health care) or expand and deregulate existing markets (Harvey, 2005). The pervasive nature of this philosophy has caused it to seep into the general consciousness of the American public (Giroux, 2009; Harvey, 2005; Lipman, 2011). Advocates and scholars have critiqued neoliberal policies for holding individuals, rather than systemic problems, responsible for their successes and failures (Giroux, 2008). In other words, individuals are accountable for inequality, success, and life outcomes; institutionalized inequality related to class, gender, or race are dismissed and ignored. In addition, the dominant discourse of neoliberalism favors the status quo, using meritocracy as the underlying rationale, and therefore privileging norms and practices that perpetuate existing inequalities by both gender and race (Suspitsyna, 2010).

Within public organizations, neoliberalism emphasizes individual performance, accountability, and market forces, including consumption and commodification, which affects the way human services, such as education, are delivered (Fawcett & Hanlon, 2009). This is particularly evident in public education, where the majority of recent reforms reflect neoliberal values. These include policies such as No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, high-stakes accountability, merit pay, value-added teacher evaluation systems, and the proliferation of school choice (Apple, 2006; Ball, 2007; Burch, 2009; Giroux, 2009; Labaree, 1997; Lipman, 2011; Ravitch, 2010, 2013). All of these policies are included, to some degree, in the latest reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act titled the Every Student Succeeds Act, which gives states more discretionary authority over accountability systems. Charter schools, specifically, were prioritized in this bill, with more grant funding now available to begin and replicate high-performing schools (Rees, 2015).

These reforms all stem from the common belief that urban schools are underperforming and inequitable because of bureaucracy, monopoly, lack of competition, insufficient accountability, and the presence of teachers’ unions (Apple, 2006; Lipman, 2011; Saltman, 2009). These criticisms easily lend themselves to policy solutions that emphasize deregulation, accountability, and choice (Kretchmar et al., 2014). Consequently, policymakers have introduced competition and choice into public schools, which is rapidly changing the face of urban education (Apple, 2006; Lipman, 2011; Saltman, 2006). The increasing adoption of market-driven reforms and privatization in education has led to a shift in governance, management, and work expectations. Advocates of such reforms do not discuss their gendered implications, therefore presenting them as gender neutral. However, building off research on neoliberalism in higher education (Suspitsyna, 2010), we argue that market-based reforms have important implications for gender equity for K-12 teachers and school leaders in the workplace because of the ways in which such reforms privilege

informal networks, career ladders, and individualistic and masculine ways of operating schools. Before we discuss the empirical literature, we provide some historical context about women in education and the workforce.

“Beyond Economic Man”: Markets as Gendered and Trivializing Care Work

Research in the field of feminist economics has described how markets are inherently gendered, and how neoliberalism trivializes that which does not have measurable market value (Lynch et al., 2012). Markets emphasize the importance of measurable factors, such as financial figures or numbers, focus primarily on individual success, and trivialize values that are either not measurable or considered feminine (e.g., care, love). For example, women have historically worked in unpaid production fields (e.g., family labor, agricultural, volunteer work), and while neoliberalism and industrialization lead to more women in the workforce, many of them are in the service sector (Beneria, 2003). This increased entry into the workforce occurs with a simultaneous attack on the welfare state, and associated decline of public benefits for families, undermining care in the public sphere as well and putting more strain on women as they enter the workforce without adequate family supports (Blackmore, 2011; Healy, 2009; Lynch et al., 2012).

Feminist economists have argued that there are hidden assumptions about gender inherent in the theoretical structure of neoclassical economics, focused as it is on “culturally ‘masculine’ topics” (Ferber & Nelson, 2003, p. 1), whereby economic actors have culturally masculine traits, such as “autonomy, abstraction, and logic” (England, 2003; Ferber & Nelson, 2003, p. 1). Unlike other resources in the economy, care and empathy, like love, are not subject to the same constraints and are not scarce or zero-sum in a traditional sense (Strober, 2003). For example, love for one’s family or friends is not subject to the characteristics of the scarce resources typically analyzed in economics, and is thus undervalued. Further, the individual focus of neoclassical economics often ignores organizational structures that guide behavior, and values self-interest over traditionally feminine values such as care (England, 2003). Neoclassical economics also typically considers the family as a single decision-making unit, a black box, which downplays intra-household gender dynamics, despite their importance in a range of issues, such as the allocation of schooling and decision-making power over finances (England, 2003). In this approach to the economy, “homo economicus” has the desired traits of efficiency, competitiveness, and individualism, which are based on norms of the White middle-class dominant male (Griffen, 2007). Today, women are included in this identity, but only so long as women take on the masculine market characteristics of efficiency and competition, while also maintaining traditionally feminine characteristics (Griffen, 2007).

Although neoclassical economics downplays its role, “care” has important implications for women in the economy. Women have been limited in access to employment and have thus crowded into traditionally female jobs due to discrimination and socially constructed gender roles (England & Folbre, 2003). This includes “caring” fields such as nursing, childcare, and education. This early crowding may have generated higher teacher quality, as highly educated women had few other job opportunities. This “feminization” of teaching had important consequences, because when employers devalue jobs filled by women, they set

lower pay scales for them (England & Folbre, 2003). Furthermore, “care work” typically has inputs and outputs that are harder to measure. For example, in education, standardized tests are commonly used to measure academic performance, but do not measure other outcomes, such as emotional skills or becoming lifelong learners, even though parents may value the care work and emotional labor conducted by teachers. Indeed, this difficulty in measuring inputs and outputs may contribute to the relatively low pay for care workers. People conducting care work are also emotionally committed to the work, which puts them in a vulnerable position when demanding higher wages or better working conditions. Researchers have called this “psychic income” (e.g., Lortie, 2002), and the intrinsic rewards or satisfaction from such work may compensate in part for the differential in pay and lead to higher productivity (e.g., Besley & Ghatak, 2005).

Furthermore, these “care” sectors are undergoing dramatic shifts in the United States and abroad due to neoliberal policies. By drawing on literature from other sectors that have undergone privatization, such as nursing, health, and social work, we can better understand the implications of educational privatization for women. Neoliberalism has shifted the “culture, organizational logic, and the socioeconomic context of the welfare state” (Connell, Fawcett, & Meagher, 2009, p. 334), leaving education as one of the last few vestiges of the welfare state (Anderson, Mungal, Pini, Scott, & Thomson, 2013). As in education, social welfare is “feminized,” with women comprising the majority of the workforce (Connell et al., 2009). While neoliberalism appears gender neutral, in that it does not overtly favor one group over another, the vision of an *entrepreneur* tends to be masculine (Connell et al., 2009). This poses a problem for women working in a public sector that is undergoing privatization. Therefore, neoliberalism, under the guise of gender neutrality structures organizations in ways that not only sustain institutionalized male bias but create it as well. Neoliberalism also ignores historical realities that demonstrate women and men do not have equal access to opportunity (Suspitsyna, 2010). For example, the public sector’s adoption of the flat organizational structures of the “new economy,” in which workers must compete with one another to move ahead, with unclear career ladders and “networking,” privileges males (Connell et al., 2009). This “casualization” of the work force is argued to increase flexibility by, for example, removing salary scales and standardized hiring procedures, but, as in the private sector, it may disproportionately negatively affect women (Fawcett & Hanlon, 2009).

As social welfare fields have privatized, they have adopted underlying gendered assumptions about professional identity and the workforce (Andersson & Kvist, 2015; Healy, 2009; Sisson & Iverson, 2014). In Sweden, for example, the field of eldercare is female-dominated. With the marketization of this industry, this work was coded as “female work” and thus devalued once it was transformed into a commodity on the market (Andersson & Kvist, 2015). The marketization of eldercare, while creating more private options for elders seeking care, actually led to worse working conditions with limited flexibility and stability, and uncertain working arrangements for staff. At the same time, the owners and managers in this industry were mostly men, while the actual care work continued to be provided by women. By creating “choices” for elders seeking care, the reforms created precarious work conditions for women.

Similarly, in Australia, in the division of child protective services, there was a great deal of concern over the gender and age profile of the workers, who were mostly young and female. Authorities stated that this was “out of balance” with the characteristics of the public sector overall (Healy, 2009). However, other fields, such as nursing and engineering, were also out of balance, sometimes with larger proportions of men, yet these received less attention. Furthermore, as the author argued, the primary concern was with service quality, and it was not made clear how increasing the percentage of men would address this, but there were underlying assumptions about the relationship. Therefore, the apparently neutral concept of achieving “gender balance” was applied in non-neutral ways to the field of social welfare in Australia as it adopted “new public management” values (Healy, 2009). In our review, we begin with the assumption that markets and neoliberal policies, while gender neutral in their language, create significant challenges for gender equity in education, especially for teachers and school leaders.

A Brief History of Women in Education

Before the late 18th century, most teachers in the United States were male (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). Women and people of color were rarely afforded the opportunity to enter the teaching force. In the mid-1800s, male teachers’ retention rates decreased, as they left teaching to pursue opportunities in other fields (Reich, 1974). Because of the need for more and cheaper teachers, as well as the lack of other work opportunities, women entered the teaching market, accepting lower salaries than men (Mitrano, 1978). Teaching has thus become a feminized field, where women dominate teaching positions, largely because of the history of viewing teachers as caregivers and the association of women with care work (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Another term to describe care work is *emotional labor* (Gonzales & Ayers, 2015; Hochschild, 1983/2012). This labor is often invisible. Women, including school leaders, are expected to provide their emotional resources (e.g., displaying a friendly face) and be more caring and supportive (e.g., listening to others’ problems) than men even when they are in equivalent jobs (Bellas, 1999; Hochschild, 1983/2012; Wajcman, 1998). Teachers also provide emotional nurturance to young children (Crawford, 2006; Sisson & Iverson, 2014), and school leaders often manage the emotions of adults. These expectations of women in teaching and leadership not only “feminize” the field, as an extension of women’s role in the family, but also position women in family roles regardless of their work.

While many women have entered teaching, they have not been well represented in leadership positions. The conditions in schools fostered the entry of women because schools could tolerate high turnover among teachers, who could drop in and out due to caretaking priorities in the home (Lortie, 2002). This is in part because students were already used to having a new teacher each year, and the traditional “egg-crate” school did not require much collaboration among teachers (Lortie, 2002). Furthermore, structural aspects of traditional public schools also support female employees, such as the alignment with schooling hours and the nine-month position. The field of teaching has been “low status” because it was comprised mostly of women and catered to “low-status” clientele (i.e., children; Labaree, 2004; Lortie, 2002). Educated women, with few other opportunities, turned to teaching, and indeed, some scholars have argued that as opportunities for women to work in other fields expanded, the quality of the teaching force declined because the most qualified female

teachers left the field to pursue these other opportunities (Corcoran, Evans, & Schwab, 2004).

Despite the large share of women in teaching, this has not translated into more women represented in leadership positions or equal pay scales (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Lynch et al., 2012). As the field became feminized, males began to seek positions in school administration (Tyack, 1974). From 1820 to 1900, women were hired for teaching positions and most administrative positions were given to men, but some women did serve as lower-level administrators (Giddings, 1984; Solomon, 1985; Woody, 1966). By the early 1900s, teaching and administrative positions became increasingly segregated by gender, and some states even passed laws to prevent women from moving into administrative roles (Beale, 1936). During the Great Depression, many women lost teaching and administrative positions (Gribskov, 1980). Then, during World War II, because of the lack of male candidates in the job market, women had more opportunities to enter administration. However, the same disparities by gender returned during the postwar period. There was a notion that education was becoming “too much of a women’s world” (Sexton, 1973, pp. 138–139), with concerns that having too many female teachers and administrators in school would “emasculate” boys. Women experienced persistent bias in the education job market and ideological pushback when they began taking on leadership positions. Despite gains made by feminist movements beginning in the late 1960s, men still outnumber women in education leadership positions in the 21st century.

The history of gender inequality in education helps to provide context to the ways in which teaching and leadership are viewed. As market-based reforms intensify in the United States and around the world, there is a need to reexamine gender inequities in schools.

Women in Market-Based Educational Settings

In this section, we review the limited research on women in market-based educational settings. In particular, we seek to understand how the literature to date can inform our understanding of how the expansion of market-driven reforms in education affects women working in the U.S. educational system. We thus review the literature that examines this particular intersection, before drawing on wider literature on women and the economy.

Several studies have examined the parental side of markets in education (e.g., school choice), and how changes to education environments have gendered impacts (e.g., André-Bechely, 2005; Cooper, 2007; Goswami, 2015; Power, 2006). Power (2006), for example, describes the misogynistic nature of school choice, in that it shifts the blame for social and educational inequities to women, particularly middle-class women, who are portrayed as selfish and hypocritical when they seek educational opportunities for their children, and as key agents in the reproduction of inequalities. This shifts blame from the public sphere to the private sphere of family decision making, which is gendered, particularly in the realm of schooling.

Advocates of school choice do not address gender, referring to the “family” as the decision-making unit. School-choice decisions are complex, but a gendered division of labor, with gendered assumptions about families and markets, often results in mothers

taking on the main responsibility (David, 1997; Stambach & David, 2005). In one study, fathers became involved when private schools were a part of the choice set because of the financial investment required, but were otherwise absent (David, 1997). Furthermore, little research explores fathers' behaviors in choosing schools for their children, not only in studies in school choice, but also in parental involvement (Domínguez-Pareto, 2014). The societal expectation that mothers should take care of their children is strongly reflected in the research. In the United Kingdom, reporters ask female politicians, more than male politicians, about where they send their children to school, and are blamed for exacerbating inequities when they attend elite schools (Power, 2006). In empirical research, too, it is mothers' choices that are highlighted. This is perhaps because mothers are more accessible during the working day for school visits, play a greater role in educational decisions, or are seen as pushing for their children in schools (Power, 2006). This, however, paints mothers as selfish and incapable of acting on public principles. It is the role of public policy to protect education from the ruthless self-interest of "pushy moms" (Power, 2006).

In contrast to this view of mothers' involvement, women may seek better educational opportunities not only for their children but also for a community. Cooper (2007), in her study of parental choice, finds that mothers sought the best educational opportunities for their children, but this was not an individualistic act. It was personal and political work to resist oppression; mothers viewed the quest for school choice as part of the collective survival and uplift of Black people, not an individualistic quest for the best education for their children only (Cooper, 2007).

While these studies have explored the gendered nature of school choice from the parents' perspective, few studies have examined how such reforms have gendered impacts for women working inside of schools (e.g., teachers, school leaders). The new economy, as embodied in market-driven reforms in education, creates what scholars have called a "24/7 work culture" (Lynch et al., 2012), which, under managerial policies, valorizes long work hours, competition, organizational dedication, and "carelessness," or a focus on product not people. Increasingly, reforms focus on "marketplace discourses" (Sisson & Iverson, 2014, p. 224) about the professionalization of teaching and leadership, accountability, and efficiency, which pits the idea of educators as caregivers against educators as experts (Sisson & Iverson, 2014). These reforms, like other neoliberal policies, thus have important implications for gender. While there is limited research on this phenomenon in K-12 education systems, in their study of neoliberalism in higher education in the United Kingdom, Lynch et al. (2012) examine how these cultural codes, enshrined in senior appointments and in the process for recruiting senior positions, affect the work of senior managers, especially women. Their findings have important applications to the K-12 context. The selection of leaders is a subjective process, and Lynch et al. find that it can be a homogenizing process, where there is a tendency to want to select leaders with familiar qualities and characteristics. This may also be the case in K-12 decentralized settings, whereby charter-school board members and staff could be selected in similar ways. Furthermore, Lynch et al. find that the 24/7 work culture is at odds with the care work that women are responsible for, which is essential for the economy. In their study, they find that search committees try to explain why women do not apply to the job, referencing the fact that they have young children, for example, but do not problematize the gendered division of care labor (Lynch et al., 2012).

New forms of educational governance have new modes of exclusion and inclusion (Blackmore, 2011), which create new hierarchies through professionalism, competition, and entrepreneurial behaviors (Stromquist, 2010). For example, the *new economy*, and its reliance on formal and informal networks, creates soft and hard capital that will provide the most enduring connections (Blackmore, 2011). This is particularly true for the flexible and mobile entrepreneurial male educator who is able to exploit organizational and cross-organizational networks to advance his career (Blackmore, 2011). The lack of clear career pathways (e.g., teacher to administrator) creates uncertainty and requires a network-based approach to creating a career trajectory. While this shift from more rigid career pathways could provide women with a hope of seeing changes in their positions more quickly, the lack of affirmative action assumes principles of meritocracy and thus does little to eliminate gender barriers (Carvalho & Machado, 2010). We explore these aspects of the new economy in greater detail below.

Challenges for Gender Equity Under Privatization: Social Networks, Career Pathways, Salary Disparities, Unions, and Leadership Styles

In this section, we draw on existing literature to develop six propositions about the impact of market-based reforms and privatization on female teachers and leaders. Throughout the section, we highlight these propositions (also in Table 1), and we return to them in the discussion to identify important areas for future research.

Women in the New Economy—The *new economy* is changing the nature of work culture, and is now seeping into the field of K-12 education. The new economy brings a host of new opportunities and challenges for gender equity (Acker, 1992; Williams, Muller, & Kilanski, 2012). The new economy—characterized by job insecurity, contracting, precarious work that is conducted in teams rather than with managers, globalization, and networking as the primary vehicle for future opportunities, with career “maps” replacing career ladders—reproduces inequalities in particular ways (Williams et al., 2012). While there is an explicit focus on recruiting more women and people of color in the new economy, suggesting that diversity, at least superficially, is valued, some research suggests that women and people of color are in fact penalized for promoting diversity, whereas White and male leaders are not (Hekman, Johnson, Foo, & Yang, 2016). This suggests that the new economy, which downplays affirmative action yet claims to value diversity, may not present real opportunities for underrepresented groups, even when members of the group gain access to leadership positions.

In an ethnographic study of women geoscientists in the new economy (Williams et al., 2012), researchers found that the new organization of workplaces appears gender neutral on the surface, and the accompanying lack of rigidity has the potential to be even more compatible with women’s careers. However, the authors find that teamwork can disadvantage women on a male-dominated team, and individuals’ contributions are obscured. It can also be harder to be assertive, and to be heard. Furthermore, the concept of career maps gives the perception that women can manage their own careers, but without standardized job descriptions, there is more confusion about duties, and raises and promotions can seem arbitrary and maintain gender disparities. Finally, networking is

fundamental to the new economy, but the authors found that the most powerful networks in the oil industry, the focus of the study, were heterosexual male-dominated, involving golf or hunting trips, fantasy football, and strippers, whereas women's-only networks existed for mentoring but were not necessarily beneficial for advancement to powerful positions.

Similarly, in education, we see a shift toward a more *networked economy*, which can exclude women and people of color from moving up the career ladder. In this networked economy, information about jobs and access to those who do hiring is available through informal or unofficial means, wherein actors rely on their contacts (i.e., social networks) for job leads, status, and social capital. Previous research has shown that social networks tend to be segregated by race and gender, and that these separations lead to unequal access to opportunities, favoring networks comprised of White males (McDonald, 2011). Therefore, in our first proposition, we predict that as privatization and market-based reforms expand, creating cities with large concentrations of charter schools and alternative teacher pathways (e.g., Detroit, Washington, D.C., New Orleans), and where there are increasingly flexible and rapid career pathways, social networks will become increasingly important for securing jobs, with important implications for who has access to and can benefit from these networks (Proposition 1). While the charter school sector is the most illustrative of this shift to the new economy and neoliberal models, traditional public schools are also seeing similar shifts, particularly with increased accountability policies in the past decade, the adoption of "portfolio management models" in many large urban districts (e.g., Bulkley, Levin, & Henig, 2010), and the growth of alternative educator pathways such as New Leaders for New Schools and Teach For America (Scott, Trujillo, & Rivera, 2016).

The informal nature of the new economy (e.g., charter-school sector), which increasingly relies on networks, can be homogenizing because of homosociability, the tendency to hire and select staff with familiar qualities and characteristics (Lynch et al., 2012). Indeed, research in K-12 education has found that access to the networks that lead to the hiring of superintendents are often closed off to women, especially women of color (Clark, 2011; Blount, 1998). There are important applications of this idea to market-based school settings. In particular, there is a need to study the social networks of K-12 teachers and leaders as they seek jobs in deregulated environments that do not have typical pathways from university preparation programs to schools. Indeed, in places like Louisiana, only a BA is needed to secure a teaching position. Other states are also considering removing requirements for school and district leadership (e.g., McGee, 2015). Therefore, how prospective teachers and leaders make use of their social networks in finding initial and subsequent jobs is a fruitful area of research.

While the study of how social networks influence job search and hiring is an aspect well studied in the private sector (e.g., Bian, 1997; Campbell, 1988; Granovetter, 1973; Lin & Dumin, 1986; Montgomery, 1992), it has hardly been studied in the education sector (for exception, see Cannata, 2011). In education, researchers have explored how networks create inequalities in parents' decision making and access to schooling options for their children, and how social interactions and networks via organizations can generate social capital (e.g., Bell, 2009; Small, 2010), but have rarely examined the role of social networks in teachers' or school leaders' job search processes or career pathways. The sociological research shows

how many jobs are found through connections and social networks in the private sector, but less research has examined whether this is also the case in the K-12 public sector once salary schedules, teacher tenure, and teachers' unions are no longer factors, or have limited influence.

Research suggests that in a networked economy, women and people of color will be disadvantaged due to the “old boy’s club”—referring to the wide and tight network among White elite males, often excluding females and people of color, whereby existing ties generate opportunities for those allowed into the circle (Blackmore, 2011; Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006). However, other research has explored how people of color use their navigational capital to succeed in contexts that are mostly White (Yosso, 2005). In places like Boston, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and New Orleans, where the number of Black teachers has declined, sometimes alongside the rise of charter schools (Barrett & Harris, 2015; Layton, 2015; White, 2016), such questions are critical to examine intersectionality—exploring simultaneously the ways in which networks operate to provide access to or limit opportunities for women, people of color, and women of color.

Finally, the organizational dedication and “24/7 work culture” prevalent in the new economy are also relevant in education markets (Lynch et al., 2012). Charter schools are known for their long hours, high teacher and leadership turnover, and 24/7 work culture. Indeed, the required hours at many charter schools are inconsistent with work–life balance or even with childcare hours. Charter-management organizations such as the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) have been criticized for their “churn and burn” strategies toward human capital (e.g., Monahan, 2014). Indeed, charter schools have higher teacher turnover rates (e.g., Miron & Applegate, 2007; Stuit & Smith, 2012). Furthermore, research on teaching and leadership more generally has noted the *culture of unhappiness* in schools facing increased external pressures and accountability under neoliberal policies, which can lead to burnout and exhaustion (Bottery, 2003; Bullough, 2012; Maxcy, 2009). These facets may be exacerbated in choice settings, with implications for retention of teachers and leaders, especially women.

Given increasing evidence that teachers are the most important school-level variable in predicting student outcomes (e.g., Chetty, Friedman, & Rockoff, 2011), charter schools are starting to focus on teacher retention, providing, for example, on-site daycare (e.g., Monahan, 2014). However, these discussions do not address gender, even though teaching is predominantly female. Despite criticism over the long workdays and low salaries at KIPP and other charter schools, few scholars have examined this from a gender perspective. We thus propose that the 24/7 work culture will disproportionately disadvantage women and privilege men (Proposition 2).

Next, we examine the potential implications for salary disparities by gender under privatization and market-based reforms.

Salary Disparities by Gender—There is a lengthy history in the United States of federal policy efforts to address workplace and wage discrimination against women. Launched in

1961 under President John F. Kennedy, the first Presidential Commission on the Status of Women developed recommendations on private and public sector discrimination and culminated in the Equal Pay Act (EPA), which barred all wage discrimination on the basis of gender, establishing the *equal pay for equal work* doctrine that exists today. Traditional views of women's roles in the workplace have shifted dramatically since the passage of the EPA. As of 2009, half of all workers in the United States were female; women also served as the primary breadwinners in four in 10 families, and 70% of families that had children at home also had a working mother (Boushey & O'Leary, 2009). Moreover, 40% of working women held managerial level positions (Boushey & O'Leary, 2009).

While the wage gap has narrowed since the 1970s, on average, women across the United States still only earn 78% of what men do (American Association of University Women [AAUW], 2015). Taking an intersectional view, this wage gap also varies by racial background. For example, Latina women earn 54% of what White men earn, for example, and Black women earn 63% of what White men earn (AAUW, 2015). The gender wage gap also increases with age, where females earn 90% of what men do until age 35, with median female incomes dropping to 75% thereafter. These trends may align with childbearing age, when women take time off to care for their children (in part because fathers may earn higher salaries). As a result, women may face negative consequences in terms of promotion and career level. Progress for females therefore has stalled in recent years, with women facing fewer high-paying job opportunities due to work environments that are not family friendly and lower rates of entry into higher paying science, math, engineering, and technology fields (Boushey & O'Leary, 2009). Furthermore, despite gains over the past several generations, some scholars argue that much of this research and policy effort continues to focus on helping women gain "equal access to men's spheres" with limited or "no major challenges to the current system" or structures (C. Marshall, 1999, p. 65).

In education, research has also revealed gender-based disparities in teacher and administrator pay (Ringler, McFadden, & Ford, 2011), despite rigid salary structures in most districts (e.g., Lee & Smith, 1990; Rumberger & Thomas, 1993). While there is a belief that pay inequity is not possible in public education because of uniform salary schedules for teachers—which many argue are inefficient (e.g., Hanushek, 2007), if equitable—salary disparities still arise by gender. Using a random sample and multilevel models to account for labor-market conditions, Lee and Smith (1990) examined teacher salaries and found a salary difference in high schools, favoring males, and variation by school type. The researchers argued that it is likely initial placement on the salary scale that generates these disparities. Using a similar methodology, Rumberger and Thomas (1993) found an even larger gender differential in salaries for teachers. Therefore, rigid step-salary schedules do not necessarily result in gender-equitable salaries.

Similarly, these pay differentials also appear at higher administrative levels in K-12 education. In Texas, Meier and Wilkins (2002) examined gender differences among superintendents. They found that differences in superintendents' salaries are subtle rather than systematic, perhaps because their pay is open-record. However, pay differences arose when female superintendents replaced male superintendents and received lower compensation. Another study compared superintendents' salary differences by gender, size

of the districts, and regions in Texas (Burkman & Lester, 2013). There were no statistically significant gender differences in salaries, but their salaries varied significantly by district size and region.

Variations by education sector also suggest that while the step schedule still has inequities, they are less severe than those that arise in the private sector, perhaps due to the lack of union representation or regulation. Even after controlling for a number of teacher characteristics, studies have found gender-based inequities in teacher salaries, with a gap of 5% in public schools, 8% in Catholic private schools, and 12% in other privates (Lee & Smith, 1990). In public schools, the salary differential was only \$1,000, whereas in private schools, it was as high as \$2,600, even after controlling for teacher qualifications. Indeed, researchers have proposed that compensation in private schools be based on a transparent salary scale to prevent allegations of gender-based discrimination against women in wages (Beall, 1995).

Given these findings, and especially the lack of more recent research examining gender disparities in salary in K-12 settings, we offer several propositions and related areas of research that might illuminate these patterns. First, there is reason to believe that more discrimination in wages appears when wages become less fixed by salary schedule, and when schools are allowed more flexibility and discretion in setting salaries, as evidenced by the larger gap between male and female salaries in private schools (Lee & Smith, 1990). Thus, we propose that salary differentials between male and female teachers and leaders will be larger in charter schools than in traditional public schools (Proposition 3), and that policies around salary confidentiality in charter schools could also perpetuate gender-based (and race-based) wage disparities because it becomes more difficult to identify the presence of such inequities.

Teachers' Unions and Wage Disparities—Unions in education historically helped to close gender and race-based wage gaps. Thus, their removal under neoliberal policies generates new concerns about wage equity. Unions can help in care work especially by creating institutional mechanisms to help both clients (such as students) and workers (England & Folbre, 2003). Unions also negotiate for a range of benefits, including paid time off and maternity leave policies that can support women of childbearing age.

By removing unions, there is the risk of introducing more discretion and room for implicit bias in hiring and promotion decisions. In other words, when school and district leaders have more discretion over salary decisions, promotions, and job descriptions, there is more room for subjective decision making, which relies greatly on individuals' inherent racial and gender biases. Economists often argue that discrimination in profit-maximizing arenas cannot survive because they will ultimately choose the most qualified candidate to remain competitive (Saunders & Darity, 2003). However, empirical research has consistently shown that employers discriminate against applicants with names that seem African American or feminine, even when they have the same qualifications (e.g., Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Neumark, Bank, & Nort, 1996). Furthermore, there remain large, unexplained gaps in salary differences by gender (Altonji & Blank, 1999; Azmat & Petrongolo, 2014). In places where there is sufficient charter-school density, and where there is competition for

teachers and high accountability pressure, advocates argue that leaders might focus primarily on teacher “quality,” over personal attributes because they must succeed in a competitive and high-stakes environment. However, the lack of profit motive in most public school settings, where even charter schools are most commonly run by non-profit agencies, leaves open the question of whether market incentives could even be expected to eliminate discrimination in this arguably less competitive environment.

Although some charter schools are unionized, one of the key outcomes of charter expansion has been limiting the role of unions (Sawchuk, 2015). Unions and salary scales were originally founded out of a desire for pay equity in terms of race and gender (A. Marshall, 2002; Murphy, 1990; Podgursky & Springer, 2007). Policies that limit the role of unions and remove salary scales, without any consideration of gender, introduce more discretion and a greater role for micro-politics. In doing so, they may exacerbate existing disparities in salary by race and gender. Removing unions may also have other potential impacts via changes in working conditions or leave policies (e.g., longer hours, unfair hiring/firing practices, or leave policies that are less family friendly). Since the time of Lee and Smith’s (1990) study on teacher disparities, which found gender disparities in pay to be larger in private schools than in public schools, we have seen other types of schools enter the market, such as charter schools, which are quasi-private in that they are run by private, usually non-profit organizations.

Therefore, we propose that as the power of teachers’ unions declines, and leaders are given more discretion over wage setting, increasing gaps will emerge between male and female compensation for teachers and leaders in the same positions with similar backgrounds and work quality, as well as potential negative impacts on working conditions or leave policies that support women of childbearing age (Proposition 4). In part, this will be a result of implicit bias on the part of administrators, but also may be shaped by gendered approaches to and comfort with negotiating salary (e.g., Leibbrandt & List, 2014), particularly when there is less job security in non-union schools. The decline of unions may be a key factor in explaining the greater wage disparities predicted in Proposition 3 and the 24/7 work culture described in Proposition 2.

We now examine implications for female leadership more closely. Even though women are overrepresented in the teaching force, they are not equally represented in leadership roles. The next section thus introduces challenges facing women in educational leadership.

Women’s Leadership Styles, Career Pathways, and Representation in Education—Research that examines gender disparities in a range of professions (e.g., airline, service, and childcare industries) demonstrates the persistence of traditional attitudes about female and male work (Ackerman, 2006; Hochschild, 1983/2012; Ruddick, 1989). Not only has caring work and emotional labor been found to be the perceived province of women, but organizational culture undervalues female attributes, often rendering women powerless in managerial positions (Kanter, 2005) or forcing women to adapt to male-derived bureaucratic work structures (Ferguson, 1984). These perceptions may shape the career ladders and ultimate advancement in women’s careers.

In education, women are underrepresented in leadership positions, despite being overrepresented among the teaching force (NCES, 2013). Descriptive statistics on women in senior positions, including a report from the American Association of School Administrators, reveal even larger disparities, although there has been improvement in female representation since the 1980s (Kowalski, McCord, Peterson, Young, & Ellerson, 2011; Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006). The percentage of female superintendents has grown from a mere 1.2% in 1982 to 24.1% in 2010. The percentage of superintendents who are racial minorities has grown from 2% in 1980 to 6% in 2010. Despite this growth, the percentage of female superintendents is still smaller than the percentage of male superintendents (Kowalski et al., 2011). For many years, the Department of Education did not even collect statistics on women in educational administration (e.g., Bell & Chase, 1993; C. Marshall, 1999). According to an NCES report (2013), more female principals are in primary schools (63.8%) than in high schools (30.1%), and more male principals are hired in large school districts (65.9%). These findings are consistent with other accounts (Kim & Brunner, 2009). As noted earlier, these disparities are likely due in part to repercussions for women who take time off to care for children at home. If seniority leads to promotion, and women lose their seniority when reentering the market after taking time off, women may suffer disproportionately in the market.

Women who aspire to the superintendency typically have more diverse and complex skill sets than aspiring men because women's career paths often include both teaching and staff positions (Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Brunner & Kim, 2010). However, women have to go through more levels of job positions to become superintendents. Female and male career paths show that men have more job opportunities and higher visibility than women and fewer barriers to promotion (Kim & Brunner, 2009). Men, thus, rise more quickly into these positions in traditional school systems, a pattern that may be perpetuated or exacerbated under privatization. This glass-ceiling phenomenon, which prevents a qualified person from advancing, also appears in women's access to advancement in higher education (Iverson, 2011).

Research on women in leadership has also suggested that female principals have different leadership styles than male principals, with different effects on teachers' work (e.g., Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Lee, Smith, & Cioci, 1993). These styles and the extent to which they are recognized or valued may affect women's salaries and movement up the career ladder. For example, Lee et al. (1993) found that male teachers feel less empowered and effective when they work with female leaders, whereas female teachers feel more empowered. They also found that female leadership styles could be characterized as more collaborative than individual, more focused on caring elements, such as an individual person's story or context, whereas male leadership focused more on management and competition. Flumerfelt, Feun, and Maxfield (2011) found that leaders' learning behaviors are also gendered. While there are differences by gender in leadership styles, there is no evidence that one approach is more effective than the other. Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of women's ways of leading (Alston, 1999; Brunner, 2000; Fulk & DeSanctis, 2001; Grogan, 2000; Mandell & Pherwani, 2003; Méndez-Morse, 2004; Ortiz & Marshall, 1998; Skrla, Reyes, & Scheurich, 2000; Zaccaro, 2001). Also, women's leadership styles often support democratic and participative organizational reforms (Fresher & Fresher, 1979; Gross & Trask, 1976;

Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). Furthermore, it is important to note that we do not intend to dichotomize and stereotype leadership styles, but it is important to be aware that these behaviors have been documented in the literature, even if socially constructed (Blackmore, 1993; Puwar, 2008).

Research has also shown that women avoid competitive settings more than men, and fare worse in such settings, even when they perform equally as well at their jobs or tasks (e.g., Dato & Nieken, 2014; Jurajda & München, 2011; Niederle & Vesterlund, 2005, 2008; Preece & Stoddard, 2015; Sutter & Glatzle-Rutzler, 2015). For example, Dato and Nieken (2014) find that male and female participants performed equally well in a tournament in a controlled lab setting, but that men were more likely to use sabotage to compete. Similarly, Preece and Stoddard (2015) find that when politically active individuals are primed to consider the competitive nature of politics, this has a strong negative effect on women's desire to pursue political office, but has no effect on men's interest. These patterns even appear among adolescents, with boys tending to have more positive attitudes toward competition whereas girls tend to be more positive regarding cooperation (e.g., Ahlgren & Johnson, 1979). As some psychologists have noted, men and women may have different motivations for competition, even when they do compete. According to one study, men tend to be more likely to compete to win whereas women are more likely to compete to excel (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010). Furthermore, even when women do engage in competitive behaviors, they might be perceived negatively despite engaging in the same competitive or aggressive strategies as men. Women face a double-edged sword: They must demonstrate leadership skills by being competitive, which can also be perceived as "bossy" or make them unlikeable, but such behaviors do not have the same type of negative impact for men (e.g., Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013; Francis, 2000, 2009; Wilkins, 2012a, 2012b).

Furthermore, contextual factors can shape how such patterns play out in practice. Indeed, Wilkins (2012a) finds that this story is more complicated. While he does find that the "neoliberal classroom," which emphasizes individualization and competition, does encourage gendered competitive behaviors, with boys more interested in intra-group competition, and girls more likely to reject elements of competition, including the idea of winners and losers, there were girls who violated this clean distinction. He concludes that the lived experience of competition in schools is more complex than predicted by previous research on competition and gender. Similarly, scholars in economics have found that particular policies can encourage or discourage female participation in competitive tournaments. For example, Niederle and Vesterlund (2008) find that when an affirmative action policy was introduced, which required equal amounts of women and men to become winners of a competitive tournament, women were more likely to compete. However, Booth and Nolen (2012) found no gender differences in competitive behaviors between boys and girls after controlling for gender environment. They concluded that the gendered competitive behaviors might reflect social learning rather than inherent gender traits. Gneezy, Leonard, and List (2009) find that women in matrilineal societies are more competitively inclined than men, thus also suggesting that context plays an important role. At the same time, some studies find no gender differences in performance, especially when controlling for general differences in psychological attitudes, such as risk aversion and self-confidence (e.g., De

Paola, Gioia, & Scoppa, 2015; Lavy, 2013). Therefore, contextual policy and organizational factors can significantly influence the success of women in competitive settings.

In light of these studies, we suggest that charter schools and systems (e.g., charter-management organizations) may perpetuate disparities in female and male representation in leadership (Proposition 5). Indeed, given the increasing numbers of non-traditional district and charter leaders (e.g., policies that only require a BA or do not require a background in education), we propose that there may even be fewer women in charter organizations or in district leadership positions in cities with large charterschool populations (e.g., portfolio districts), as there is no longer a need to rise up from the teacher ranks (still female-dominated) to be eligible for those positions.

Women may be underrepresented in senior positions because of assumptions about their leadership approaches and capabilities. Market-driven reforms emphasize competition over collaboration; for example, in districts with school choice, school leaders are expected to compete with one another for students (e.g., Betts & Loveless, 2005). Although market mechanisms of choice and competition are supposedly gender neutral, they have different implications for male and female leadership, and can be viewed as valuing competition (masculinity) more than collaboration (femininity). In light of these leadership differences, female leaders may respond to the competitive pressures resulting from school choice in different ways, perhaps focusing more on the internal organization, whereas male leaders may position themselves as competitors. Whether real or perceived, these leadership styles may have important implications for the hiring and success of female leaders in such roles. Research might examine the leadership philosophies present in different market-oriented settings, in schools facing increased competition, and how, if at all, these vary by gender.

As market-based reforms emphasizing choice and competition expand, it is important to examine how female leaders navigate these competitive markets to compete for staff and students, and the extent to which they are willing to engage in “sabotage” in the recruitment and retention of students and staff, as compared with male leaders. Indeed, a recent study showed that there were major differences between male and female leaders in perceptions of competition in school-choice settings (Jabbar, 2015). Female principals were far less likely to report competitors, even after controlling for a number of variables related to their experience and schools in which they worked. These findings demonstrate different perceptions and perhaps ultimately behaviors in relation to competition. These findings suggest that in market-based settings (e.g., districts with school choice and competition), female leaders may, on average, respond to competition in ways different from male leaders (Proposition 6). These differences in perception and response to competitive pressures are important to study empirically.

Discussion, Future Research, and Implications

This review set out to examine how market-based reforms might impact female actors within schools (e.g., teachers, school leaders). Drawing on the literature in educational leadership, economics (including feminist economics), and education policy, we outlined specific ways in which market-based policies have, or have the potential, to affect female leaders and

teachers. Education is considered a feminized field because of the large percentage of female teachers, but this does not translate into leadership, pay scales, or representation among the highest positions. Furthermore, feminist perspectives are usually not considered in education policy more generally, perhaps due to the dominance of post-positivist and economic perspectives in policy research (e.g., Blank, 2002; Stone, 2001). This is, in part, a shortcoming of educational policy research, but also a result of gender equity scholars not situating their topics within a policy or political framework (C. Marshall, 1999). Schools also contribute actively to inequalities by gender, in part because leadership and teacher preparation programs do not always work to undo gender biases (e.g., C. Marshall, 1999; C. Marshall & Young, 2013), even in programs that emphasize multicultural teaching and address race, racism, and White privilege (Jones & Hughes, 2016). White females are still the majority of the teacher population, so it is essential to provide more community-based experience in teacher education to help teachers become aware of not only White privilege but also gender inequality so that they can successfully teach diverse student bodies (Jones & Hughes, 2016).

We reviewed literature in economics on gender, including feminist economics, and literature on wage gaps, gender, and the new economy in the private sector. Based on this research, we propose that as the public sector becomes infused with private sector values and practices, we may observe greater disparities between men and women in education. Privatization and neoliberal policies are inherently gendered, while having the appearance of gender neutrality (e.g., Griffen, 2007). Both researchers and policymakers have largely ignored the potential and actual impacts of market-based reforms and privatization on women, especially female teachers and leaders.

We argue that as market-driven policies grow and spread, their emphasis on deregulation, flexibility, and greater discretion may in fact limit women's career pathways. As social networks become increasingly important for securing teaching and leadership jobs, rather than traditional pathways, women and people of color may be less able to access and benefit from these networks. Market-driven policies and deregulation may also allow implicit bias to play a greater role in hiring and pay decisions, further exacerbating salary and leadership disparities. The decline of teachers' unions and the deregulation of entry into teaching and leadership may further perpetuate these disparities. Furthermore, as we have observed in the charter sector, demands for teachers and leaders to be dedicated to the organization and its mission and work 24/7 may have disproportionate effects on women who, because of gendered divisions of labor, may have to care for children or family members in the home.

In this review, we examined how features of market-based reforms, such as the 24/7 work culture, the valorization of long work hours, and competition, have implications for female teachers and leaders (e.g., Lynch et al., 2012). We specified the ways in which these inequities may arise through six propositions, which we review next and for which we propose areas for further research. Furthermore, while our focus was on gender, intersectional approaches that include race and class are necessary to fully understand how the expansion of market-based reforms impacts women, women of color, and communities.

After laying out our propositions, we suggest that scholars attend to several understudied areas of research. In particular, we draw on theory and research from other fields to outline several important areas for further inquiry in education policy and leadership. First, in relation to Proposition 1, which poses that as the number of cities with large concentrations of charter schools grows, social networks may play greater role in accessing jobs, we suggest researchers examine how the expansion of market-based reforms increasingly relies on social networks that may privilege certain actors over others, particularly by race and gender. Studies examining these networks could attend to the role of race, class, and gender in the structure of these networks, as well as in how information flows or is used within these networks. Similarly, the networked nature of employment in market-driven settings could also be studied from the demand side, as in Lynch et al.'s (2012) study of higher education hiring decisions. For example, research might explore how school leaders or charter network leaders seek principals and teachers, the internal micro political dynamics that shape their decisions, and how they rely on their networks to identify potential candidates (Lynch et al., 2012). In particular, how school leaders conceptualize “talent,” and how it might be gendered or racialized, is important to understand, and has policy implications for gender and racial equity and representation in the teaching and leadership forces.

In relation to Proposition 2, which suggests that the demands for organizational dedication and 24/7 work culture in many large charter-management organizations may disproportionately disadvantage women, researchers could closely study such organizations to see how their norms and values shape the experiences of school actors and how they impact women in particular. Findings from this research may also be useful to charter organizations seeking to boost their retention rates and reduce burnout. Future research might also track the growth of charter-sector teachers' unions (e.g., Beabout & Gill, 2015) to explore how such bargaining agreements come about and how they affect teachers' working conditions.

Propositions 3 and 4 emphasize the potential impacts of market-based reforms on gender- and race-based salary disparities for teachers and leaders, even when they occupy the same positions and have similar backgrounds and work quality. We suggest that researchers reexamine salary disparities, comparing the private and public sectors in education, as well as the “quasi-private,” alongside the decline of teachers' unions. Decreasing transparency in salary scales, with the removal of strict salary schedules and teachers' unions, creates opportunities for school leaders to be more flexible and responsive to teachers' needs, but may ultimately disadvantage women—as it has in the private sector more generally. Salary transparency is important for gender equity, and wages may be less transparent in charter organizations. We urge researchers to closely examine salary disparities by race and gender in charter and traditional sectors, as well as in non-profit organizations designed to support education reforms, both in teaching and leadership positions. In particular, there are surprisingly few studies exploring trends in salaries for leadership positions by gender.

By also incorporating newer value-added measures of teacher effectiveness alongside typical measures of quality from years of experience and certification area, researchers can better explain the reasons for any gender disparities. There is a need to replicate studies in

new organizational types by drawing on the economic theory of wage discrimination and by holding all else equal to observe differences in mean wages. There are now more sophisticated measures, such as value-added measures, albeit with shortcomings, to capture teacher effectiveness that could also be used as controls in such studies (e.g., Harris, 2011). There is a need for researchers to update previous studies (e.g., Lee & Smith, 1990; Rumberger & Thomas, 1993) to include charter schools, while also using multiple methods, including large-scale quantitative analyses that can examine such differences systematically, and in-depth qualitative studies examining how decisions are made on the ground, what conditions influence the awarding of salary to teachers and leaders, and what organizational factors contribute to smaller or larger disparities in salary by gender and race. Little is known about *how* gender discrimination plays out in the workplace (Bobbitt-Zeher, 2011). Other researchers can use audit studies (e.g., removing applicants' names or randomly assigning "male" or "female" sounding names to resumes or applications) to see whether there are systematic differences in responses to female and male applicants with the same qualifications.

Proposition 5 states that the informal nature of career pathways in decentralized and privatized settings may create new opportunities for women, but may also create new challenges in terms of access. There is thus a need for research to systematically examine the differences in career pathways to leadership positions, representation in charter schools and boards, as well as representation in central offices in districts with large numbers of charter schools (e.g., portfolio districts). Future studies might explore whether such contexts privilege men, and examine women's representation in leadership positions, as well as their salaries and turnover rates.

Proposition 6 states that in market-based settings, women may respond to competitive pressures differently than men—due to the constrained nature of the actions they can take. We suggest that research unpack how women perceive and respond to competitive pressures resulting from school choice. Similar to research that has found some evidence of different leadership styles, women may have identified other (non-competitive) strategies for succeeding in the marketplace, or there might be detrimental effects of increased school competition on women's career pathways and success in leadership in settings with school choice.

In sum, a broad range of theoretical perspectives, epistemologies, and methods are needed to generate a robust literature on how market-based reforms impact women in elementary and secondary education. These approaches should certainly include, but need not be limited to, feminist epistemologies and methodologies (e.g., Allan et al., 2010; C. Marshall, 1999). Indeed, a broad range of research will be needed to unpack and test these relationships and mechanisms, including methods that can make causal claims, such as experiments and large-scale quasi-experimental quantitative studies, as well as in-depth qualitative and critical research. A multifocal approach will ensure that these issues are explored through multiple theoretical and methodological lenses and perspectives (Young, 1999).

Our review also highlights several policy implications. Market-based reforms are not gender neutral in their impacts, and therefore, they cannot be addressed with gender-neutral

remedies (C. Marshall, 1999). Discourses in policy reports should address constructions of gender and gender equity explicitly rather than assume gender neutrality (Allan, 2010). Many of these market-driven policies aim, rightly, to give school leaders and educators on the ground more autonomy and discretion; however, in some areas, such as compensation and hiring, this discretion may allow for individual bias to play a greater role. Indeed, research has shown the role of institutional policies as a mechanism for discrimination (Bobbitt-Zeher, 2011). In districts and cities with expanding market-based policies (e.g., school choice, new teacher pay systems), we suggest policymakers closely examine what areas require greater flexibility and discretion, and where there may be a need to restrict discretion to generate equitable outcomes for women. In focusing on gender equity, however, policymakers and researchers should ensure that concepts of gender equality are not co-opted by advocates of neoliberal reforms, as they have been in international settings (e.g., Calkin, 2015; Moeller, 2013). Policymakers should also consider the gendered impacts of their policy proposals, particularly those that privilege informal networks and decrease transparency in decision making.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Janelle Scott, Irenka Domínguez-Pareto, Brendan Maxcy, Terrance Green, Joshua Childs, and Lauren Schudde for their helpful comments and suggestions on this manuscript.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Biographies

Huriya Jabbar is an Assistant Professor in the Education Policy and Planning program in the Department of Educational Administration at The University of Texas at Austin. Her research examines the social and political dimensions of market-based reforms in education, including school choice and competition in K-12 and higher education contexts.

Wei-Ling Sun is a Doctoral Student in the Education Policy and Planning program in the Department of Educational Administration at The University of Texas at Austin. Her research examines the cultural political economy of the school-to-prison pipeline.

Melinda A. Lemke is an Assistant Professor in the University at Buffalo's Graduate School of Education, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy. She also collaborates with Swansea University, College of Law and Criminology, on a study examining the rights and needs of displaced children. Her research examines how educational actors are attentive to underserved student populations, multisector collaboration and societal violence, gaps between policy and practice, and global human rights issues.

Emily Germain is a Doctoral Student in the Education Policy and Planning program in the Department of Educational Administration at The University of Texas at Austin. Her research examines markets in education; geography, equity, and opportunity; and sustainable development.

References

- Acker J. (1992). Gendering organizational theory. In Mills AJ & Tancred P. (Eds.), *Gendering organizational analysis* (pp. 248–260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ackerman DJ (2006). The costs of being a child care teacher: Revisiting the problem of low wages. *Educational Policy*, 20, 85–112. doi:10.1177/0895904805285283
- Ahlgren A, & Johnson DW (1979). Sex differences in cooperative and competitive attitudes from the 2nd through the 12th grades. *Developmental Psychology*, 15, 45–49. doi:10.1037/h0078076
- Allan EJ (2010). Feminist poststructuralism meets policy analysis: An overview. In Allan EJ, Iverson SV, & Ropers-Huilman R. (Eds.), *Reconstructing policy in higher education: Feminist poststructural perspectives* (pp. 11–36). London, England: Routledge.
- Allan EJ, Iverson SV, & Ropers-Huilman R. (Eds.). (2010). *Reconstructing policy in higher education: Feminist poststructural perspectives*. London, England: Routledge.
- Alston JA (1999). Climbing hills and mountains: Black females making it to the superintendency. In Brunner CC (Ed.), *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency* (pp. 79–90). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Altonji J, & Blank R. (1999). Race and gender in the labor market. In Ashenfelter O. & Card D. (Eds.), *Handbook of labor economics* (Vol. 3, pp. 3143–3259). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Amanatullah ET, & Tinsley CH (2013). Punishing female negotiators for asserting too much . . . or not enough: Exploring why advocacy moderates backlash against assertive female negotiators. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 120, 110–122. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.03.006.
- American Association of University Women. (2015). The simple truth about the gender pay gap. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/research/the-simple-truth-about-the-gender-pay-gap/>
- Anderson G, Mungal A, Pini M, Scott J, & Thomson P. (2013). Policy, equity, and diversity in global context. In Tillman LC & Scheurich JJ (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational leadership for equity and diversity* (pp. 43–61). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Andersson K, & Kvist E. (2015). The neoliberal turn and the marketization of care: The transformation of eldercare in Sweden. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 22, 274–287. doi:10.1177/1350506814544912
- André-Béchely L. (2005). Public school choice at the intersection of voluntary integration and not-so-good neighborhood schools: Lessons from parents' experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41, 267–305. doi:10.1177/0013161X04269593
- Apple MW (2006). *Educating the right way: Markets, standards, god, and inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Au W, & Ferrare JJ (2014). Sponsors of policy: A network analysis of wealthy elites, their affiliated philanthropies, and charter school reform in Washington State. *Teachers College Record*, 116, 1–24. [PubMed: 26120219]
- Azmat G, & Petrongolo B. (2014). Gender and the labor market: What have we learned from field and lab experiments? *Labour Economics*, 30, 32–40. doi:10.1016/j.labeco.2014.06.005
- Ball SJ (2007). *Education PLC: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. London, England: Taylor & Francis.
- Barrett N, & Harris D. (2015). Significant changes in the New Orleans teacher workforce. New Orleans, LA: Tulane University.
- Beabout BR, & Gill I. (2015). Why here and why now? Teacher motivations for unionizing in a New Orleans charter school. *Journal of School Choice*, 9, 486–502. doi:10.1080/15582159.2015.1079467
- Beale HK (1936). *Are American teachers free? An analysis of restraints in American schools*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Beall J. (1995). Strategic management of private schools: Recruitment, compensation, development, and retention of teachers, and appendices. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED404745>

- Bell C. (2009). All choices created equal? The role of choice sets in the selection of schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84, 191–208. doi:10.1080/01619560902810146
- Bell C, & Chase S. (1993). The underrepresentation of women in school leadership. In Marshall C. (Ed.), *The new politics of race and gender* (pp. 141–154). London, England: Falmer.
- Bellas ML (1999). Emotional labor in academia: The case of professors. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561, 96–110. doi:10.1177/000271629956100107
- Beneria L. (2003). Economic rationality and globalization: A feminist perspective. In Ferber MA & Nelson JA (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 115–134). Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago.
- Bertrand M, & Mullainathan S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, 94, 991–1013.
- Besley T, & Ghatak M. (2005). Competition and incentives with motivated agents. *The American Economic Review*, 95, 616–636. doi:10.1257/0002828054201413
- Betts JR, & Loveless T. (Eds.). (2005). *Getting choice right: Ensuring equity and efficiency in education policy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Bian Y. (1997). Bringing strong ties back in: Indirect ties, network bridges, and job searches in China. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 366–385. doi:10.2307/2657311
- Blackmore J. (1993). “In the shadow of men:” The historical construction of educational administration as a “masculinist” enterprise. In Blackmore J. & Kenway J. (Eds.), *Gender matters in educational administration and policy: A feminist introduction* (pp. 27–48). Bristol, PA: Falmer.
- Blackmore J. (2011). Bureaucratic, corporate/market and network governance: Shifting spaces for gender equity in education. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18, 443–466. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00505.x
- Blank R. (2002). What do economists have to contribute to policy decision-making? *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 42, 817–824. doi:10.1016/S10629769(02)00154-0
- Blount J. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendency, 1873–1995*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bobbitt-Zeher D. (2011). Gender discrimination at work connecting gender stereotypes, institutional policies, and gender composition of workplace. *Gender & Society*, 25, 764–786. doi:10.1177/0891243211424741
- Booth A, & Nolen P. (2012). Choosing to compete: How different are girls and boys? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 81, 542–555. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2011.07.018
- Bottery M. (2003). The management and mismanagement of trust. *Educational Management & Administration*, 31, 245–261. doi:10.1177/0263211X03031003003
- Boushey H, & O’Leary A. (Eds.). (2009). *The Shriver report: A woman’s nation changes everything*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Available from <http://www.awomansnation.com/>
- Brunner CC (2000). *Principles of power: Women in the superintendency*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Brunner CC, & Grogan M. (2007). *Women leading school systems: Uncommon roads to fulfillment*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brunner CC, & Kim YL (2010). Are women prepared to be school superintendents? An essay on the myths and misunderstandings. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5, 276–309.
- Bulkley KE, Levin HM, & Henig J. (Eds.). (2010). *Between public and private: Politics, governance, and the new portfolio models for urban school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Bullough RV (2012). Cultures of (Un)happiness: Teaching, schooling, and light and dark humor. *Teachers and Teaching*, 18, 281–295. doi:10.1080/13540602.2012.629836
- Buras KL (2011). Race, charter schools, and conscious capitalism: On the spatial politics of whiteness as property (and the unconscionable assault on black New Orleans). *Harvard Educational Review*, 81, 296–331.

- Buras KL, & Urban South Grassroots Research Collective. (2013). New Orleans education reform: A guide for cities or a warning for communities? (Grassroots lessons learned, 2005–2012). *Berkeley Review of Education*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/3dd2726h>
- Burch P. (2009). *Hidden markets: The new education privatization*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burkman A, & Lester D. (2013). Superintendent salary study: Is there gender equity in Texas? *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 31, 38–54.
- Calkin S. (2015). Feminism, interrupted? Gender and development in the era of “Smart Economics.” *Progress in Development Studies*, 15, 295–307. doi:10.1177/1464993415592737
- Campbell K. (1988). Gender differences in job-related networks. *Work and Occupations*, 15, 179–200. doi:10.1177/0730888488015002003
- Cannata M. (2011). Charter schools and the teacher job search. *Journal of School Choice*, 5, 111–133. doi:10.1080/15582159.2011.548256
- Carvalho T, & Machado M. d. L. (2010). Gender and shifts in higher education managerial regimes. *Australian University Review*, 52, 33–42.
- Chetty R, Friedman JN, & Rockoff JE (2011). *The long-term impacts of teachers: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Chubb J, & Moe T. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America’s schools*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Clark D. (2011). Women leaders as superintendents: Stories of courage and character. In Martin JL (Ed.), *Women as leaders in education: Succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges* (Vol. 2, pp. 245–268). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Connell R, Fawcett B, & Meagher G. (2009). Neoliberalism, new public management and the human service professions. *Journal of Sociology*, 45, 331–338. doi:10.1177/1440783309346472
- Cooper CW (2007). School choice as “motherwork”: Valuing African-American women’s educational advocacy and resistance. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20, 491–512. doi:10.1177/0730888488015002003
- Corcoran S, Evans WN, & Schwab RM (2004). Women, the labor market, and the declining relative quality of teachers. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 23, 449–470. doi:10.1002/pam.20021
- Corcoran S, & Jennings JL (2015). *The gender gap in charter school enrollment*. New York, NY: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education. Retrieved from <http://ncspe.tc.columbia.edu/working-papers/OP223.pdf>
- Crawford M. (2006). *Transformations: Women, gender and psychology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dato S, & Nieken P. (2014). Gender differences in competition and sabotage. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 100, 64–80. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2014.01.012
- David M. (1997). Diversity, choice and gender. *Oxford Review of Education*, 23, 77–87. doi:10.1080/0305498970230107
- DeBray-Pelot EH, Lubienski CA, & Scott J. (2007). The institutional landscape of interest group politics and school choice. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82, 204–230. doi:10.1080/01619560701312947
- De Paola M, Gioia F, & Scoppa V. (2015). Are females scared of competing with males? Results from a field experiment. *Economics of Education Review*, 48, 117–128. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.06.002
- Dillard CB (1995). Leading with her life: An African American feminist (re) interpretation of leadership for an urban high school principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31, 539–563. doi:10.1177/0013161X9503100403
- Dillard CB (2000). The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen: Examining an endarkened feminist epistemology in educational research and leadership. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13, 661–681. doi:10.1080/09518390050211565
- Domínguez-Pareto I. (2014). *Learning advocacy: Decentering parental involvement discourse through the experiences of Latina mothers of children with disabilities in Northern California* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley.

- Eagly AH, & Carli LL (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- England P. (2003). Separate and soluble selves: Dichotomous thinking in economics. In Ferber MA & Nelson JA (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 33–60). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- England P, & Folbre N. (2003). Contracting for care. In Ferber MA & Nelson JA (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 61–80). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fawcett B, & Hanlon M. (2009). The “return to community:” Challenges to human service professionals. *Journal of Sociology*, 45, 433–444.
- Ferber MA, & Nelson JA (Eds.). (2003). *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man*. Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press.
- Ferguson KE (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Flumerfelt SR, Feun L, & Maxfield CR (2011). Understanding gender-based leadership learning behaviors. In Martin JL (Ed.), *Women as leaders in education: Succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges* (Vol. 2, pp. 195–219). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Francis B. (2000). The gendered subject: Students’ subject preferences and discussions of gender and subject ability. *Oxford Review of Education*, 26, 35–48. doi:10.1080/030549800103845
- Francis B. (2009). The role of the Boffin as abject Other in gendered performances of school achievement. *The Sociological Review*, 57, 645–669. doi:10.1111/j.1467954X.2009.01866.x
- Fresher JM, & Fresher RS (1979). Educational administration: A feminine profession. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15, 1–13. doi:10.1177/0013161X7901500204
- Fulk J, & DeSanctis G. (2001). Articulation of communication technology and organizational form. In Sharfritzt JM & Ott JS (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (5th ed., pp. 400–518). Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Galman S. (2012). *Wise and foolish virgins: White women at work in the feminized world of primary school teaching*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Giddings P. (1984). *When and where I enter: The impact of Black women on race and sex in America*. New York, NY: Morrow.
- Giroux HA (2008). *Against the terror of neoliberalism: Politics beyond the age of greed*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Giroux HA (2009). Obama’s dilemma: Postpartisan politics and the crisis of American education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79, 250–266.
- Gneezy U, Leonard L, & List JA (2009). Gender differences in competition: Evidence from a matrilineal and a patriarchal society. *Econometrica*, 77, 16371664. doi:10.3982/ECTA6690
- Gonzales LD, & Ayers DF (2015, November 7). An institutional logics approach to studying community college faculty as emotional labors. Paper presented at the Association to the Study of Higher Education: 40th Annual Conference, Denver, CO.
- Goswami N. (2015). Costs, security and discipline: Gendering the debate on school choice in India. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 22, 243–264. doi:10.1177/0971521515578245
- Granovetter MS (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360–1380. doi:10.1086/225469
- Gribskov M. (1980). Feminism and the woman school administrator. In Biklen SK & Brannigan MB (Eds.), *Women and educational leadership* (pp. 77–91). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Griffen P. (2007). Sexing the economy in a neo-liberal world order: Neo-liberal discourse and the (re)production of heteronormative heterosexuality. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 9, 220–238. doi:10.1111/j.1467856X.2007.00280.x
- Grogan M. (2000). Laying the groundwork for a reconception of the superintendency from feminist postmodern perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36, 117–142. doi:10.1177/00131610021968912
- Grogan M, & Shakeshaft C. (2011). *Women and educational leadership*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.
- Gross N, & Trask AE (1976). *The sex factor and the management of schools*. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Hanushek EA (2007). The single salary schedule and other issues of teacher pay. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82, 574–586. doi:10.1080/01619560701602975
- Harris DN (2011). *Value-added measures in education: What every educator needs to know*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Harvey D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610, 22–44. doi:10.1177/0002716206296780
- Healy K. (2009). A case of mistaken identity: The social welfare professions and the New Public Management. *Journal of Sociology*, 45, 401–418.
- Hekman DR, Johnson S, Foo MD, & Yang W. (2016). Does diversity-valuing behavior result in diminished performance ratings for nonwhite and female leaders? *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 1–59. doi:10.5465/amj.2014.0538
- Hibbard DR, & Buhrmester D. (2010). Competitiveness, gender, and adjustment among adolescents. *Sex Roles*, 63, 412–424. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9809-z
- Hochschild AR (2012). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1983)
- Hymowitz C, & Schellhardt TC (1986, March 24). The glass ceiling: Why women can't seem to break the invisible barrier that blocks them from top jobs. *Wall Street Journal*. Available from <http://www.wsj.com>
- Iverson SV (2011). Glass ceilings and sticky floors: Women and advancement in higher education. In Martin JL (Ed.), *Women as leaders in education: Succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges* (Vol. 1, pp. 79–105). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Jabbar H. (2015). Competitive networks and school leaders' perceptions: The formation of an education marketplace in post-Katrina New Orleans. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(6), 1093–1131.
- Jones S, & Hughes HE (2016). Changing the place of teacher education: Feminism, fear, and pedagogical paradoxes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 86(2), 161–182. doi:10.17763/0017-8055.86.2.161
- Jurajda Š, & Münich D. (2011). Gender gap in performance under competitive pressure: Admissions to Czech universities. *The American Economic Review*, 101, 514–518. doi:10.1257/aer.101.3.514
- Kanter RM (2005). Power failure in management circuits. In Shafritz JM, Ott JS, & Jang YS (Eds.), *Classics of organizational theory* (pp. 342–351). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Kim Y, & Brunner CC (2009). School administrators' career mobility to the superintendency: Gender differences in career development. *The Journal of Education Administration*, 47, 75–107. doi:10.1108/09578230910928098
- Kowalski TJ, McCord RS, Peterson GJ, Young PI, & Ellerson NM (2011). *The American school superintendent: 2010 decennial study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kretchmar K, Sondel B, & Ferrare JJ (2014). Mapping the terrain: Teach For America, charter school reform, and corporate sponsorship. *Journal of Education Policy*, 29, 742–759. doi:10.1080/02680939.2014.880812
- Labaree DF (1997). *How to succeed in school without really learning: The credentials race in American education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Labaree DF (2004). *The trouble with Ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lavy V. (2013). Gender differences in market competitiveness in a real workplace: Evidence from Performance-based pay tournaments among teachers. *The Economic Journal*, 123, 540–573. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0297.2012.02542.x
- Layton L. (2015, September 15). The number of black teachers has dropped in nine U.S. cities. *The Washington Post*. Available from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Lee VE, & Smith JB (1990). Gender equity in teachers' salaries: A multilevel approach. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12, 57–81. doi:10.2307/1163587
- Lee VE, Smith JB, & Cioci M. (1993). Teachers and principals: Gender-related perceptions of leadership and power in secondary schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15, 153–180. doi:10.3102/01623737015002153

- Leibbrandt A, & List JA (2014). Do women avoid salary negotiations? Evidence from a large-scale natural field experiment. *Management Science*, 61, 20162024. doi:10.1287/mnsc.2014.1994
- Lin N, & Dumin M. (1986). Access to occupations through social ties. *Social Networks*, 8, 365–385. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(86)90003-1
- Lipman P. (2011). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Lortie DC (2002). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press.
- Lubienski C, Scott J, & DeBray EH (2011). The rise of intermediary organizations in knowledge production, advocacy, and educational Policy. *Teachers College Record*. Available from <http://www.tcrecord.org>
- Lynch K, Grummell B, & Devine D. (2012). *New managerialism in education: Commercialization, carelessness, and gender*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mahitivanichcha K, & Rorrer AK (2006). Women’s choices within market constraints: Re-visioning access to and participation in the superintendency. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42, 483–517. doi:10.1177/0013161X06289962
- Mandell B, & Pherwani S. (2003). Relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style: A gender comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17, 387–404. doi:10.1023/A:1022816409059
- Marshall A. (2002). Organizing across the divide: Local feminist activism, everyday life, and the election of women to public office. *Social Science Quarterly*, 83, 707–725. doi:10.1111/1540-6237.00110
- Marshall C. (1999). Researching the margins: Feminist critical policy analysis. *Educational Policy*, 13, 59–76. doi:10.1177/0895904899131006
- Marshall C, & André-Bechely L. (2008). Feminism and education politics: No longer for women only. In Cooper BS, Cibulka JG, & Fusarelli LD (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 281–310). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marshall C, & Young M. (2013). Policy inroads undermining women in education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 16, 205–219.
- Marshall J. (1995). Researching women and leadership: some comments on challenges and opportunities. *International Review of Women and Leadership*, 1, 1–10.
- Martin JL (Ed.). (2011). *Women as leaders in education: Succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges* (Vol. 2). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Maxcy B. (2009). New public management and district reform managerialism and deflection of local leadership in a Texas school district. *Urban Education*, 44, 489–521. doi:10.1177/0042085908318778
- McDonald S. (2011). What’s in the “old boys” network? Accessing social capital in gendered and racialized networks. *Social Networks*, 33, 317–330. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2011.10.002
- McGee K. (2015, November 18). Texas board of education rejects proposed changes to superintendent requirements. Austin, TX: National Public Radio. Retrieved from <http://kut.org/post/texas-board-education-rejects-proposed-changes-superintendent-requirements>
- Meier KJ, & Wilkins VM (2002). Gender differences in agency head salaries: The case of public education. *Public Administration Review*, 62, 405–411.
- Méndez-Morse S. (2004). Constructing mentors: Latina educational leaders’ role models and mentors. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 561–590. doi:10.1177/0013161X04267112
- Miron G, & Applegate B. (2007). *Teacher attrition in charter schools*. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Research Unit and Education and the Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://epsl.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPSSL-0705-234-EPRU.pdf>
- Mitrano BS (1978). Teaching as a women’s occupation: A feminist critique. *Journal of Education*, 160, 50–63.
- Moeller K. (2013). Proving “the girl effect:” Corporate knowledge production and educational intervention. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 33, 612–621. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2013.08.001

- Monahan R. (2014, November 11). Charter schools try to retain teachers with momfriendly policies. *The Atlantic*. Available from <http://www.theatlantic.com>
- Montgomery JD (1992). Job search and network composition: Implications of the strength-of-weak-ties hypothesis. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 586–596.
- Murphy M. (1990). *Blackboard unions, the AFT and the NEA, 1900–1980*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2013). *The condition of education 2013*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013037>
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2015). *Fast facts: Teacher trends*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=28>
- Neumark D, Bank RJ, & Nort KDV (1996). Sex discrimination in restaurant hiring: An audit study. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111, 915–941. doi:10.2307/2946676
- Niederle M, & Vesterlund L. (2005). *Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much?* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Niederle M, & Vesterlund L. (2008). Gender differences in competition. *Negotiation Journal*, 24, 447–463. doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.2008.00197.x
- Oplatka I, Foskett N, & Hemsley-Brown J. (2002). Educational marketisation and the head's psychological well-being: A speculative conceptualisation. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50, 419–441. doi:10.1111/1467-8527.t01-2-00212
- Ortiz FI (1982). The distribution of Mexican American women in school organization. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 4, 181–198. doi:10.1177/07399863820042004
- Ortiz FI, & Marshall C. (1998). Women in educational administration. In Boyan N. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 123–141). New York, NY: Longman.
- Parsons M, & Ward ER (2001). The roaring silence: Feminist revisions in the educational policy literature. *Policy Studies Review*, 18, 46–64. doi:10.1111/j.1541-1338.2001.tb00185.x
- Podgursky MJ, & Springer MG (2007). Teacher performance pay: A review. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26, 909–950. doi:10.1002/pam.20292
- Power S. (2006). Markets and misogyny: Educational research on educational choice. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54, 175–188. doi:10.1111/j.14678527.2006.00340.x
- Preece J, & Stoddard O. (2015). Why women don't run: Experimental evidence on gender differences in political competition aversion. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 117, 296–308. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2015.04.019
- Puwar N. (2008). *Space invaders: Race, gender and bodies out of place*. London, England: Berg.
- Ravitch D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Ravitch D. (2013). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Rees N. (2015, December 15). Charter schools bring parties together: Congress shows bipartisan support for charter schools with the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act. U.S. News & World Report. Retrieved from <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/articles/2015-12-15/every-student-succeeds-act-reflects-bipartisan-support-for-charter-schools>
- Reich A. (1974). Teaching is a good profession . . . for women. In Stacey J, Bereaud S, & Daniels J. (Eds.), *And Jill came tumbling after: Sexism in American education* (pp. 337–343). New York, NY: Dell.
- Ringler M, McFadden C, & Ford V. (2011). Women in administration: Differences in equity. In Martin JL (Ed.), *Women as leaders in education: Succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges* (pp. 221–243). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Ross EW, & Gibson R. (2007). *Neoliberalism and education reform*. New York, NY: Hampton Press.
- Ruddick S. (1989). *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Random House.
- Rumberger RW, & Thomas SL (1993). The economic returns to college major, quality and performance: A multilevel analysis of recent graduates. *Economics of Education Review*, 12, 1–19. doi:10.1016/0272-7757(93)90040-N

- Saltman KJ (2006). The right-wing attack on critical and public education in the United States: From neoliberalism to neoconservatism. *Cultural Politics*, 2, 339–358. doi:10.2752/174321906778531637
- Saltman KJ (2009). Corporatization and the control of schools. In Apple M, Au W, & Gandin L. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 51–63). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Saunders L, & Darity W. (2003). Feminist theory and racial economic inequality. In Ferber MA & Nelson JA (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 101–104). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sawchuk S. (2015, September 9). Unionization bid sparks discord in L.A. charter network. *Education Week*. Available from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Scott J. (Ed.). (2005). *School choice and diversity: What the evidence says*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Scott J. (2009). The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy*, 23, 106–136. doi:10.1177/0895904808328531
- Scott J. (2013). A Rosa Parks moment? School choice and the marketization of civil rights. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54, 5–18. doi:10.1080/17508487.2013.739570
- Scott J, Trujillo T, & Rivera MD (2016). Reframing teach for America: A conceptual framework for the next generation of scholarship. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(12), 1–33. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2419
- Sexton PC (1973). The feminized male. In Stoll CS (Ed.), *Sexism: Scientific debates* (pp. 61–73). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Shakeshaft C. (2010). Wild patience: Women in school administration. In English FW (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of educational leadership* (pp. 210–222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sisson JH, & Iverson SV (2014). Disciplining professionals: A feminist discourse analysis of public preschool teachers. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 15, 217–230. doi:10.2304/ciec.2014.15.3.217
- Skrla L, Reyes P, & Scheurich JJ (2000). Sexism, silence, and solutions: Women superintendents speak up and out. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36, 44–75. doi:10.1177/00131610021968895
- Small ML (2010). *Unanticipated gains: Origins of network inequality in everyday life*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Solomon OM (1985). *In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stambach A, & David M. (2005). Feminist theory and educational policy: How gender has been “involved” in family school choice debates. *Signs*, 30, 1633–1658.
- Stone D. (2001). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Strober MH (2003). The application of mainstream economics constructs to education: A feminist analysis. In Ferber MA & Nelson JA (Eds.), *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man* (pp. 135–156). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Stromquist NP (2010). Knowledge capital and excellence: Implication of a science-centered university for gender equity. In Allan EJ, Iverson SVD, & Ropers-Huilman R. (Eds.), *Reconstructing policy in higher education: Feminist poststructural perspectives* (pp. 215–234). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stuit DA, & Smith TM (2012). Explaining the gap in charter and traditional public school teacher turnover rates. *Economics of Education Review*, 31, 268–279.
- Suspitsyna T. (2010). Purposes of higher education and visions of the nation in the writings of the Department of Education. In Allan EJ, Iverson SVD, & Ropers-Huilman R. (Eds.), *Reconstructing policy in higher education: Feminist poststructural perspectives* (pp. 63–80). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sutter M, & Glatzle-Rutzler D. (2015). Gender differences in the willingness to compete emerge early in life and persist. *Management Science*, 61, 2339–2354. doi:10.1287/mnsc.2014.1981

- Tillman BA, & Cochran LL (2000). Desegregating urban school administration: A pursuit of equity for Black women superintendents. *Education and Urban Society*, 33, 44–59. doi:10.1177/0013124500331005
- Tillman LC (2002). Culturally sensitive research approaches: An African-American perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 3–12. doi:10.3102/0013189X031009003
- Trujillo T. (2014). The modern cult of efficiency intermediary organizations and the new scientific management. *Educational Policy*, 28, 207–232. doi:10.1177/0895904813513148
- Tyack DB (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tyack DB, & Hansot E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820–1980*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Wajcman J. (1998). *Managing like a man: Women and men in corporate management*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Weber L, & Higginbotham E. (1997). Black and White professional-managerial women's perceptions of racism and sexism in the workplace. In Higginbotham E. & Romero M. (Eds.), *Women and work: Exploring race, ethnicity, and class* (pp. 153–175). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- White T. (2016). Teach for America's paradoxical diversity initiative: Race, policy, and Black teacher displacement in urban schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(16), 1–42. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2100
- Wilkins AA (2012a). Push and pull in the classroom: Competition, gender and the neoliberal Subject. *Gender and Education*, 24, 765–781. doi:10.1080/09540253.2011.606207
- Wilkins AA (2012b). The spectre of neoliberalism: Pedagogy, gender and the construction of learner identities. *Critical Studies in Education*, 53, 197–210. doi:10.1080/17508487.2012.672332
- Williams CL, Muller C, & Kilanski K. (2012). Gendered organizations in the new economy. *Gender & Society*, 26, 549–573. doi:10.1177/0891243212445466
- Woody T. (1966). *A history of women's education in the United States*. New York, NY: Octagon Books.
- Yosso T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8, 69–91. doi:10.1080/1361332052000341006
- Young MD (1999). Multifocal educational policy research: Toward a method for enhancing traditional educational policy studies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36, 677–714. doi:10.3102/00028312036004677
- Young MD, & Skrla L. (Eds.). (2003). *Reconsidering feminist research in educational leadership*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Zaccaro SJ (2001). *The nature of executive leadership: A conceptual and empirical analysis of success*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Table 1.

Six Propositions for the Future Study of Gender and Markets in Education.

Proposition #	Description	Proposed areas for research
1	As the number of cities with large concentrations of charter schools grows, with increasingly flexible career pathways, social networks may become increasingly important for securing jobs, with important implications for who has access to and can benefit from these networks	Examine whether greater reliance on social networks privileges some actors over others (by race, class, and gender) in access to job opportunities Study how information flows in these networks Explore how school leaders define talent, and how internal political dynamics shape hiring, promotion
2	Demands for organizational dedication and the “24/7 work culture” in charter schools may disproportionately disadvantage women	Examine how the 24/7 work culture influences women teachers and leaders Explore the inception and growth of charter-sector teachers’ unions, and their impact on working conditions
3	Gender and race-based salary disparities for teachers and leaders in the same positions with similar backgrounds and work quality may be larger in charter schools than in traditional public schools. This pattern may be exacerbated by policies around salary confidentiality	Update research on gender disparity in salary, comparing public, private, and “quasi-public” markets, using Value Added Models as controls Discern whether and how charter-school policies create salary disparities Conduct in-depth qualitative studies to examine what conditions influence awarding of salary and what organizational factors contribute to levels of disparity in practice
4	The decline in the power of teachers’ unions may influence wage disparities by gender, and may also have potential negative impacts on working conditions or leave policies that support women of childbearing age	The research proposed regarding Proposition 3 could be conducted alongside analyses measuring the impact of the decline of union power Examine how the erosion of power among teachers’ unions impacts working conditions with a particular focus on policies that impact women (e.g., leave policies)
5	Informal nature of career pathways in charter schools and systems may perpetuate disparities in female and male representation in leadership	Systematically explore career pathways to leadership, gender, and race representation in charter-school systems, schools, boards, and central offices in charter-heavy districts
6	In market-based settings, female leaders may, on average, respond to competition in ways different from male leaders	Examine how women perceive and respond to competitive pressures Examine alternative ways women behave and strategize that lead to success in the marketplace