BARRIERS TO WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT IN PUBLIC

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN OKLAHOMA: A

VIEW FROM THE APPLICANT POOL

By

CHERI SAWDERS QUINN

Bachelor of Arts
San Jose State University
San Jose, California
1977

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1989

BARRIERS TO WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT IN PUBLIC

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN OKLAHOMA: A

VIEW FROM THE APPLICANT POOL

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth W. Clair
Thesis Adviser

Thomas J. Smith

Kenneth Stern

Daniel Selakovich

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Kenneth St.Clair for constant encouragement and support throughout my graduate program. Dr. St.Clair helped keep me focused and productive and provided needed objectivity when my own tried to desert. I also wish to thank my other committee members. To Dr. Kenneth Stern a huge thank you for meticulous attention to detail. To Dr. Thomas Smith a thank you for many useful suggestions for the final draft. To Dr. Daniel Selakovich a thank you for helping me to keep my sense of humor and to not take myself too seriously. Also a thank you to Dr. Lynn Arney for providing a statistical roadmap when it was most needed.

No undertaking of this magnitude could have been completed without the support and love of my family. My husband, John, shouldered the bulk of family responsibilities while I completed this work. He always believed in my ability and helped foster the confidence to continue. My children, Erin, Patrick and Shannon, deserve heartfelt gratitude for enduring hastily thrown together meals, for often taking more than their shares of the load, and for never making me feel guilty if I had to miss an activity that was important to them.

My mother, L. Fran Sawders Boon, rode the 165 miles to Stillwater once a week for a whole semester just so I would

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many studies have quantified and enumerated an envia-
able list of practices and prejudices that have worked to
keep women from positions of leadership. That women are not
part, in any substantial way, of the leadership of public
schools in America is not in question. The cogent question
has to be, "Why are women not equally represented in admin-
istrative ranks in proportion to their numbers in the
classroom? The expectation of representative numbers of
women administrators in a profession where women comprise two-
thirds of the work force seems reasonable."

Fifty-five percent of the elementary principals in 1928
were women. The ranks of women holding elementary principal-
ships have declined steadily since then, with 41 percent in
1948, 38 percent in 1958, 22 percent in 1968, and 18 per-
cent in 1978 (Pharis and Zakariya,1979).

In 1978 women accounted for only seven percent of secon-
dary school principals. Women commanded only one percent
of secondary principalships, fewer than one percent of all
superintendencies and fewer than three percent of assistant
superintendencies according to Rosser's 1980 study. In their
examination of the numbers of women in administration, Jones

1

and Montenegro (1982) reported that women accounted for less than two percent of superintendents in the 1981-1982 school year. In a more recent study, Shakeshaft (1987) showed that 16.9 percent of elementary principals are women, three and one-half percent of secondary principals are women , three percent of superintendents are women and 38.3 percent of school board members are women. For women school board members this figure represents a ten percent increase since the 1982-1983 school year.

The problem of poor female representation in decision-making ranks is not limited to education. Loring and Wells (1972) point to women's under-representation in all managerial positions. Nor is the problem endemic to the United States alone. Shack (1975) cited similar statistics in her study of administrative positions in the province of Ontario. In the 74 school districts of the Province, two-thirds of the classroom teachers were women, yet a total of only 82 women held any kind of administrative position.

Vocational and higher education suffer from a remarkably similar lack of female representation in positions of power. Fulton's (1983) study revealed that women held 16 percent of the administrative positions in institutions of higher education, but that the majority of these women can be found in institutions with high minority and female enrollments. Couch (1981) found that female vocational administrators were under-represented even in the area where they enjoyed the most representation, home economics.

Previous research attempts to explain how it is that women represent a majority in the professional ranks from which administrators are selected, yet so few find their way into leadership roles, include a virtual laundry list of factors that contribute to at least some portion of the disparity. Among the often cited reasons for so few women educational leaders are

1. a lack of mentors or sponsors to serve as role models and promoters of talented women (Metzger, 1985; Shakeshaft, 1981; Valverde, 1980).

2. failure actively to pursue position openings (Metzger, 1985; Neidig, 1980).

3. personal and family imposed constraints, such as delaying career plans in favor of child-rearing or an unwillingness to relocate for an administrative position (Metzger, 1985; Shakeshaft, 1981).

4. an insufficient pool of qualified women applicants (Fulton, 1983; Metzger, 1985).

5. sex-role stereotyping (Adkison,1981).

6. sex discrimination (Johnston, Yeakey, & Moore, 1980).

7. sex-typed jobs, for example women can be coordinators and supervisors, but coaching and principalships are men's jobs (Howard, 1975; Johnston, Yeakey, & Moore, 1980; Shakeshaft, 1981).

8. the Cinderella syndrome, or the belief that someone will recognize the woman's brilliance, and if they don't, then the woman wasn't worthy anyway (Rosser,1980).

9. the belief that women can't discipline older students (Fansher and Buxton, 1984; Shakeshaft, 1987).

10. improper socialization and personal attributes for positions of leadership (Johnston, Yeakey & Moore, 1980).

11. no access to the "old boy" network where promotional decisions are made (ibid.).

12. declining enrollments, retrenchment, and a diminished economy that all affect women and minority aspirants first (ibid.).

13. the widespread belief that women do not want to work for other women and men resent women superiors (Howard, 1975).

The absence of women in administrative positions becomes very alarming when one considers that the period of most recent decline in the ranks of women administrators corresponds roughly with the very active period of the twentieth century women's rights movement.

The laws are in place that would seem to guarantee women protection in the job market. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1972, Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, the Equal Pay Act, Executive Order 11246, as amended by Executive Order 11375, and the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution certainly provide the legal clout to pursue charges of sex discrimination in employment (Pearson, 1975). In spite of these laws and other efforts at consciousness raising and affirmative action, the figures speak for themselves. Women are simply not being promoted to leadership roles in the

public schools. Indeed, even compiling accurate figures is difficult. Record keeping has been sporadic and much of the data are not available by either gender or by ethnic status (Shakeshaft, 1987). At least one result of this lack of record keeping is the inability to challenge claims of increased minority and female participation in leadership positions.

Laundry list of mitigating factors aside, it appears that there is something more at work to perpetuate this terrible waste of talent. There is evidence to support a strong case for sex-discrimination or any one of the much studied factors on our laundry list. After all the efforts at consciousness-raising and all the lip-service paid to "improving" the status of women, is it possible that these efforts have been thwarted by so simple a method as the competitive hiring process? At least one study (McDade & Drake, 1982) suggests that women may find it less than appealing to prepare and work toward an administrative position only to be left out for reasons not related to credentials or experience.

This study examined the hiring process from the point of view of those in the applicant pool, administrative certificate holders in Oklahoma.

Statement of the Problem

There is an almost complete lack of systematic research on the impact of hiring process barriers encountered by men

and women aspiring to administrative posts in the public schools. An examination of the hiring process, from the perspective of the pool of qualified applicants, explored perceived barriers to hiring, particularly as those barriers related to women.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the nature and extent of the formal and informal organizational barriers in Oklahoma that tend to thwart women's efforts to secure line positions in public schools. Further, the study attempted to support the belief that the identified barriers present greater obstacles for women than for men. All other things being equal, which barriers in the hiring process cause women to be excluded from leadership positions? This study also endeavored to delineate a strategy to help overcome some of the identified barriers.

Research Questions

This study attempted to answer the following 14 research questions. The first seven questions were generated from the work of Neidig (1980). Questions eight through ten are directly related to the research done by Valverde (1980).

Questions 11 and 12 were derived from the work of Johnston, Yeakey, and Moore (1980). Question 13 is from the work of Maienza (1986). Question 14 was included in the hope that further research could provide a prediction model for administrative aspirants and a plan to counter

background and experience deficits. The specific research questions are:

1. Why are women not more aggressive in pursuing administrative positions?

2. Given the same performance, are men and women judged as having performed equally?

3. Does fear of failure, or the perception of failure, prevent women from pursuing administrative positions?

4. Is failure to secure a sought-after position perceived as a threat to future promotion, or as a chance to learn and develop experience?

5. Does the presence of women on selection committees increase the likelihood of the selection of a woman for the position?

6. Are position announcements mailed to all simultaneously?

7. If position announcements are not made simultaneously to all, what is the protocol for those announcements?

8. Does the lack of female incumbents prevent sponsorship of female candidates?

9. Does the school district's commitment to selecting minority and women candidates increase the success of those candidates in seeking positions?

10. Are females less likely to be identified as proteges because they lack personal attributes that are reflective of the sponsor who is almost always male?

11. Are efforts at GASing, or Getting the Attention of

Superiors, similar for men and women?

12. Is GASing interpreted correctly for women by their male supervisors?

13. Do professors in educational administration pro-grams champion women students for available positions?

14. Do people who attain line administrative po-sitions share background variables, career histories, and childhood experiences that better prepare them for positions of leadership?

In a gender study, one would not only expect differences, but would find a lack of differences difficult to explain. A 1984 study by Lester and Chu supports the belief that masculinity and femininity are not ". . . bipolar opposites of a single continuum, but are two separate dimensions. . ." (p. 176). The preceeding research questions were explored to determine which barriers in the hiring process exclude women from administrative jobs in the public schools.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study the following defi-nitions were used:

Applicant pool- those people already holding the credentials to qualify them for specific administrative positions.

Aspirants- individuals who indicate a desire to at-tain a position within the administrative hierarchy of the public schools and who also actively pursue their aims in at least one of four ways: by taking certification classes;

by enrolling in a doctoral program in educational adminis-
tration; by working in an entry level administrative
position, such as a vice-principalship; and by applying and
interviewing for administrative posts (Edson, 1981 p.171).

Formal organizational barriers - policies and pro-
cedures that tend to favor one group of applicants over
another.

GASing- Getting the Attention of Superiors, often
done to let superiors know of interest in promotion
(Valverde, 1980).

Hiring process - the logical steps involved to
secure employees for open positions. These can include
advertising positions, screening applicants, interviewing
applicants, negotiating salary and benefits and final
selection.

Hiring process barriers - any obstacles, related to
the process used to select new administrators that must be
overcome to secure a new position.

Informal organizational barriers - established
practices that reduce the opportunity for promotion for
large groups of prospective applicants.

Line administrative positions- for the purposes
of this study, superintendent, assistant superintendent,
principal and assistant principal, or positions with like
duties but different titles.

Mentors- adults who serve less experienced adults
for the purpose of promoting them to positions of power.

Sex Discrimination- excluding from activities or opportunities solely on the basis of gender.

Sex-Role Stereotyping- attributing characteristics, determining capabilities and assigning value as a result of preconceived beliefs about gender-specific roles.

Sex-Typed Jobs- determining both consciously and unconsciously what jobs are suitable to which specific gender.

Staff administrative positions- for the purposes of this study, support positions such as coordinator, super- visor, specialist, director and the like.

Limitations

For the purposes of this study the following limitations were identified:

1. The population was limited to the pool of individuals already holding administrative certification, so there were no data about qualified women or men who have not yet applied for certification, nor were there data about others in the public schools who might aspire to administrative positions.

2. There are limitations of the survey method of data collection. Two such limitations are (1) giving socially acceptable rather than candid answers and (2) researcher bias in preparation of the survey. Further, the retrospective nature of the survey questions may subject the data to faulty memory.

3. The study is generalizable only to administrative certificate holders in Oklahoma.

4. This study did not address those serving as teaching principals without administrative certification.

Delimitations

1. Both male and female certificate holders were surveyed.

2. Both those holding and those seeking administrative positions were included in the survey.

3. Respondents represented a variety of geographic regions in the State.

4. Respondents represented rural, urban, and suburban school districts in the State.

5. The use of structured interviews for development of the survey instrument and subsequent piloting of the instrument reduced some of the problems inherent in the survey method, primarily in the area of researcher bias.

6. Male responses were not considered the norm with female responses considered deviant, rather the responses of each gender were considered prima facie to be accurate depictions of experiences for that particular group.

Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. Subjects responded to the interview questions in an honest and thoughtful manner.

2. Subjects represented a wide array of experiences in their quests for administrative positions.

3. Subjects represented a wide variety of educational and social backgrounds.

4. Subjects met the minimum requirements to hold an administrative position as evidenced by certification.

5. It was possible to examine the research questions using the instrument developed from the interviews and piloted in two education administration classes at Oklahoma State University.

Summary

This chapter has included an introduction to the study, specialized definitions pertinent to the study, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the limitations and delimitations of the study and the assumptions underlying the study.

Chapter II, Review of the Literature, provides the theoretical framework for the study and the review of the literature related to the study. Chapter III, Procedure for Collection and Treatment of Data, explains the structured interviews used to develop the instrument, the pilot testing of the survey instrument and the collection and treatment of the data for the purposes of this study.

Chapter IV, Presentation of Findings, describes the findings of this study in relation to the research questions. Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations, discusses the results of the study, the researcher's conclusions and recommendations for further research and action.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe
the nature and extent of the formal and informal organi-
zational barriers in Oklahoma that tend to thwart women's
efforts to secure line positions in public schools for both
men and women. Further, the study attempted to support the
belief that the identified barriers present greater obstacles
for women than for men. All other things being equal, which
barriers in the hiring process cause women to be excluded
from leadership positions? This study also endeavored to
delineate a strategy to help overcome some of the identified
barriers. This chapter, Review of the Literature, presents
the theoretical framework for the study and a discussion of
selected literature related to the study.

Historical Perspective

Putting the specter of sex discrimination into an his-
torical context provides an evolutionary look at how 47
percent of today's labor force, women, find themselves under-
employed and often compensated at rates not equivalent to
their male counterparts. Kohl and Stevens (1987) provide a
thumbnail sketch of women in the work force. They further

13

cite legislation designed to give women legal avenues from which to pursue equality in the workplace.

According to Kohl and Stevens (1987) the belief that women are chiefly wives and mothers has persisted. As early as 1908, legislation protecting women in the workplace, while excluding men from the same protection, was deemed reasonable by the United States Supreme Court [Mueller v. Oregon, 208 U.S. 412 (1908)]. The Court, rightly or wrongly, perceived the role of perpetuators of the race,to be a position that needed and deserved protection. One of the ramifications of this Court decision was to assure that employers excluded women from the workplace once pregnancy became a factor. Another, less obvious result, was to deny women access to employer-sponsored health plans based on the assumption that women's employment was at best, temporal.

During the Great Depression when jobs of any kind were scarce, women were openly excluded from many sectors of the labor market, with outright hiring bans in some industries. Kohl and Stevens (1987) cite a study conducted in 1930-1931 that revealed 77 percent of all school districts refused to hire married women and 63 percent fired women who got married. A pattern of differentiated expectations in public schools is certainly not a new phenomenon.

With the advent of World War II women entered the labor market in great numbers. Companies, as a result of urging from the federal government, generally provided equal training, equal promotion opportunities and equal pay for their

women employees. Once again it is necessary to look at intent to realize the full impact of these events. The placing of women in positions of responsibility was viewed as a temporary necessity; after all, things would return to normal at the end of the War. Normal was still defined as men in positions of responsibility, prestige and high pay. Women, no matter their positions during the War, would return to their homes as wives and mothers. Even though some improvements had been enjoyed, an example being unpaid leave for pregnancy, the situation of women in the workforce was still viewed as temporary.

Legislation designed to alleviate built-in discrimination in the workplace (Kohl and Stevens, 1987) includes the following:

1. Equal Pay Act of 1963 which sought to assure equal pay and benefits to workers doing similar jobs. (This issue continues to be a source of many court battles.)

2. Civil Rights Act of 1964 which included prohibition of discrimination based on sex. (Court cases continue to seek clarification of the parameters of this law.)

3. Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 which required all firms to treat pregnancy like all other illnesses for the purposes of leave and insurance.
Kohl and Stevens (1987) conclude that women have never enjoyed more expanded legal rights to pursue a career.

If what Kohl and Stevens (1987) contend is true and the legislation is in place, how then are the huge disparities

in the upper echelons of almost any organization we choose to examine explained?

Shakeshaft (1987) offers some insight into the dynamics of legal remedies. Many women simply ignore subtle discrimination and choose not to pursue legal avenues of redress for fear they will ruin future opportunities. When legal redress is sought, the gains have been minor and the process has been both lengthy and costly. Likewise, Affirmative Action plans have sometimes hindered women's efforts to break into administration. Shakeshaft (1987) recounts the following to illustrate the negative impact such programs have had in some cases:

> A number of white male candidates returned from administrative interviews in anger because they had been told that although they were outstanding candidates, the district could not hire them because affirmative action regulations forced that district to hire a woman or minority.
>
> . . . . . Understandably, these men were angry; they felt unfairly treated because, based only on their sex and race, ... they couldn't be seriously considered for a position. In response, they expressed negative views toward affirmative action, women and minority people (p. 103).

Shakeshaft goes on to say a follow-up demonstrated that a white male had been hired for every position available. Not one woman or minority candidate was hired.

Theoretical Framework

There is ample support for the finding that women are under-represented in public school administration (Adkison, 1985; Byrne, Hines, & McCleary, 1978; Cirincione-Coles, 1975;

Howard, 1975; Neidig, 1980; Rosser, 1980).

Bonuso and Shakeshaft (1981) posit the need for a feminist perspective from which to pursue research on women in educational administration. Most current gender studies are conducted from perspectives that are decidedly male. The instruments used to collect data are often sexist in content. The structures, strategies and processes employed by men in educational administration are considered the norm. Women's experiences, often different from men's, are considered deviant. As Stewart (1978) explains it:

> Women's supposedly different motivations for
> working and the fact their labor force par-
> ticipation is frequently discontinuous and
> tied to the family life cycle have been used
> to eliminate them as subjects in much research
> (because they are not 'real' or 'normal' workers)
> and even served to disqualify them from the
> American occupational structure . . . (p. 340).

No longer will the male model for the study of educational administration suffice to explain the experiences of women. A new paradigm for future research about women in educational administration was suggested by Bonuso and Shakeshaft (1981). They called for a framework with six components:

1. An expansion of qualitative methods.

2. The need for research to grow out of the personal experiences, feelings and needs of the researcher.

3. A feminist perspective.

4. Taking the conclusions from the work back to the participants.

5. A reliance on the oral tradition, rather than the written one, in both data collection and reporting of results.

6. Finally, the research must be used as a basis for social change (pp. 26-7).

While Bonuso and Shakeshaft's (1981) vision of a feminist theoretical model would have represented the ideal for the purposes of this research, the practicalities of conducting this study demanded that some adjustments be made to the model. Specifically, the study is a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. The initial phase of the study utilized structured interviews of of a carefully selected sample. The results of these interviews were used to generate a survey instrument for the quantitative portion of the research. Every effort to eliminate both sexist language and perspective was employed. The other requirements of the model were followed.

Sex-Role Stereotypes, Achievement/Motivation and Gender-Specific Socialization

Much of the current literature focuses on the prevalence of sex-role stereotyping and the socialization of women (Yeakey, Johnston & Adkison, 1986). Women are often evaluated on expected parameters of behavior outlined by the "rational man" model, rather than on actual behavior and performance. These unrealistic expectations serve to dampen women's enthusiasm to seek positions in the male-dominated arena of school administration (Yeakey, Johnston & Adkison, 1986). The women who ignore the expected behavioral imperative are often viewed as unfeminine or their motives for seeking administrative positions are viewed as

suspect. These same women often experience role conflict and ambiguity as a result of entering an arena reserved for men only (Horner, 1972; Dyer and Condry, 1976).

The belief that men possess more of the characteristics of successful managers was moderately supported in a study designed to measure the presence of sex-role stereotyping. This study found that both men and women viewed "manager" as a sex-typed job and both believed men were better suited for managerial positions (Massengill & Di Marco, 1979).

Fansher and Buxton (1984), in a nationwide study of job satisfaction among the 408 female secondary principals in the United States, found with 65 percent responding, that females are somewhat reluctant to apply for openings, relying instead on being sought out for a position. The portion of their study devoted to examining personality traits and beliefs about discrimination and sex-role stereotyping is more germane to this study than their findings regarding job satisfaction. A large number of respondents listed fairness, working with people, honesty, working with parents and friendliness as the most important traits for success in the principalship.

In the Fansher and Buxton (1984) study, women principals stated the belief that many myths exist which should be of concern to the female public secondary school principal. The three myths cited most often were:

1. Females cannot discipline older students, particularly males.

2. Females are too emotional.

3. Females are too weak physically (p. 37).

As early as 1976 Bach reported that with the advent of legislation and court action aimed at protecting the rights of parents and students, the school boards that hire high school principals for their size and muscle have paid for a commodity that, when used, may be costly indeed.

Horner (1972) argues that women have a strong unconscious desire to avoid success because they expect negative consequences, such as social rejection, if they succeed. Baruch's 1967 study divided the achievement motivation of adult women into three phases: one before children, one when home and family are the major concern, and one when the family has been established. The results of this study lend minor support to the view that college-educated women have a revival of strong achievement "fantasy" between the ages of 35 and 39, usually followed by their return to the workforce. Another equally plausible explanation could be the additional financial strain placed on the family budget by a family with growing needs.

Oregon aspirants were studied by Edson (1981) who determined that these women were actively pursuing administrative openings, specifically a principalship. Edson attempted to identify the motivators for aspirants. Among the reasons cited for seeking administrative posts were: the challenge of administration; the encouragement by a superior or peer; the desire to help students and the desire

to have greater influence on the educational process.

How men and women account for their successes and fail-
ures was explored in a study of achievement motivation
conducted by Bar-Tal and Frieze (1977). This study lent sup-
port to the notion that high achievement motivated men and
women are more similar than different, with each group tend-
ing to attribute their successes to the internal causes,
ability and effort. The most significant difference in these
two groups was the tendency of women to place more emphasis
on effort, a less stable internal cause than ability. While
males tended to explain their failures as a result of external
factors such as luck and task difficulty, women explained
their failures in the same light used to claim success, abil-
ity and effort. Given that gender alone does not account for
a large portion of the variance between high achievement men
and women; how are the differences in success rates explained?
Bar-Tal and Frieze further suggest that expectations of suc-
cess may be the factor that ultimately determines outcome,
with men being perceived by both sexes as able to perform at
higher levels.

Galvin, Plake, Powers-Alexander, and Lambert (1984) in a
study of undergraduate college students, attempted to deter-
mine if bias against competent women had lessened in the
period since a similar study in 1968. Sex-appropriateness,
considered crucial in their bias research, was manipulated in
the scenarios presented to subjects. The findings indicated
that men and women described with masculine attributes were

seen as successful as a result of skill. Skill was also cited as the determiner of success for both males and females in non-traditional programs. Luck was perceived as the salient factor in success for females and males described with feminine attributes. The researchers concluded that the source of success determines the value of success, with skill, an internal variable, providing a bias in favor of an individual, and luck, an external variable, providing a bias against an individual. This study seems to partially support the notion that a global bias no longer exists, but that skill is a more valued determinant of success than luck and that skill is most convincingly conveyed in masculine terms. If sex is viewed as a status characteristic rather than as a cultural role to be carried out, then the research shifts to an interesting focus. According to research conducted by Lockheed and Hall (1976) employing Expectation States Theory, sex is a status characteristic, with men enjoying greater status than women in mixed-sex groups. In mixed-sex groups men and women display three behaviors consistently:

1. Men are more influential than women, with women being more likely to yield to a man's opinion.

2. Men are more active than women, with men initiating more verbal acts than women.

3. Men initiate more of their acts in task-oriented behaviors, with women initiating more social-emotional acts. (Lockheed and Hall, 1976)

By comparing matched subjects of both mixed-sex and

single-sex groups, Lockheed and Hall (1976) supported the
Expectation States Theory and suggested that maleness affords
more status and therefore more prestige and power than
femaleness in mixed-sex groups.

Shack (1975) points out that most men who enter teach-
ing expect to become administrators while many women have
no aspirations beyond the classroom. Shack explains it
this way:

> Some women are actually afraid of being success-
> ful; they are afraid that if they are aggressive,
> ambitious, show themselves more intelligent, more
> efficient, more capable than their boy friends,
> their fiancees, their husbands, especially if they
> manage to earn more money, then they will lose love
> and their position in the family (p. 29).

A prevalent argument for justifying the exclusion of
women from managerial roles would include the sex-role
socialization differences that place men on one end of a
behavioral expectations continuum and women on the opposite
end. At least one 1978 study revealed the fallacies of the
sex-role socialization explanation. This study pointed out
that many of the studies related to socialization garner re-
sults often in conflict with each other, making any definitive
conclusions impossible. Of particular interest is the or-
ganization approach to group behavior and leader legitimacy
this study takes. Basically the study finds that white men
hold most positions of authority in most organizations,there-
fore all white men in the organization enjoy the status
associated with legitimate authority, making promotion to
to such a position seem logical and rational. On the other

hand, women, who do not generally hold positions of authority in organizations, become an entirely "suspect" group when thrust into positions where they are required to exercise authority (Fennell, Barchas, Cohen, McMahon, & Hildebrand, 1978). The conclusion derived from this study seems to be that women, even women in positions of authority, are at a socially derived disadvantage at the outset of a promotion.

Shakeshaft (1987) offers the following explanation:

. . . a number of women have confided that they completed doctoral work so that they could carry with them the aura of legitimate authority, transmitted by the title 'Dr' (p.16).

Epstein (1970), in a study of sex-status limits on women in the professions, suggests that:

. . . those persons whose status-sets do not conform to the expected and preferred configuration cause discordant impressions on members of the occupa-tional network and the society at large: the black physician, the Jewish Wall Street lawyer, and foot-ball-hero philosophy professor all generate such discordance (p.972).

Although Epstein did not address public school administrators, it would be most fitting to include the female superintendent or the female high school principal in this list of individ-uals sure to evoke such discordant responses. Epstein (1970) also points out that for all occupations in all societies, as one approaches the top of the decision-making hierarchy and the pinnacle of status, the proportion of men increases and the proportion of women decreases.

Supply, Demand and the Feminization

of Occupations

The relatively small percentage of managerial positions available in any given school district has often been cited as a major factor limiting promotion opportunities for women. The small number of administrative openings should affect men more dramatically than women. If men and women were represented in administrative positions at the same ratio as they are represented in the classroom, then there would be roughly 8.5 female administrators for every 1.5 male administrators in all elementary schools. The reality in elementary schools is that women represent 85 percent of the teachers, but less than 18 percent of the principals (Neidig, 1980). If we compare all public school teaching positions against administrative positions of all kinds, then women represent 67 percent of all teachers, but less than 16 percent of all administrators (Lyon & Saario, 1973). More recent figures show 50 percent of all secondary teachers are women, while only three percent of the secondary principal-ships are held by women (Rosser, 1980). A predictably simi-lar pattern is cited in many other studies (Byrne, Hines, & McCleary, 1978; Cirincione-Coles, 1975; Howard,1975; Pavan 1985; Pharis & Zakariya, 1979; Shack, 1975). Colleges and universities share similar statistics with the public schools (Lester & Chu, 1984; Van Alstyne, Withers, & Elliot, 1977).

If the figures show that women are so poorly represented

in the decision-making ranks of public schools could it be that women fail to obtain the necessary qualifications for filling these openings? Pavan's 1985 study in Pennsylvania showed that if women had been hired to fill openings in that state, drawing only from the ranks of already certified people during the past fifteen years, then 73 percent of all administrative openings would be occupied by fully certificated women. Instead, women hold 3.3 percent of superintendencies, 7.6 percent of assistant superintendencies, 3.5 percent of secondary principalships, and 16.9 percent of elementary principalships.

In a supply and demand study undertaken by Kuh, McCarthy, and Zent (1983) it was found that women accounted for 18 percent of those preparing for superintendencies while less than two percent of superintendents are women. Further, 23 percent of those seeking secondary principalships are women with only ten percent of those posts filled by women. The area where women seem to be more fairly represented still shows a large disparity. Of those preparing for elementary principalships, 43 percent are women who hold only 27 percent of the positions.

This same study found a declining demand for line administrative positions and suggested that the decline would be more keenly felt by women and minorities (Kuh, McCarthy, and Zent, 1983).

A 1979 study conducted by Cronin and Pancrazio offers a cautiously optimistic outlook for women in administration.

The basis for their optimism was the appointment of women to some highly visible key positions in universities, state agencies and federal agencies. The caution for their predictions of a bright future for women in administration stemmed from figures indicating a significant decline in the number of female administrators across the country between 1968 and 1978. The more recent studies cited show that the caution suggested by Cronin and Pancrazio was justified.

Of the people who hold administrative certification in Oklahoma, 1223 or 25.3 percent are women and 3620 or 74.7 percent are men (State Department of Education, 1987). Of the 456 independent school districts in Oklahoma, seven (1.5 percent) have female superintendents (Bell, Chase, and Livingston, 1987).

Early findings of a study tracking the results of the mandated curriculum tests in Oklahoma, indicate that of those tested in all areas of administration between August, 1985 and July, 1987, 76 percent of the women and 64 percent of the men passed the exams (Arney, Hyle, & Stern, 1987). While the number of subjects in this study is small, some trends can be found. Women passed the elementary principal's test about twice as often as men. The test for secondary principals was passed at about the same rate. The pass rate for superintendent's certification shows the greatest disparity, with 100 percent of the women passing and 65 percent of the men passing. However, there were only two women who took the test as opposed to 23 men, so the basis for comparison remains too

inequitable to consider. Whether or not curriculum exams will
have a significant impact on the number of women in the appli-
cant pool of prepared administrators is to be seen. Shake-
shaft (1987, p. 23) points out that the "most able educators"
have historically been women and that the "less capable edu-
cators" have been men who were either without other employment
or on their way to other employment.

Endeavors that have become feminized often are perceived
as lacking the status afforded male-dominated organizations.
The literature is peppered with this information in one form
or another. Some call this the predominant gender hypothesis,
that is, organizations dominated by women fail to achieve
professional status. Public education is certainly dominated
by women and the status associated with teaching is certainly
somewhere below the traditional professions: medicine and
law specifically. Are female dominated endeavors relegated to
sub-professional status on the basis of that same female
domination?

Forsyth (1984) suggests the predominant gender
hypothesis is simplistic in its failure to explain how it
is that the characteristics of women work to subserve an
organization. He further points out that to view all women
as an undifferentiated whole fails to consider the wide
range of women, a factor simply assumed among men. Forsyth's
study supports what he calls the alternative hypothesis,
that the nature of the task performed by the organization
is the primary determinant of professional status, with

society valuing that which is essential, complex and exclusive.

According to Greiner (1985) the service professions of social work, nursing, teaching and librarianship are female professions. These predominantly female fields share certain common characteristics, namely:

1. within the hierarchy of all occupations/professions, they are low in status, prestige, and income.

2. administrative positions are usually held by men.

3. men earn more than women who are at equal levels of occupational/professional development (p. 259).

Greiner's study was concerned with the role sex played in determining salaries of library directors, their career progression and library support. Men were found to be directors of two-thirds of all public libraries and to enjoy both salaries and library support at significantly higher levels than salaries or support for libraries with female directors. The study further concluded that women were in other subordinate positions within their libraries for significantly longer periods before being offered the opportunity for advancement. This pattern of differentiated career advancement is noted in many studies of public school administrators (Barnes, 1976; Johnston, Yeakey & Moore, 1980; Jones & Montenegro, 1982; Maienza, 1986; McDade & Drake, 1982; Schmuck, 1975; Tracy, 1985).

Formal Preparation, Support Networks

and Mentoring

Tetenbaum and Mulkeen (1987) suggest that society is or-
ganized, and reality is defined around a set of standards
that reflect the experiences of men. This world view is
called androcentrism. Additionally, this androcentric per-
spective is employed in the development of the theories
underlying educational administration. Tetenbaum and
Mulkeen enumerate the theory-building research that has
relied entirely on male samples. They suggest rethinking the
premises that undergird educational administration to include
the experiences of administrative women.

This seems a reasonable proposition when one considers
that the number of women currently completing degrees in edu-
cational administration represents a marked increase over
previous decades.

In a study of administrative aspirations in a large metro-
politan school district, Adkison (1985) found that personal
contacts (men 51.0%; women 47.7%) and formal training (men
17.8%; women 36.4%) were reported as the most important fac-
tors that positively effect promotability.

The reported responses indicate that both men and women
consider personal contacts crucial to advancement. Adkison
(1985) argues that promotion opportunities are greatly en-
hanced by principals who provide opportunities for aspirants
to gain recognition by assigning temporary duties that

underscore their abilities and increase their range of personal contacts. Women encounter more difficulty than men establishing their potential for administration because these opportunities are controlled, by and large, by men.

Adkison (1985) suggested that women are aspiring to administration at about the same level as men and that women are preparing for administrative positions. Adkison further suggested that the problem lies in lack of opportunities for advancement, not a lack of ambition on the part of women.

Shakeshaft (1987) explored the preparation of women for administrative roles and quickly concluded that the theory and practice in corporate as well as in educational administration programs are wholly inadequate for preparing women. Shakeshaft targeted several areas for consideration: the graduate school environment, the literature of the field, the female world of schools, administration and the female world and women and educational administration.

Examining the graduate school environment, Shakeshaft (1987) reported that women find a less than supportive atmosphere. Women who pursue graduate degrees in administration are less traditional and more socially deviant than the faculty, which is generally composed of older, traditional white males. Neither are male students a source of support. Few role models exist for women in these programs.

Shakeshaft (1987) noted that the literature of the field, the instructional material that must be read, is largely based on the behavior and experiences of men. This lack of

positive and appropriate curricular materials serves to
dampen the career goals of women. Even though there are
similarities in the backgrounds and experiences of men and
women administrators, there are also important differences.
Shakeshaft says it this way, "To be useful and inclusive,
theory and practice need to take into account the experiences
of all the players" (p.6).

In her examination of the female world of schools,
Shakeshaft (1987) concluded that, while both men and women
use a wide range of behaviors in their work, the patterns
of use vary greatly. Shakeshaft suggests four themes to
illustrate this point.

1. "Relationships with others are central to all actions
of women administrators" (p.7). As a result of this charac-
teristic, morale and productivity for both faculty and stu-
dents is higher under women administrators. Parents are also
more supportive and satisfied with schools run by women.

2. "Teaching and learning is the major focus of women
administrators" (p.8). Women administrators are more in-
volved and more knowledgeable in the area of instruction.
As a result, academic achievement is higher in schools and
in districts run by women.

3. "Building community is an essential part of a woman
administrator's style" (p.8). Inclusiveness, rather than
exclusiveness, is encouraged by the more democratic, parti-
cipatory style of women leaders.

4. "Marginality overlays the daily worklife of women

administrators" (p.9). The lives of administrative women are different than those of administrative men because of token status and sexist attitudes toward women which make women highly visible and vulnerable to criticism.

The exclusion of women from the literature of educational administration sets the tone for a host of books and articles advising women to imitate the male style. In her section on administration and the female world, Shakeshaft (1987) points out that male strategies are not necessarily helpful for women and are sometimes harmful. Supervision styles, uses of power and authority are all employed differently by women than by men. Likewise, the issue of climate from a female perspective needs to be addressed. Most climate research has focused solely on male perspectives.

Women's motives for entering education differ from men's motives. Women enter education to teach, to be close to children and to make a difference. As the tasks of administration move more toward the managerial, corporate model, the more alienated women become from administration.

As teaching and decision-making become separated by an ever-widening gulf, women (by nature) will be left behind, choosing to have a more immediate impact on the learning process. Shakeshaft (1987) suggests that the management metaphor could be replaced with an instructional leadership metaphor and attract more women to administration.

In the final section of Shakeshaft's book (1987), Women and Educational Administration, it is pointed out

that reconceptualizing theory and research to include the experiences of women is the first step toward any real understanding of human behavior in organizations.

Erickson (1985) draws on her research to present a composite view of how the female administrator handles conflict. As Erickson views it, there are two sources of conflict: internal conflict created by the socialization of females; and external conflict created by the tensions of playing very different roles between the home and the job. Erickson seems to be saying that women must adjust their beliefs and behaviors to fit the male model, something Shakeshaft would no doubt find wholly unacceptable. Erickson (1985) further takes an apologist stance regarding external conflict. She suggests adopting an androgynous approach to conflict on the job and a fairly traditional approach to resolving conflict at home. Basically, she advocates a "back door" approach to leadership or subtle insinuation into the power structure, remaining sufficiently unobtrusive so as not to lose one's femininity. At one point, she suggests strategies for getting one's husband to "permit" attendance at professional conferences.

Dodgson (1986) declares, as a result of her study, that women definitely need mentors to advance in administration. Yet, Lovelady-Dawson (1980) reports that those responsible for identifying, recruiting and promoting look to those with whom they can most easily identify. The result is that the largely white male leadership in our schools choose other

white males for promotion. Edson (1981) states that lack of a mentor may be a major deterrent to women's advancement in administration.

The Dodgson (1986) study encompassed Canadian women in administration. The most revealing finding was the identification of two crucial career steps that are greatly enhanced by the presence of a mentor. The first crucial career move in education comes when the woman moves from teacher to vice principal. Twenty-one of twenty-four women interviewed by Dodgson had a mentor to help them over this first major hurdle. The second pivotal point occurs when the woman is ready to move to a senior administrative position.

Unlike the initial move into a vice principal position, these women no longer need encouragement to attempt advancement, rather they need an "advocate, confidant and friend" (Dodgson, 1986, p.30). In the Dodgson (1986) study, all women who had made it to senior administration had mentors.

Dissertation research by Bahr (1985) examined mentoring experiences of female nursing students. There was an abundance of mentoring taking place for women in baccalaureate nursing programs but Bahr found limited mentoring for the administrative role. By way of explanation, Bahr suggested that mentors were readily available for students but the small number of female administrators greatly reduced the pool of possible mentors for administrative women and those seeking administrative roles.

Portraits of Female Administrators

Several studies focus on the identifiable characteristics of female administrators, many in an attempt to explain the the women's apparent success in terms of characteristics shared with men.

Maienza (1986), in a study of female superintendents in a five state area, concluded that socioeconomic status may be a factor that affects access to the superintendency, with women from working class backgrounds more likely to become superintendents. These women were found to be set apart from their peers in early childhood and to have developed a strong ability to seek out and effectively use relationships outside their families to foster positive advancement of their own agenda. Rather than career and family creating unsurmountable obstacles for these women, the data support the argument that the strong role model of a working mother along with the need to assume family responsibilities at an early age prompted these women to take responsibility for launching their own careers.

Schmuck (1975) addressed the issue of taking responsibility for advancement in her study of 40 Oregon administrators. Schmuck's interviews revealed that many, in fact most, of the women she interviewed, would not be in administrative positions had a superior not encouraged, and in some cases prodded their reluctant proteges. Many women reported that they enjoyed more freedom of career choice than did men. They

explained that if women choose to remain in the classroom they are still considered successful. On the other hand, men in education are expected to seek advancement. Many women simply saw no advantage to taking on more responsibility.

Schmuck's (1975) study also found that women display more self-doubts and lack of confidence about their abilities to be managers than do men. This, coupled with very real incidents of sex discrimination and the lack of role models, serves as a very effective deterrent to aspiring women.

Woo (1985) discovered in her survey of 450 top women administrators that the women did not believe they had benefited from affirmative action or flexible work hours. Neither did they believe that assertiveness training and special career guidance had greatly enhanced their promotability. Nor did they credit mentors with playing a significant role in their career advancement. These women seemed to put to rest the notions that women fear success and that they wish to be taken care of by men (Cinderella syndrome). Interestingly, in drawing a composite of these women, the one factor that distinguishes them from their non-administrative cohorts was active participation in competitive sports as children.

Do background variables, such as age, race, birth order and marital status make a difference for those aspiring to administrative posts? Paddock (1981) examined the background variables of a group of assistant principals, principals and superintendents. The results of this examination

revealed that educational administrators are "disproportion-ately middle aged, native born, male, married, white Protestants from nonurban backgrounds" (p.189). Controlling for gender, the same factors do not seem to project success for women. Paddock concluded that gender may be the most difficult factor to overcome. The only other variable that seemed to work against women was marriage. The interesting point here is that men in administration are expected to be married and in Paddock's study, over 90 percent were. Only 60 percent of the women in the study were married. Paddock suggests that family demands are viewed differently for men and women by the committees that make hiring decisions.

In a study of career paths of women superintendents, McDade and Drake (1982) found that women followed one of six possible patterns in their climbs to the top.

1. Approximately 36 percent followed a non-interrupted course from teaching or counseling to assistant principal, principal, director of elementary or secondary education, assistant superintendent, and finally superintendent. This path to the superintendency follows line positions and was more often attained within the same school district which was ordinarily small.

2. Almost 24 percent proceeded on a non-interrupted course through one or more specialized positions, such as special education or federal program directorships, finally arriving at the superintendency.

3. Another 12 percent of the women superintendents had

one or more interruptions in their careers as a result of family responsibilities, but had nevertheless proceeded through direct line positions to the superintendency.

4. Other women superintendents had family interruptions in their careers, but had attained the superintendency through one or more specialization positions. Fewer women, eight percent, followed this particular career path.

5. Even less traveled was the career path that had been interrupted for reasons other than family, but nonetheless progressed through line positions. Only six percent of the respondents had opted to interrupt their progression for further graduate study, internships and career pursuits outside education.

6. Somewhat more of the women superintendents, 13 percent, had progressed through specialization positions to the superintendency after interruptions for non-family reasons.

Paddock's (1981) study of male and female career paths in school administration took a different approach and reached somewhat different conclusions than did McDade and Drake (1982). Paddock (1981) concluded that once the initial position was gained, the career paths of men and women in public school administration did not differ markedly.

Paddock (1981) found that women got their first administrative position after more teaching experience than men and were therefore older than their male counterparts in a first administrative position. In this study, women entered teaching at an earlier age than men but were more likely to have

interruptions in their careers, further delaying their entry into administrative ranks. Additionally, women tended to decide they wanted an administrative career later than did men.

An earlier study by Howard (1975) indicated that women remained in lower-status, entry-level positions for much longer periods than did men. Howard concluded that even after gaining initial appointment to an administrative post women were likely to be promoted less often and much more slowly than men.

Teran and Licata (1986) examined the informal lines of communication as they relate to promotability in one northern city school district in the midwestern United States. The results of their interviews with 35 school principals show that informal patterns of communication closely parallel formal school district structure, with elementary principals interacting more closely with elementary principals, high school with high school and so forth. The interactions with central office personnel showed an extension of previously established ties at the building level.

The Teran and Licata (1986) study seems to undergird the belief that informal lines of communication are very important to promotability. While the Teran and Licata study did not focus on the issue of gender, it does underscore the importance of being part of an informal network to enhance the possibilities of promotion.

Adkison (1985) and Edson (1981) both found that women and men decide they want a career as an administrator sometime in

their twenties. This raises a question about whether women
are able to sustain that desire in the face of very limited
opportunities for advancement.

Intervention Programs

A number of studies cite efforts to intervene on behalf
of women. These intervention efforts seem to hold some
promise, although careful follow-up is needed to determine
their impact fully .

An Arizona program designed to prepare women for the
principalship, considered a stepping-stone to the superin-
tendency, was instituted in 1978. Between 1979 and 1983, 40
to 50 women participated each year. Within four years of
completing the program, 52 percent of the participants became
assistant principals, principals or district-level adminis-
trators. Overall, the percentage of women principals
increased from 12 percent in 1980 to 25 percent in 1984, with
70 percent having attended the institute (Metzger, 1985).
There was no indication of the proportion of secondary to
elementary principals in this group. Other research finds the
elementary principalship to be a dead-end on the career climb
(Shakeshaft, 1987).

An earlier program in South Florida centered its efforts
on raising aspiration levels among women teachers. Providing
female role models and "shadowing" working administrators
were among the activities. No data were offered to indicate
increases in women's representation in administration as a

result of this program (Kimmel and Harlow, 1977).

Gray (1983) attempted to assess the effectiveness of sex-equity workshops conducted by the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational Education. The purpose of the workshops was to increase awareness of sex role stereotyping and sex-bias. It was hoped the workshops would result in lasting attitudinal changes. Gray found that awareness was increased but that attitudinal changes had regressed when tested six months after the workshops. Gray (1983) concludes:

> Workshops addressing the question of sex equity,
> then, deal with values rooted in an individual's
> religion, culture, family, environment, past ex-
> perience, and even political views. A two-day
> workshop cannot do much in changing attitudes
> that are 20 years in the making, but it can
> create an awareness of some of the problems that
> sex bias and sex stereotyping can create (p.58).

The Sex Equity in Educational Leadership (SEEL) Project as reported by Schmuck in Schmuck, Charters and Carlson (1981), sought to change (1) individual attitudes, behaviors and understandings, (2) organizational policies and practices, and (3) local school district hiring practices in Oregon. The results of the study indicated that, while more women were hired for administrative positions in the 1977-1978 school year in Oregon, the majority of new women administrators were hired for jobs typically viewed as appropriate for females. In almost every case, the positions filled by women were low-status, staff positions.

In a 1979 assessment of a number of programs designed to help women seek promotion, Kimmel, Harlow and Topping con-cluded that these efforts should continue and that the impact

on the women who participate has been positive and rewarding.

Summary

This chapter has included a selected review of the literature, including research related to historical perspective, theoretical framework, sex-role stereotypes, achievement/ motivation, gender-specific socialization, supply and demand, the feminization of occupations, formal preparation, support networks, mentoring, portraits of female administrators and intervention programs.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTION AND

TREATMENT OF DATA

Population

The population for this study consisted of individuals
certified to serve as elementary principals, secondary prin-
cipals and superintendents in Oklahoma as of September 27,
1987. The list obtained from the State Department of Educa-
tion contained more than 8000 entries, with 4841 different
names and addresses, indicating that some of the people on
the list hold administrative certification in more than one
area. Since the list gave no indication of the level of the
certificate(s) held, i.e. elementary or secondary principal
or superintendent, it was impossible to sample from each
level proportionately. Gender was also not specified. In
most cases this did not present a problem. However, gender
was a salient variable for the purposes of this study.
Therefore, it was necessary to draw a sufficient random
sample of both men and women.

The population was operationally defined as those indi-
viduals either currently occupying administrative positions
or prepared to occupy administrative positions, as evidenced

44

by certification. The population did not include individuals currently preparing for certification, nor those who aspire to administration but have not yet begun to prepare formally. Those serving as teaching principals without certification were not part of the population for this study.

Sample Selection

An equal allocation stratified random sample (Wiersma 1986) was chosen as the best approach to the research questions posed. The population was first divided into two strata, or sub-populations, men and women. The individuals in each group were then numbered. The first stratum, men, contained 3618 names or 74.7 percent of the total population. Women accounted for 1223 names or 25.3 percent of the population.

When names did not lend obvious assignment of gender, gender was assigned based on conventional spellings for gender-specific names. For example, Francis was assigned a number in the male stratum and Frances was assigned a number in the female stratum. Random selection of subjects from the strata assured random distribution of any misassigned names and should not confound data collection.

Two hundred and fifty names were selected from each stratum using a random number table. According to McCall (1980), an appropriate sample size for a population of 5000 is 357. A sample of this size produces a 95 percent level of confidence with a permissible error level of .05. Increasing the

sample to 488 increases the level of confidence to 98 percent with the same error level. A sample of 500 was chosen. A return rate of 48 percent or 240 usable surveys was projected.

Subjects

The primary analysis units (AUs) for the study were certificate holders employed as line administrators in job status one, line, and those aspiring to line positions in job status two, aspiring. Line positions, defined in Chapter 1 of this study, included superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals and positions with like duties but different titles. Certificate holders employed in staff positions and as classroom teachers were considered aspirants. All AUs were employed in public schools in Oklahoma. Respondents not currently employed in the public schools of Oklahoma were not considered in the data analysis.

Based on the definitions of aspirant and line administrator, six categories were generated. The six categories included the following:

1. Superintendents and assistant superintendents. This category did not include county superintendents serving dependent school districts without a high school.

2. Secondary principals and assistant principals. This category did include middle school, junior high and high school line administrators.

3. Elementary principals and assistant principals.

Administrators in dependent (K-8) and independent (K-12) districts were considered.

4. District level staff positions. These included titles such as director and coordinator.

5. Building level staff positions. These included quasi-administrative positions such as department chair and counselor.

6. Classroom teachers. These included coaches.

Categories one through three comprised the first level of the dependent variable, job status and categories four through six comprised the second level of job status. The six categories were further delineated according to gender. This produced twelve levels under the variable name, position. The twelve levels are:

1. Women employed as superintendents or assistant superintendents.

2. Women employed as secondary principals or assistant principals.

3. Women employed as elementary principals or assistant principals.

4. Women aspiring from district-level staff positions.

5. Women aspiring from building-level staff positions.

6. Women aspiring from teaching positions.

7. Men employed as superintendents or assistant superintendents.

8. Men employed as secondary principals or assistant principals.

9. Men employed as elementary principals or assistant principals.

10. Men aspiring from district- level staff positions.

11. Men aspiring from building-level staff positions.

12. Men aspiring from teaching positions.

Thus, the variable, position, became a dependent variable with twelve possible levels of analysis.

Preparing for the Study

The research questions posited in Chapter I are the questions that needed to be answered and the literature did not support any one methodology for deriving reasonable explanations for these various phenomena. The research questions suggested in this study are those "questions for further research" that were garnered from a number of studies.

As suggested by the work of Bonuso and Shakeshaft (1981), a deviation from the traditional methods of logical positivism is essential to begin to explore the many facets of gender-specific experience. It was in this spirit that the methodology for the study was proposed.

In the course of attempting composition of a survey instrument that would reasonably address the issues of this study it became apparent that without somehow enumerating the experiences, feelings and beliefs of those people comprising the applicant pool it would be virtually impossible to collect and quantify data capable of explaining any portion of the research questions. A three part study was undertaken

for the purpose of exploring the research questions.

Instrument Development

The first phase of the study consisted of developing interview protocols (Appendix A), interviewing 18 subjects, analyzing responses and developing a survey instrument.

Step one was to develop the interview protocols. The interview instrument included demographic questions, career pattern questions and hiring process questions. The questions were derived from the literature discussed in Chapter II. Some of the questions were forced choice while others were more open-ended. The protocols were piloted with two colleagues who made suggestions that were incorporated in the protocols.

The second step of phase one began with selection of 24 men and 24 women from the population. The 48 subjects were exclusive of the larger sample of 500. The <u>1987-1988 Oklahoma Educational Directory</u> was used to determine who among the 48 was currently employed in a line position. Four men and five women were identified as current line administrators and phone numbers were noted.

Telephone books in the public library were scrutinized for the remaining 36 subjects. When a telephone directory was not available for a listed community, or when an individual's number was not listed in an available directory, Directory Assistance was called. This search yielded phone numbers for sixteen subjects.

Calling began on April 21, 1988. Of the original 24 phone numbers from the list of 48 subjects, nine produced interviews. One of the interviews was not considered appropriate for inclusion because the subject was retired.

Nine interviews was not considered adequate to complete any meaningful analysis that could lead to survey construction. Three of the first nine interviewed were called back and asked to suggest interviewees. To identify and interview subjects representing all six categories of the dependent variable, job status, this method of soliciting subjects was continued. Ultimately 18 subjects were interviewed and all levels of job status were represented.

The interviews were conducted by telephone between April 21, 1988, and May 19, 1988. Each interview was recorded on audio tape and a separate protocol form was kept as the interviews proceeded.

Step three required analyzing the interviews for patterns. As patterns emerged survey questions were written to parallel the findings. Step four of phase one, developing the survey instrument was completed in early June. Once again, colleagues responded to the instrument and suggested revisions, many of which were incorporated in the instrument.

Phase two of the study involved piloting the instrument, analyzing the data and revising the instrument once more. The instrument (Appendix B) was piloted in EAHED 6453, Legal Aspects of Education and EAHED 6263 Supervision on June 16, 1988 at Oklahoma State University. The participants were

asked to respond to the questions and to include any comments regarding the nature and structure of the instrument. The instrument itself contained 76 questions with several requiring response at multiple levels. The instrument was six typewritten pages long.

The participants did not parallel the research population even though both classes where the instrument was piloted are required for administrative certification. Several respondents were employed in state agencies and in higher education. These people found it difficult to respond to many items and indicated such. The suggestion advanced most frequently was to shorten the survey and to adjust the format for ease of reading These suggestions were incorporated in the final instrument.

While it is unnecessary and perhaps inappropriate to report the analysis of data from the pilot study, it is worthy of note that the analysis led to the decision to omit several questions and more closely target those items directly related to the research questions.

Data Collection

The final phase of the study began with a final revision of the survey instrument. The final instrument consisted of 61 items on two pages. Colleagues reviewed the instrument. Revisions were incorporated before final printing.

A cover letter (Appendix C) was prepared. The instruments were mailed August 12, 1988 and August 13, 1988. This time frame was chosen to increase return rate. Public school

employees have generally returned to school by early August in Oklahoma. It was believed this time frame would encourage subjects to respond as they returned and began to think about school. A time cue, August 26, 1988, was included in the cover letter, allowing approximately ten days to respond and four days for mailing both ways. Stamped, return envelopes were included with the instrument. Follow-up postcards, (Appendix E) were mailed to 243 non-respondents on August 27 and 28, 1988.

Treatment of the Data

Treatment of the data began with the conversion of responses to numerical values (Appendix F). After tabulating each variable by gender, several variables were collapsed into groups for ease and practicality of analysis (Appendix G). Two variables, gender and title, were combined to form an additional variable, position; gender and previous title were combined to form yet another variable, previous position (Appendix H). The two levels of job status were derived by including superintendents or assistants, secondary principals or assistants and elementary principals or assistants in level one, line administration and including district-level staff, building-level staff and classroom teachers in level two, aspiring to line positions.

A total of 62 variables and 264 cases was included in the data set. The Systat program for statistical analysis was used to compute all values.

Cases that did not fit one of the six categories of the two levels of the dependent variable, job status, were deleted from the data set. Those respondents omitted included retirees, employees of state-level agencies, those employed in the private sector and those employed in vocational schools. Range, mean and standard deviation were computed for all variables. Descriptive statistics for each level of the derived variable, position, were computed in the hope that a more comprehensive view of employment patterns would emerge.

Where measures of central tendency were not appropriate, the data were tabulated by percent. This was done first by position, then by position and previous position so that some information could be gleaned about the patterns of promotion for the groups under consideration.

The research instrument produced frequencies in discrete categories, both nominal and ordinal, making chi-square the appropriate technique for data analyses. The level of significance for the study was set at $p < .05$.

Summary

This chapter has included a description of the population, method of sample selections, definition and delineation of the dependent variable, preparation for the study, data collection and treatment of the data.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The presentation of the data includes both descriptive
and inferential statistics. A total of 322 (64.4%) of the
surveys were returned. Thirty-six (7.2%) were returned by
the Postal Service as undeliverable; three (.6%) were re-
turned with notes explaining that the respondent was deceased;
four (.8%) were returned with notes explaining that the sub-
ject was no longer in education; one (.2%) was returned
unanswered but with a note explaining that the subject did
not have an administrative position. Fifteen (3%) were re-
turned by the Postal Service with forwarding addresses
included. Each was subsequently resent to the new address.
All 15 of the remailed surveys were returned. A total of 264
(52.8%) usable surveys was received. After omitting re-
spondents employed in agencies other than public schools
(2.8%), in private schools (.8%) and those who identified
themselves as retired (3.4%), the final data set subjected to
analysis contained responses from 235 individuals, repre-
senting 47% of the original sample.

Descriptive Statistics

Women represented 52.8 percent (N=124) of the respondents;

men represented 47.2 percent (N=111). The average age of all subjects was slightly over 46 (46.5) with the youngest being 28 and the oldest 67. The average age of women was 46.0 with the youngest female respondent being 28, the oldest 62. The men in the study averaged 46.9 years with the range being 29 to 67.

Men were more likely than women to have children and the average number of children was slightly higher (2.165) for men than for women (2.080).

Level of educational attainment was coded from one to seven (Appendix F), with one equal to less than high school, two equal to high school, three equal to some college, four equal to a bachelor's degree, five equal to a master's degree, six equal to an education specialist's degree and seven equal to a doctor's degree. Spouses of administrative certificate holders tended to have slightly less than a bachelor's degree (3.973) with the spouses of women (4.140) more likely than the spouses of men (3.796) to have a bachelor's degree.

On average, the fathers (2.183) and mothers (2.305) of respondents had completed slightly more than high school. The parents of female respondents had completed slightly more schooling (fathers 2.333 and mothers 2.392) than either parent of male respondents (fathers 2.027 and mothers 2.212).

Size of home community was collapsed into categories with one representing communities of less than or equal to 2,500, two representing communities of between 2,501 and 20,000, three representing communities of between 20,001 and 100,000

and four representing communities equal to or more than 100,001. Size of high school graduating class ranged from one to four, with one being a class less than or equal to 50, two a class between 51 and 200, three a class between 201 and 400 and four a class greater than or equal to 401. (Appendix G) Women grew up in communities slightly larger (1.742) than the communities men grew up in (1.712) and tended to come from larger graduating high school classes (women, 2.113; men, 1.874).

The average respondent had 12.385 years of experience as a classroom teacher, 8.135 years of experience as an adminis- trator and had secured their first administrative position before their thirty-sixth birthday, 35.794.

The average female respondent was almost 38 (37.946) before securing an administrative job. Average tenure as an administrator was 5.120 years after 12.828 years as a class- room teacher.

The typical male respondent taught for 11.904 years, moved into administration at 33.991 years and has been in an administrative position for 11.413 years. The background variables previously discussed are summarized in Table I.

Several of the demographic variables did not lend them- selves to measures of central tendency. These variables were tabulated by percentage of all respondents and in some cases by position, the derived variable created by combining gender and job title.

An overwhelming majority of the sample was white (N=213,

TABLE I

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OF SUBJECTS ON SELECTED
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variable	Men (N=111)		Women (N=124)		Total (N=235)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Age	46.939	8.394	46.032	8.216	46.467	8.297
Child	2.165	1.147	2.080	1.248	2.121	1.199
SpsEd	3.796	1.182	4.140	1.349	3.973	1.280
FaEd	2.027	1.411	2.333	1.444	2.183	1.433
MoEd	2.212	1.206	2.392	1.183	2.305	1.195
Grad	1.874	1.054	2.113	1.053	2.000	1.058
Town	1.712	0.985	1.742	0.945	1.728	0.962
Exper	11.904	6.706	12.828	6.282	12.385	6.492
AdmExp	11.413	7.537	5.120	5.233	8.135	7.157
FstAdm	33.991	6.985	37.946	10.036	35.794	8.717

KEY: Age = present age; Child = # of children; SpsEd, FaED
and MoEd = educational attainment of spouse, father and
mother respectively with 1 = < high school, 2 = high
school, 3 = some college, 4 = BA/BS, 5 = MA/MS, 6 = Ed Spec
and 7 = EdD/PhD; Grad = size of high school graduating
class with 1 <= 50, 2 = 51 - 200, 3 = 201 - 400 and 4 >=
401; Town = size of childhood community with 1 <= 2,500,
2 = 2,501 - 20,000, 3 = 20,001 - 100,000 and 4 >= 100,001;
Exper = years of classroom experience; AdmExp = years of
administrative experience; FstAdm = age on attaining first
administrative position.

90.64%). Blacks represented the next largest group with N=11 or 4.68 percent. Native Americans accounted for 3.40 percent (N=8), Asians .43 percent (N=1) and Hispanics .43 percent (N=1).

Those reporting being the first born or only child accounted for 44.26 percent (N=104) of the sample. Those born after the first child in a family but before the last, comprised 30.21 percent and 25.53 percent of the respondents were the last child born in their families.

A large portion of the sample was married (87.23%). The percentage of respondents reporting being either single or divorced was approximately the same, 5.53 percent and 5.96 percent respectively. No men and a small percentage of women (1.28%) indicated they were widowed.

Men (44.26%) were more likely to be married than women (42.98%) and less likely to be single (1.70% for men and 3.83% for women) or divorced (1.28% for men and 4.68% for women).

One female subject indicated that she held no administrative certificates and one female subject did not respond to the item. The subject who reported no certificate perhaps misunderstood the question since her name came from a list of administrative certificate holders in Oklahoma.

Of those responding to the item, administrative certificates held, 44.68 percent held either provisional elementary or standard elementary certification; 46.38 percent held either provisional secondary or standard secondary

certification; and 8.08 percent held either provisional or standard superintendent's certification.

Men held standard secondary certification (27.23%) at about the same level that women held standard elementary certification (25.53%). A much larger percentage of men (7.13%, compared to women at .85%) held superintendent's certification. The majority of respondents indicated they were currently ineligible to hold additional certification (59.57%). Men (22.98%) were more likely than women (17.34%) to be eligible for further certification.

Slightly more than one-fourth (25.96%) of all respondents were in school districts with less than 300 students. School districts with between 1,000 and 2,999 students employed 22.13% of those responding. The other 52 percent of subjects were distributed somewhat evenly; 301-599 students, 13.62 percent; 600-999 students, 14.04 percent; 3,000-9,999 students, 11.49 percent; more than 10,000 students, 12.77 percent.

One male respondent reported having only a bachelor's degree. The possibility of misunderstanding the question is posed since administrative certification requires a minimum of a master's degree.

The vast majority of subjects hold a master's degree (90.64%), two men (.83%) hold education specialist's degrees and a small percentage of subjects (8.09%) hold a doctor's degree. More respondents hold advanced degrees in fields other than administration (55.70%) than in administration (41.70%). Women (21.77%) were slightly more likely than men

(20.43%) to hold advanced degrees in administration.

A large portion (66.38%) of subjects reported that they had been promoted within the same district. Women (37.87%) were more likely to be promoted within one district than were men (28.51%). Nearly a third (29.36%) of all promotions occurred as a result of applying outside the district, with men (17.45%) more likely to receive promotion in this manner than women (11.91%). These variables are summarized in Table II.

Selected Demographic Variables
by Position

The independent variables gender, age, number of children, race, birth order, marital status, administrative certification, eligibility for administrative certificates, school population, highest degree, field of study and promotion from within the same district were tabulated by the derived variable, position. Measures of central tendency did not provide useful information about these variables, so the numbers represent the percent of all respondents and the percent of respondents by position. Position was determined by combining the variable, gender with the variable, title, thus producing the following twelve levels of the variable, position.

1. Women employed as superintendents or assistants.

2. Women employed as secondary principals or assistants.

3. Women employed as elementary principals or assistants.

TABLE II

TABULATION OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variable Level	Men (N=111)		Women (N=124)		Total (N=235)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race						
. No Response	1	.43	0	.00	1	.43
1 White	101	42.97	112	47.66	213	90.64
2 Black	5	2.12	6	2.55	11	4.68
3 Asian	1	.43	0	.00	1	.43
4 Nat.Amer.	3	1.27	5	2.12	8	3.40
5 Hispanic	0	.00	1	.43	1	.43
BOrd						
1 First	43	18.29	61	25.96	104	44.26
2 Not First or Last	40	17.02	31	13.19	71	30.21
3 Last	28	11.91	32	13.62	60	25.53
MStat						
1 Single	4	1.70	9	3.83	13	5.53
2 Married	104	44.26	101	42.98	205	87.23
3 Divorced	3	1.28	11	4.68	14	5.96
4 Widowed	0	.00	3	1.28	3	1.28
AdmCrt						
. No Response	0	.00	1	.43	1	.43
0 None	0	.00	1	.43	1	.43
1 Prov. Elem	0	.00	21	8.94	21	8.94
2 Std. Elem	24	10.21	60	25.53	84	35.74
3 Prov. Sec	6	2.55	10	4.26	16	6.81
4 Std. Sec	64	27.23	29	12.34	93	39.57
5 Prov. Supt	2	.85	0	.00	2	.85
6 Std. Supt	15	6.38	2	.85	17	7.23
Elig						
0 None	57	24.25	83	35.32	140	59.57
1 One or More	54	22.98	41	17.45	95	40.43

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable Level	Men (N=111)		Women (N=124)		Total (N=235)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SchPop						
1 < 300	29	12.34	32	13.62	61	25.96
2 301-599	16	6.81	16	6.81	32	13.62
3 600-999	15	6.38	18	7.66	33	14.04
4 1000-2999	28	11.91	24	10.21	52	22.13
5 3000-9999	14	5.96	13	5.53	27	11.49
6 >= 10000	9	3.83	21	8.94	30	12.77
Degree						
1 BA/BS	1	.43	0	.00	1	.43
2 MA/MS	101	42.97	112	47.66	213	90.64
3 EdSpec	2	.85	0	.00	2	.85
4 EdD/PhD	7	2.98	12	5.11	19	8.09
Field						
. No Response	4	1.70	2	.85	6	2.55
1 Admin	48	20.43	50	21.77	98	41.70
2 Other	59	25.11	72	30.64	131	55.75
SamDst						
. No Response	3	1.28	7	2.98	10	4.26
1 Prom/in dist	67	28.51	89	37.87	156	66.38
2 Prom/out dist	41	17.45	28	11.91	69	29.36

KEY: BOrd = birth order of respondent; MStat = marital status; AdmCrt = administrative certificates held; Elig = eligibility for additional administrative certificates; SchPop = size of school district where employed; Degree = highest degree held; Field = highest degree held in administration (1) or other area (2); SamDst = promotion to administration within the same district where a classroom teacher.

4. Women aspiring from district-level staff positions.

5. Women aspiring from building-level staff positions.

6. Women aspiring from teaching positions.

7. Men employed as superintendents or assistants.

8. Men employed as secondary principals or assistants.

9. Men employed as elementary principals or assistants.

10. Men aspiring from district-level staff positions.

11. Men aspiring from building-level staff positions.

12. Men aspiring from teaching positions.

This simple tabulation yielded an informative picture of employment in line positions and aspiring positions.

Of the 220 individuals who responded to this item, 149 held line positions. Sixty-three (42.28%) of the line positions were held by women. Sixty-five percent of the line positions occupied by women were elementary principals or assistant principals. Eighty-six (57.72%) of the line positions were held by men, 37 were secondary principals or assistant principals and 34 were superintendents or assistant superintendents.

Seventy-one of the respondents were employed in positions defined in Chapter One as aspiring. Sixty-one (85.91%) of these positions were filled by women, with 28 (45.90%) aspiring from the classroom, 15 (24.59%) aspiring from a building-level staff position and 18 (29.50%) aspiring from a district-level staff position. All 10 (14.08%) men in aspiring positions were currently employed in district-level staff slots. Complete figures for position by gender are included in Table III.

TABLE III

TABULATION OF POSITION BY GENDER

Pos	Gender Female (N = 124)	Male (N = 111)	Line Pos % Gen	% Total	Aspiring Pos % Gen	% Total
1	4		6.35	2.68		
7		34	39.53	22.82		
2	18		28.57	12.08		
8		37	43.02	24.83		
3	41		65.08	27.51		
9		15	17.44	10.07		
	___	___				
Totals	63	86				
4	18				29.51	25.35
10		10			100.00	14.08
5	15				24.59	21.13
11		0			00.00	00.00
6	28				45.90	39.44
12		0			00.00	00.00
	___	___				
Totals	61	10				

KEY: Line Positions: 1 - 2 - 3 = female superintend-
ents or assistants, secondary principals or assistants,
elementary principals or assistants respectively ; 7 - 8 -
9 = male superintendents or assistants, secondary princi-
pals or assistants, elementary principals or assistants
respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4 - 5 - 6 = female
district-level staff, building-level staff, and classroom
teachers respectively; 10 - 11 - 12 = male district-level
staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respec-
tively.

Of all respondents, 1.28 percent were 29 years old or younger, 20.43 percent were between 30 and 39, 42.13 percent were between 40 and 49 (the largest group), 30.21 percent between 50 and 59 and 5.96 percent were 60 years old or older. There was no basis for comparing the ages of males and females aspiring from either building-level staff positions or from the classroom since there were no male respondents in those positions. Almost one-fifth (18.74%) of the female respondents were aspiring from these positions and 5.96 percent were 50 years old or older. For those groups that can be compared, 40 to 49 was the age group most represented in the administrative ranks.

When the responses were divided by those employed in line positions versus those aspiring to line positions, the two levels of the dependent variable, job status, the distribution of men and women diverged in a clearer pattern. Of all respondents, 63.33 percent hold line positions; 26.72 percent held by women; 36.61 percent held by men. Of those responding, 29.39 percent report aspiring to line positions: 25.13 percent women and 4.26 percent men.

The single largest group of women (7.66% of all respondents) was elementary principals or assistant principals between the ages of 40 and 49. The next largest group of women (6.38% of all respondents) was elementary principals or assistant principals between the ages of 50 and 59.

Male superintendents or assistant superintendents between the ages of 50 and 59 and secondary principals or assistant

principals between the ages of 40 and 49 represent the largest groups of male administrators (5.96% each of all respondents). Male superintendents or assistant superintendents between the ages of 40 and 49 represent the second largest group of men (5.11% of all respondents). A complete account of the ages of respondents by position is included in Table IV.

Two children were reported by 44.68 percent of all respondents regardless of position. Almost a fifth (18.72%) of the respondents reported having three children.

All superintendents and assistant superintendents were white. Almost all those reporting any line position were white (57.87% of all respondents). A small percentage (2.56%) of all positions was held by black women. Black men fared somewhat worse with 1.71 percent of all positions. All other minority groups combined held only 6.85 percent of all positions. Tabulation of race by position is detailed in Table V.

First born women held more line positions (12.76% of all respondents) than later born (12.22% of all respondents) or last born (7.24 of all respondents). A larger percentage of first born women held aspiring positions (13.19% of all respondents) rather than line positions. Men in line positions were more likely to be first born (14.47% of all respondents) than later born (11.22% of all respondents) or last born (9.80% of all respondents), but the differences were small. Table VI details birth order by position.

The majority of respondents were married (87.23%). Single

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE OF AGE BY POSITION

Pos	=> 29 Women	Men	30-39 Women	Men	40-49 Women	Men	50-59 Women	Men	=< 60 Women	Men	Total* Women	Men
1/7	.00	.00	.85	1.70	.00	5.11	.85	5.96	.00	1.70	1.70	14.47
2/8	.00	.43	.43	3.33	3.83	5.96	2.55	4.68	.85	.85	7.66	15.74
3/9	.00	.00	2.55	2.13	7.66	2.55	6.38	1.28	.85	.43	17.45	6.38
Tot	.00	.43	3.83	7.66	11.49	13.62	9.78	11.92	1.70	2.98	26.72	36.61
4/10	.00	.00	2.13	.43	4.26	2.13	1.28	1.70	.00	.00	7.66	4.26
5/11	.43	.00	1.70	.00	2.98	.00	1.28	.00	.00	.00	6.38	.00
6/12	.43	.00	2.98	.00	3.83	.00	3.40	.00	1.28	.00	11.91	.00
Tot	.86	.00	6.81	.43	10.22	2.13	5.96	1.70	1.28	.00	25.13	4.26

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

Key: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE OF RACE BY POSITION

Pos	White Women	White Men	Black Women	Black Men	Asian Women	Asian Men	Nat Amer Women	Nat Amer Men	Hispanic Women	Hispanic Men	Total* Women	Total* Men
1/7	1.7	14.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.7	14.4
2/8	7.23	13.6	0.43	1.28	0	0	0	0.43	0	0	7.66	15.3
3/9	15.3	5.53	1.28	0	0	0.43	0.85	0.43	0	0	17.4	6.39
Tot	24.2	33.6	1.71	1.28	0	0.43	0.85	0.86	0	0	26.8	36.1
4/10	7.23	3.83	0	0.43	0	0	0.43	0	0	0	7.66	4.26
5/11	5.96	0	0	0	0	0	0.43	0	0	0	6.39	0
6/12	10.2	0	0.85	0	0	0	0.43	0	0.43	0.43	11.9	0.43
Tot	23.4	3.83	0.85	0.43	0	0	1.29	0	0.43	0.43	25.9	4.69

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGE OF BIRTH ORDER BY POSITION

Pos	First		Not 1st or last		Last		Total*	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
1/7	0.85	6.81	0.43	3.4	0.43	4.26	1.71	14.4
2/8	4.68	5.11	1.28	6.38	1.7	4.26	7.66	15.7
3/9	7.23	2.55	5.11	2.55	5.11	1.28	17.4	6.38
Tot	12.7	14.4	6.82	12.3	7.24	9.8	26.8	36.6
4/10	4.68	0.85	2.55	1.7	0.43	1.7	7.66	4.25
5/11	3.4	0	0.85	0	2.13	0	6.38	0
6/12	5.11	0	2.98	0	3.83	0	11.9	0
Tot	13.1	0.85	6.38	1.7	6.39	1.7	25.9	4.25

* Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

respondents (5.53%) and divorced respondents (5.96%) were in the minority and only 1.28 percent reported being widowed. When marital status was examined by position, it became clear that most superintendents and assistant superintendents are married. More male (97.06%) than female (75%) superintendents or assistant superintendents were married. Slightly more male (89.19%) than female (83.33%) secondary principals or assistant principals were married. Male elementary principals and assistant principals were all married (100%). Slightly more than 80 percent of female elementary principals and assistant principals were married. Marital status by position is detailed in Table VII.

Tables VIII and IX deal with current administrative certification held and eligibility to hold additional certification respectively. Of the four women reported to hold position one, superintendent or assistant superintendent, none reported holding superintendent's certification and three (75%) reported being eligible for this certificate. On the other hand, of the men reporting employment as superintendents or assistant superintendents, position seven, 17 (50%) had either a provisional or standard superintendent's certificate and an additional 17 (50%) reported eligibility for the proper certificate. This finding is somewhat of a mystery since certification is required.

For positions two and eight, secondary principal or assistant principal, 15 women (83.33%) and 36 men (97.29%) hold the appropriate certificate. Of the one remaining man

TABLE VII

PERCENTAGE OF MARITAL STATUS BY POSITION

Pos	Single Women	Single Men	Married Women	Married Men	Divorced Women	Divorced Men	Widowed Women	Widowed Men	Total* Women	Total* Men
1/7	0.43	0	1.28	14.0	0	0.43	0	0	1.71	14.4
2/8	0.43	1.28	6.38	14.0	0.85	0.43	0	0	7.66	15.7
3/9	1.7	0	14.0	6.38	0.85	0	0.85	0	17.4	6.38
Tot	2.56	1.28	21.7	34.4	1.7	0.86	0.85	0	26.8	36.6
4/10	0.43	0	6.38	4.26	0.85	0	0	0	7.66	4.26
5/11	0	0	6.38	0	0	0	0	0	6.38	0
6/12	0.85	0	8.51	0	2.13	0	0.43	0	11.9	0
Tot	1.28	0	21.2	4.26	2.98	0	0.43	0	25.9	4.26

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals,
elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents,
secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring
Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff,
classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff,
building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE CERTIFICATES HELD BY POSITION

| | Certificate Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total* | |
Pos	1 Women	Men	2 Women	Men	3 Women	Men	4 Women	Men	5 Women	Men	6 Women	Men	Women	Men
1/7	0.43	0	1.28	1.7	0	0	0	5.53	0	0.85	0	6.38	1.71	14.46
2/8	0	0	0.85	0.43	0.43	0.43	6.38	14.8	0	0	0	0	7.66	15.75
3/9	0.43	0	17.0	6.38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.4	6.38
Tot	0.86	0	19.1	8.51	0.43	0.43	6.38	20.4	0	0.85	0	6.38	26.8	36.59
4/10	0.85	0	2.13	1.28	0	0	2.98	2.98	0	0	0.85	0	6.81	4.26
5/11	1.7	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.4	0
6/12	5.53	0	2.55	0	0	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	9.78	0
Tot	8.08	0	6.38	1.28	0	0	4.68	2.98	0	0	0.85	0	19.9	4.26

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.
Certificate Levels: 1 = provisional elementary, 2 = standard elementary, 3 = provisional secondary, standard secondary, 5 = provisional superintendent, 6 = standard superintendent.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

TABLE IX

PERCENTAGE OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION BY POSITION

Pos	Prov Elem Women	Men	Stan Elem Women	Men	Prov Sec Women	Men	Stan Sec Women	Men	Prov Supt Women	Men	Stan Supt Women	Men	Total* Women	Men
1/7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.55	0.43	0.43	0.85	6.81	0.43	9.79
2/8	0	0	0.43	1.28	0	0	0	0	2.13	2.98	0	1.7	2.56	5.96
3/9	0	0	0	0	0.43	0	0.85	0.85	1.28	0.85	1.28	1.28	2.56	2.98
Tot	0	0	0.43	1.28	0.43	0	0.85	3.4	3.84	4.26	2.13	9.79	5.55	18.7
4/10	0	0	0	0	0.43	0	0.85	0.43	1.28	0.43	1.28	1.28	3.84	2.14
5/11	0	0	0.85	0	0.43	0	0	0	0.43	0	0	0	1.71	0
6/12	0	0	2.13	0	0	0	0.85	0	1.28	0	0	0	4.26	0
Tot	0	0	2.98	0	0.86	0	1.7	0.43	2.99	0.43	1.28	1.28	9.81	2.14

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendent, secondary principal, elementary principal respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendent, secondary principal, elementary principal respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from table; total does not equal 100%.

and the three remaining women in this position, none reported being eligible for proper certification.

Positions three and eight, the elementary principalship or assistant principalship, had 56 respondents, 41 women and 15 men. All of the men and women hold an elementary principal's certificate. Six women and five men in this group report eligibility for a superintendent's certificate.

Of those aspiring from district-level positions, four and 10, seven women hold an elementary principal's certificate, nine hold a secondary principal's certificate and two hold a superintendent's certificate. Of the ten men reporting, three hold an elementary principal's certificate and seven hold a secondary principal's certificate. Of this group, six women and five men reported eligibility for a superintendent's certificate. Of the 28 people in these positions, only 13 reported being ineligible for additional certification.

For those aspiring from staff positions at the building level, five and 11, and classroom positions, six and 12, there was no basis for comparison of men and women since no men reported holding these positions. For the women at these levels, 27 hold an elementary principal's certificate, with seven more being eligible. Fourteen women in these groups hold a secondary principal's certificate, with three more being eligible for the certificate. None in these groups currently holds a superintendent's certificate, but four report eligibility for this certificate. Of the 43 women in these categories, 29 report ineligibility for certification

beyond their initial certificates.

As noted earlier, almost half of all respondents were employed in school districts serving fewer than 300 students (25.96%) or serving between 1,000 and 2,999 students (22.13%). A composite of school population by position is presented in Table X.

Briefly, women superintendents or assistant superintendents tend to be in schools of less than 300 or more than 3,000. Men appear to be distributed fairly evenly with a slightly higher percentage in schools with populations between 1,000 and 2,999.

Women secondary principals or assistant principals also seem to be concentrated in either very small or very large schools. Men in the secondary principalship were represented in larger numbers and by greater percentages than women at all levels of school population.

All women in the superintendency hold a master's degree in a field other than administration. Men in the superintendency hold master's degrees, education specialist's degrees and doctor's degrees with field of study divided evenly between administration and non-administration.

For the secondary principalship and assistant principalship, the majority of both men and women hold master's degrees with more men than women holding degrees in administration. One male reported holding only a bachelor's degree and five women had a doctorate. The vast majority of elementary principals or assistant principals hold a master's degree. Five women reported holding a doctorate. Twenty-two women and

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL POPULATION BY POSITION

Pos	<= 300 Women	Men	301-599 Women	Men	600-999 Women	Men	1,000-2,999 Women	Men	3,000-9,999 Women	Men	>= 10,000 Women	Men	Total* Women	Men
1/7	0.85	2.55	0	2.98	0	1.7	0	3.83	0.43	2.13	0.43	1.28	1.28	14.4
2/8	1.28	3.4	0.85	1.7	0.85	2.98	1.7	5.11	0.43	1.7	2.55	0.85	5.11	15.7
3/9	5.53	2.98	1.7	1.28	3.83	0.43	2.98	1.28	1.7	0.43	1.7	0	15.7	6.4
Tot	7.66	1.28	2.55	5.96	4.68	5.11	4.68	10.2	2.56	4.26	4.68	2.13	22.1	28.9
4/10	0.85	0	1.7	0	0.85	0.43	1.7	0.43	1.28	0.85	1.28	1.28	7.66	2.99
5/11	1.7	0	1.28	0	0.43	0	2.55	0	0	0	0.43	0	6.39	0
6/12	3.4	0	1.28	0	1.7	0	1.28	0	1.7	0	2.55	0	11.9	0
Tot	5.95	0	4.26	0	2.98	0.43	5.53	0.43	2.98	0.85	4.26	1.28	25.9	2.99

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

eight men reported their highest degree to be in administration. Eighteen women and six men held their degrees in a field other than administration.

Of all respondents in the aspiring categories (71), 68 had a master's degree. Two women and one man in an aspiring position hold a doctorate. Twenty-nine had degrees in administration. Tables XI and XII summarize the data for highest degree held and field of study by position, respectively.

Most women in line positions were promoted within the same district (54 of 63 or 85.71%). The same was true for men, with 51 of 86 or 5?.3 percent promoted within the same district. For those who secured a promotion by going outside the district, men fared much better than women. Promotions of men to line positions secured outside the district accounted for 40.7 percent of all men in line positions. For the elementary principalship, more men (9 or 53.33%) secured their position outside the district than from within. Only 14.29 percent of women in line positions secured positions outside the district. A summary of these findings appears in Table XIII.

Two questions related to the study but not included in the research questions were whether there were differences in the career paths and mentoring experiences of men and women in line positions. Tables XIV and XV deal with these issues.

In order to examine career paths, position was tabulated by previous position. The results of this analysis are included in Table XIV. One half of the women superintendents

TABLE XI

PERCENTAGE OF HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY POSITION

	BA/BS		MA/MS		Highest Degree Held Ed Spec		RdD/PhD		Total*	
Pos	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
1/7	0	0	1.7	11.0	0	0.85	0	2.55	1.7	14.4
2/8	0	0.43	5.53	15.3	0	0	2.13	0	7.66	15.7
3/9	0	0	15.3	6.38	0	0	2.13	0	17.4	6.38
Tot	0	0.43	22.5	32.7	0	0.85	4.26	2.55	26.8	36.5
4/10	0	0	7.23	3.83	0	0	0.43	0.43	7.66	4.26
5/11	0	0	6.38	0	0	0	0	0	6.38	0
6/12	0	0	11.4	0	0	0	0.43	0	11.9	0
Tot	0	0	25.1	3.83	0	0	0.86	0.43	25.9	4.26

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%

TABLE XII

PERCENTAGE OF FIELD OF STUDY BY POSITION

| | Field of Study | | | | | |
| | Admin | | Other | | Total* | |
Pos	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
1/7	0	6.81	1.7	7.24	1.7	14.0
2/8	2.55	6.81	5.12	8.94	7.67	15.7
3/9	9.36	3.4	7.66	2.56	17.0	5.96
Tot	11.9	17.0	14.4	18.7	26.3	35.7
4/10	2.55	2.98	5.11	1.28	7.66	4.26
5/11	2.13	0	4.26	0	6.39	0
6/12	4.68	0	6.81	0	11.4	0
Tot	9.36	2.98	16.1	1.28	25.5	4.26

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGE OF PROMOTION WITHIN
THE DISTRICT BY POSITION

	Within		Outside		Total*	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Pos						
1/7	1.28	7.23	0.43	7.23	1.71	14.4
2/8	7.23	11.4	0.43	4.26	7.66	15.7
3/9	14.4	2.98	2.98	3.4	17.4	6.38
Tot	22.9	21.7	3.84	14.8	26.8	36.5
4/10	5.11	3.4	2.13	0.85	7.24	4.25
5/11	3.83	0	2.55	0	6.38	0
6/12	5.96	0	3.4	0	9.36	0
Tot	14.9	3.4	8.08	0.85	22.9	4.25

Promotion Patterns

*Figures represent percentage of all respondents.

KEY: Line Positions: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary, principals, elementary principals respectively; 7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5-6 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively; 10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively.

No response excluded from the table; total does not equal 100%.

TABLE XIV

PERCENTAGE OF PREVIOUS POSITION BY POSITION

Pos	Previous Position													
	1/7		2/8		3/9		4/10		5/11		6/12		Total*	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
1/7	0	44.1	0	29.4	50	5.88	25	14.7	0	2.94	25	2.94	75	100
2/8	0	0	11.1	43.2	0	0	22.2	0	33.3	27.0	33.3	29.7	66.6	99.9
3/9	2.43	6.67	0	13.3	21.9	33.3	17.0	0	19.5	0	39.0	46.6	60.9	100
Tot	2.43	50.7	11.1	85.9	71.9	39.2	64.2	14.7	52.8	29.9	97.3	79.3		
4/10	0	10	11.1	0	5.56	20	33.3	20	27.7	0	22.2	0	100	50
5/11	6.67	0	0	0	6.67	0	0	0	40	0	46.6	0	100.	0
6/12	0	0	0	0	0	0	7.14	0	0	0	93	0	100.	0
Tot	6.67	10	11.1	0	12.2	20	40.4	20	67.7	0	161.	0		

*Figures represent percentage of respondents by positions, i.e. of women superintendents, 50% were previously elementary principals and 25% were previously classroom teachers.

KEY: Line Positons: 1-2-3 = female superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respec-
7-8-9 = male superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals respectively. Aspiring Positions: 4-5 = female district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom teachers respectively;
10-11-12 = male district-level staff, building-level staff, classroom respectively.

No response excluded from the table; line totals do not always equal 100%.

TABLE XV

PERCENTAGE OF MENTOR'S GENDER BY GENDER

| | Gender | | | | |
| | Women | | Men | | |
MentGen	N	%	N	%	Total*
Opposite	30	24.4	3	2.7	14.1
Same	30	24.4	27	24.3	24.3
None	63	51.2	81	73	61.5
Total	123	100	111	100	99.9

*Figures represent percentage of those reporting a mentor.

were in at least their second line position, all having
advanced from the elementary principalship to the superintend-
ency. One woman advanced from district-level staff and one ad-
vanced from the classroom to the superintendency. Almost 80
percent of the male superintendents had held at least one
other line position. Fifteen of the men (44.12%) were in at
least their second superintendency. One reported gaining the
superintendency from the classroom. More men were promoted
to the superintendency from district-level positions than from
building-level positions.

Eleven percent of the women and 43.24 percent of the men
in the secondary principalship had held a similar position
prior to their current position. Promotion to the secondary
principalship occurred about equally from building-level staff
positions and from the classroom for both men and women.

For the elementary principalship, the group with the
largest percentage of women office-holders, only 24.39 percent
were in at least their second line position and of those, nine
of the 10 had held the elementary principalship prior to their
current position. Thirty-nine percent of the women had been
promoted to the elementary principalship from the classroom.
Even though the number of men (15) was far less than the
number of women (41) in the elementary principalship or
assistant principalship, a greater percentage, 33.33, had
held this position at least once before. Seven men (46.67%)
were promoted to this position from the classroom.

Women were more likely to have a mentor than men. A

mentoring relationship was reported by 61 women and 30 men. This total, 91, represents 38.72 percent of the sample, therefore the majority of respondents have not had a mentor. Women were equally likely to have a mentor of either gender, with 30 reporting a male mentor and 30 reporting a female mentor. Males who reported having a mentoring relationship were most likely mentored by another male (90%). Of the men reporting having had a mentor, only three had had a female mentor.

Data Analyses

Chi-square probabilities were computed for all variables. First, chi-squares were computed by gender then job status (line or aspiring) to allow comparison of women in line positions to women in aspiring positions. Chi-squares were then computed by job status then gender to allow comparison of women in line positions to men in line positions and women in aspiring positions to men in aspiring positions. In each case the primary question posed was, "Do these groups differ significantly from each other and if so how?" Level of significance was set at $p < .05$.

For ease of reporting, summary tables of chi-square probabilites for the three categories of questions identified in the instrument (demographic variables, career information variables and career pattern variables) are included for each set of groups compared. Observed and expected frequencies are tabled for each relevant significant variable by

comparison groups. In some cases variables that produced statistical significance were not tabled since they lacked usefullness for comparison purposes; i.e. in the first row of the summary table of probabilities for career information (Table XVII), administrative experience (AdmExp), age when first appointed to administration (FstAdm), previous title (PreTitl) and position prior to administration in the same district (SamDst) are all statistically significant, but logically irrelevant. In this case the groups compared were women in line positions and women in aspiring positions. It would be expected that the groups would vary significantly on these variables and statistical confirmation does not produce logically useful information.

Three questions were not addressed in the data collection or data analyses: number two - "Given the same performance, are men and women viewed as having performed equally?", number four - "Is failure to secure a sought-after position perceived as a threat to future promotion, or as a chance to learn and develop experience?" and number 12 - "Is GASing (getting the attention of superiors) interpreted correctly for women by their male supervisors?" It was not possible to examine these questions using the survey method.

Before attempting to elucidate the research questions it is necessary to look at the overall picture presented by the chi-square probabilities. Table XVI summarizes the chi-square probabilities for all demographic variables. No significant differences were found between any of the groups under

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY TABLE OF CHI-SQUARE PROBABILITIES FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

	Age	Race	BOrd	MStat	Child	SpsEd	FaEd	MoEd	Grad	Town	SchPop
				Women in Line Positions v. Women in Aspiring Positions							
Chi-Square	.661	.623	.674	.302	.833	.790	.452	.973	.294	.404	.640
Yates	.664	.562	.672	.320	.837	.748	.261	.974	.302	.385	.646
				Women in Line Positions v. Men in Line Positions							
Chi-Square	.894	.755	.279	.170	.187	.134	.145	.614	.169	.633	.295
Yates	.893	.665	.276	.121	.175	.057	.122	.608	.166	.633	.285
				Women in Aspiring Positions v. Men in Aspiring Positions							
Chi-Square	.636	.571	.395	.453	.854	.405	.129	.329	.456	.798	.865
Yates	.436	.405	.397	.359	.829	.263	.066	.267	.442	.804	.864

p < .05

KEY: Line Positions = superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals or assistants. Aspiring Positions = district-level staff, building-level staff and classroom teachers.

Variables: Age = age of respondent, Race = race of respondent, BOrd = birth order, MStat = marital status, Child = number of children, SpsEd/FaED/MoEd = educational attainment of spouse, father and mother respectively, Grad = size of high school graduating class, Town = size of childhood community and SchPop = size of school district where employed.

consideration. An examination of career information variables
reveals several areas of significant differences. These
values are found in Table XVII. As pointed out earlier, some
of the variables that yielded statistically significant dif-
ferences are not worthy of note when examined logically.
When women in line positions are compared to women in aspir-
ing positions, years of administrative experience (AdmExp),
age at first administrative appointment (FstAdm), title just
prior to present position (PreTitl) and pattern of promotion
either within or outside the same district (SamDst) all test
as significant. All lack a logical reason for inclusion in
the analysis. Each presents a case where the outcome is a
reasonable expectation. Three other variables are worthy of
consideration, administrative certificates held (AdmCrt), com-
position of the interview committee (Comm) and gender of the
incumbent (Incumb). Observed and expected frequencies for
these variables are shown in Table XVIII. Women in line posi-
tions hold standard elementary principal certificates at a
greater rate that expected and women in aspiring positions
hold standard secondary principal certificates and standard
superintendent certificates at a slightly greater rate than
expected. Earlier analysis indicated that women enjoyed
greater numbers in elementary administration than in other
areas. Do more women prepare for the elementary principal-
ship than for secondary positions or the superintendency?
The data suggests that this is the case and that is not sur-
prising since women comprise 85% of all elementary teachers

TABLE XVII

SUMMARY TABLE OF CHI-SQUARE PROBABILITIES FOR CAREER INFORMATION VARIABLES

	Degree	Field	Exper	AdmExp	FstAdm	Pretitl	SamDst	AdmCrt	Elig	Comm	Incumb
Women in Line Positions v. Women in Aspiring Positions											
Chi-Square	.123	.746	.134	.000*	.000*	.065	.000*	.000*	.389	.002*	.000*
Yates	.220	.650	.114	.000*	.000*	.010*	.000*	.000*	.411	.002*	.000*
Women in Line Positions v. Men in Line Positions											
Chi-Square	.237	.574	.036*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.004*	.000*	.003*	.020*	.021*
Yates	.145	.549	.023*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.007*	.000*	.001*	.008*	.015*
Women in Aspiring Positions v. Men in Aspiring Positions											
Chi-Square	1.00	.044*	.945	.006*	.003*	.001*	.939	.002*	.450	.088	.000*
Yates	1.00	.030*	.898	.005*	.002*	.000*	.938	.000*	.423	.053	.000*

* $p < .05$

KEY: Degree = highest degree attained, Field = field of study (administration or other), Exper = years of classroom experience, AdmExp = years of administrative experience, FstAdm = age at first administrative appointment, Pretitle = title just previous to present position, SamDst = pattern of promotion (within or outside district), AdmCrt = administrative certificates held, Elig = eligibility for additional certificates, Comm = composition of the interview committee and Incumb = gender of incumbent.

TABLE XVIII

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES FOR SIGNIFICANT CAREER INFORMATION VARIABLES: LINE V. ASPIRING POSITIONS

Job Status of Women				Line Positions				Aspiring Positons			
AdmCrt	Line	Aspiring	Row Totals	AdmCrt	Female	Male	Row Totals	AdmCrt	Female	Male	Row Total
Prov. Elem.	6 (13.4)	15 (7.6)	21	Prov. Elem.	6 (2.8)	0 (3.2)	6	Prov. Elem.	15 (9.9)	0 (5.1)	15
Stan. Elem.	49 (38.4)	11 (21.6)	60	Stan. Elem.	49 (32.9)	21 (37.1)	70	Stan. Elem.	11 (9.2)	3 (4.8)	14
Prov. Sec.	5 (6.4)	5 (3.6)	10	Prov. Sec.	5 (3.3)	2 (3.7)	7	Prov. Sec.	5 (5.9)	4 (3.1)	9
Stan. Sec.	18 (18.5)	11 (10.5)	29	Stan. Sec.	18 (31.0)	48 (35.0)	66	Stan. Sec.	11 (17.7)	16 (9.3)	27
Prov. Supt.	0	0	0	Prov. Supt.	0 (.93)	2 (1.1)	2	Prov. Supt.	0	0	0
Stan. Supt	0 (1.3)	2 (.72)	2	Stan. Supt.	0 (7.0)	15 (8.0)	15	Stan. Supt.	2 (1.3)	0 (.7)	2
Col. Totals	78	44	122	Col. Totals	78	88	166	Col. Totals	44	23	67

Key: AdmCrt = administrative certificates held

(Neidig, 1980) and certification for the principalship in Oklahoma is an add-on to whatever level teaching certificate one holds. The literature suggests that women seek preparation in an area where they will likely have the opportunity to be promoted and as has been suggested by Adkison (1985) and Edson (1981), elementary administration offers more opportunities for women's advancement than does secondary or central office administration. Shakeshaft (1987) pointed out that the elementary principalship tends to be a dead-end on the career ladder.

Women in line positions were interviewed by a committee composed of men only at a higher rate than expected. The observed composition of the interview committees for aspiring women was evenly divided at 17 each of a mixed-gender committee and a male only committee. Neither group reported being interviewed by a committee of women only. Research question number five asked if the presence of a woman on the selection committee increased the likelihood of the selection of a woman for the position? The data suggest that women fare better when the committee is all male.

Women in line positions almost always replaced a male incumbent. Aspiring women interviewed about equally for positions with male and female incumbents. The lack of women incumbents is apparent from examining expected frequencies.

There were considerable differences on career information variables between women in line positions and men in line positions. Of the 11 variables tested nine yielded

statistically significant differences between groups. Observed and expected frequencies are reported in Table XIX.

Women generally reported more years of classroom experience (Exper) than did men. More women reported having classroom experience in the range of six to 10 years, 11 to 15 years and 16 to 20 years than would be expected. Men reported having one to five years and 21 to 25 years classroom experience more often than was expected. It appears that women have and perhaps need more teaching experience to become administrators. This finding parallels what Paddock (1981) reported almost a decade ago.

If years of classroom experience is reported against a backdrop of age at first administrative appointment (FstAdm) it becomes clear that men gain access to an administrative post much younger than do women. Since women have more classroom experience this finding is not surprising. What is surprising is the number of years between accessibility for men and accessibility for women. Men reported gaining their first administrative position more often than expected in the 22 to 29 age bracket and in the 30 to 39 age bracket. Of the line administrators responding, only six women as opposed to 29 men reported gaining an initial administrative post prior to age 30. Women repondents were represented at a rate exceeding expectations in the 40 to 49 age bracket and the over 50 age bracket. It is interesting to note that the number of men (69) reporting gaining an administrative position prior to their 40th year falls just one short of the total number

TABLE XIX

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES FOR SIGNIFICANT CAREER INFORMATION VARIABLES: LINE WOMEN V. LINE MEN

PreTitl	Women	Men	Row Totals	AdmExp	Women	Men	Row Totals	Exper	Women	Men	Row Totals
Supt.	0 (5.6)	12 (6.4)	12	0	11 (5.2)	0 (5.8)	11	1-5	7 (13.6)	22 (15.4)	29
Asst.Supt	2 (2.8)	4 (3.2)	6	1-5	29 (21.6)	17 (24.4)	46	6-10	27 (24.4)	25 (27.6)	52
Dist.Stf.	12 (8.0)	5 (9.0)	17	6-10	18 (21.1)	27 (23.9)	45	11-15	24 (19.7)	18 (22.3)	42
JH Prin	0 (8.9)	19 (10.0)	19	11-15	17 (16.0)	17 (18.0)	34	16-20	16 (13.6)	13 (15.4)	29
JH Asst.	2 (5.2)	9 (5.8)	11	16-20	2 (7.5)	14 (8.5)	16	21-25	3 (5.6)	9 (6.4)	12
JH Stf	5 (3.8)	3 (4.2)	8	21-25	1 (3.8)	7 (4.2)	8	26-30	0 (.47)	1 (.53)	1
HS Stf	1 (.5)	0 (.5)	1	26-30	0 (1.9)	4 (2.1)	4	>=30	1 (.47)	0 (.53)	1
Elem Asst	4 (4.7)	6 (5.3)	10	>=30	0 (.94)	2 (1.1)	2	Column Totals	78	88	166
Elem stf	8 (4.7)	2 (5.3)	10	Column Totals	78	88	166				
Agency	5 (2.3)	0 (2.7)	5								
Tchr	30 (23.5)	20 (26.5)	50								
Coun	9 (8.0)	8 (9.0)	17								
Column Totals	78	88	166								

Key: PreTitl = title just previous to present position, AdmExp = years of adminis-trative experience, Exper = years of classroom experience.

TABLE XIX (Continued)

AdmCrt	Women	Men	Row Totals	Elig	Women	Men	Row Totals	FstAdm	Women	Men	Row Totals
Prov.Elem	6 (2.8)	0 (3.2)	6	None	56 (47.0)	44 (53.0)	100	22-29	6 (15.5)	29 (19.5)	35
Stan.Elem	49 (32.9)	21 (37.1	70	Stan.Elem	3 (2.8)	3 (3.2)	6	30-39	27 (29.7)	40 (37.3)	67
Prov.Sec.	5 (3.3)	2 (3.7)	7	Prov.Sec.	2 (.94)	0 (1.1)	2	40-49	33 (22.6)	18 (28.4)	51
Stan.Sec.	18 (31.0)	48 (35.0)	66	Stan.Sec.	2 (4.7)	8 (5.3)	10	>=50	4 (2.2)	1 (2.8)	5
Prov.Supt.	0 (.93)	2 (1.1)	2	Prov.Supt.	10 (9.4)	10 (10.6)	20	Column Totals	70	88	158
Stan.Supt.	0 (7.0)	15 (8.0)	15	Stan.Supt.	5 (13.2)	23 (14.8)	28				
Column Totals	78	88	166	Column Totals	78	88	166				

Key: AdmCrt = administrative certificates held, Elig = eligibility for additional certificates,
     FstAdm = age at first administrative appointment.

TABLE XIX (Continued)

SamDst	Women	Men	Row Totals	Comm	Women	Men	Row Totals	Incumb	Women	Men	Row Totals
Yes	63 (54.5)	53 (61.5)	116	Men & Women	27 (33.3)	46 (39.7)	73	None	3 (2.7)	3 (3.3)	6
No	15 (23.5)	35 (26.5)	50	Men Only	47 (40.2)	41 (47.8)	88	Man	51 (55.3)	73 (68.7)	124
Column Totals	78	88	166	Women Only	0 (.5)	1 (.5)	1	Woman	16 (12.0)	11 (15.0)	27
				Column Totals	74	88	162	Column Totals	70	87	157

Key : SamDst = pattern of promotion (within or outside district), Comm = composition of the interview committee, Incumb = gender of the incumbent.

of women reporting having gained a position. Good things do come to those who wait.

In light of the figures previously presented it is not surprising that men had significantly more administrative experience (AdmExp) than did women. It is once again surprising that the differences were so great. Eleven women reported having no administrative experience, indicating they were in their first year in an administrative slot. No men reported not having administrative experience. Women also reported administrative experience at a rate greater then expected in the one to five year range, the six to 10 year year range and the 11 to 15 year range. No women had more than 25 years experience and only three had between 16 and 25 years. On the other hand men reported less than expected frequencies in the one to five year range and the 11 to 15 year range. For every other category the observed frequenies for men were more than expected. Other than no experience, the only category with more women than men was the one to five year range. This finding may be a positive sign that women are beginning to find administrative positions. Another equally plausible explanation is that these women represent a reaction to affirmative action considerations.

An examination of the position held just prior to the present position (PreTitl) shows that women in line positions were likely to come from classroom positions, elementary staff positions, junior high staff positions, outside agencies and counselors positions, all defined as aspiring, more often than

expected. Men gained a line position more often than expected from the superintendency or assistant superintendency, junior high principalship or assistant principalship and the elementary assistant principalship, all defined as line positions. Fewer men than expected (20) were promoted directly from the classroom.

Other career information variables that produced significantly different results between women in line positions and men in line positions were composition of the interview committee (Comm), gender of the incumbent (Incumb), employment by the same district prior to promotion (SamDst), administrative certificates held (AdmCrt) and eligibility for additional administrative certificates (Elig). Women fared better than expected when the committee was composed of men only. It appears that a woman on the selection committee does not improve a woman's chance of being selected. Women were successful in securing positions more often than expected when the incumbent was a woman or when it was a newly created position. Women in line positions were much more likely to be promoted within the district where they were already employed than were men. Women were more likely than expected to hold elementary certification or provisional secondary certification. Men were more likely than expected to hold secondary certification or superintendents certification. Most of the men and women reporting were not eligible for additional certification. Of those that were, more women than expected were eligible for a provisional superintendents certificate and more men than

expected were eligible for either a secondary principals certificate or a standard superintendents certificate. More men than women appear to be preparing for secondary line positions or the superintendency.

Field of study (Field), years of administrative experience (AdmExp), age at first administrative appointment (FstAdm),position just prior to present position (PreTitl), administrative certificates held (AdmCrt) and gender of the incumbent (Incumb) all indicated significant differences between women in aspiring positions and men in aspiring positions. It is important to note that many of these respondents hold non-line administrative positions such as directors coordinators, specialists, and the like. A summary of the chi-square probabilities for career information variables is found in Table XVII. Observed and expected frequencies for the significant variables are found in Table XX.

Men were much more likely than women to hold their advanced degrees in administration. Observed and expected frequencies were equal for field of study. Women reported administrative experience in the under 15 year categories at a much higher rate than was expected. Men reported administrative experience at a higher rate than expected in the six to 10 year category, the 16 to 20 year category, the 21 to 25 year category, the 26 to 30 year category and the over 30 year category. No men reported having no years of administrative experience. It was reported earlier that no men reponding to the survey were aspiring from the classroom. It

TABLE XX

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES FOR SIGNIFICANT CAREER INFORMATION VARIABLES: ASPIRING WOMEN V. ASPIRING MEN

PreTitl	Women	Men	Row Totals
Supt	0 (1.3)	2 (.7)	2
Dist Stf	8 (6.7)	2 (3.3)	10
JH Prin	1 (4.7)	6 (2.3)	7
JH Asst	1 (2.7)	3 (1.3)	4
JH Stf	0 (.7)	1 (.3)	1
Elem Asst	1 (2.0)	2 (1.0)	3
Agency	1 (.7)	0 (.3)	1
Tchr	30 (24.7)	7 (12.3)	37
Coun	4 (2.7)	0 (1.3)	4
Column Totals	46	23	69

AdmExp	Women	Men	Row Totals
0	11 (5.2)	0 (5.8)	11
1-5	29 (21.6)	17 (24.4)	46
6-10	18 (21.1)	27 (23.9)	45
11-15	17 (16.0)	17 (18.0)	34
16-20	2 (7.5)	14 (8.5)	16
21-25	1 (3.8)	7 (4.2)	8
26-30	0 (1.9)	4 (2.1)	4
>=30	0 (.9)	2 (1.1)	2
Column Totals	78	88	166

AdmCrt	Women	Men	Row Totals
Prov.Elem	15 (9.9)	0 (5.1)	15
Stan.Elem	11 (9.2)	3 (4.8)	14
Prov.Sec.	5 (5.9)	4 (3.1)	9
Stan.Sec.	11 (17.7)	16 (9.3)	27
Prov.Supt.	0	0	0
Stan.Supt.	2 (1.3)	0 (.7)	2
Column Totals	44	23	67

Key: PreTitle = title just previous to present position, AdmExp = years of administrative experience, AdmCrt = administrative certificates held.

TABLE XX (Continued)

Field	Women	Men	Row Totals	PstAdm	Women	Men	Row Totals	Incumb	Women	Men	Row Totals
Admin	17 (17.0	8 (8.0)	25	None	27 (20.7)	4 (10.3)	31	None	2 (1.1)	0 (.91)	2
Other	28 (28.0	13 (13.0)	41	22-29	1 (2.7)	3 (1.3)	4	Man	12 (16.8)	19 (14.2)	31
Column Totals	45	21	66	30-39	9 (14.7)	13 (7.3)	22	Woman	11 (7.1)	2 (5.9)	13
				40-49	8 (7.3)	3 (3.7)	11	Column Totals	25	21	46
				>=50	1 (.7)	0 (.3)	1				
				Column Totals	46	23	69				

Key : Field = field of study (administration or other), PstAdm = age at first administrative appointment,
Incumb = gender of the incumbent.

66

appears that women's presence in non-line administrative ranks closely parallels the findings reported for women in line positions. The inclusion of women at any level of school administration is a relatively recent event when compared to the years of administrative experience reported by men. Once again, not particularly surprising until one examines the breadth of the disparity. Three women reported having more than 15 years administrative experience. There were 27 men who reported more than 15 years administrative experience. There were 17 men with less than six years administrative experience. The expected frequency was 30.2. Women with less than six years administrative experience accounted for 40 of the 78 women in aspiring positions. The expected frequency was 26.8.

A comparison of age at first administrative appointment (FstAdm) reveals that men were more likely than expected to be under 40 years of age and that women were more likely than expected to be over 40 years of age when first appointed to an administrative slot. Women held more elementary principal and superintendent certificates than expected and fewer secondary principal certificates than expected. Men held fewer elementary principal and superintendent certificates than expected and more secondary principal certificates than expected. Men replaced male incumbents almost exclusively and certainly at a higher rate than expected. Women replaced male incumbents less often than expected and female incumbents more often than expected. Women reported replacing male and female incumbents at about equal rates.

Chi-square probabilities were compared for career pattern variables for women in line positions against women in aspiring positions. The results are reported in Table XXI. Statistically significant differences were found between the groups on six of the variables. Observed and expected frequencies for these variables are reported in Table XXII.

In-house applicants were interviewed as a courtesy (Court) more often than expected for women in line positions but less often than expected for women in aspiring positions. It appears that a policy of interviewing in-house applicants increases the chances of being chosen for a line position. Few women in any position reported that a position had been created for them (Create). Slightly more women in line positions than expected reported that a position had been created for them. Women in line positions were less likely than women in aspiring positions to report that failure to secure a sought after position had cooled their desire to seek future positions (Cool). Women in aspiring positions had a higher rate of involvement in civic and religious activities (Civic) than did women in line positions. All aspiring women reported some level of involvement.

Regarding pursuit of administrative positions, line women reported lower levels of active pursuit of openings than was expected, with many reporting that they had never pursued an opening. This finding corresponds to research reported by Fansher and Buxton (1984) that females are reluctant to apply for openings, instead waiting to be sought out. The Fansher

TABLE XXI

SUMMARY TABLE OF CHI-SQUARE PROBABILITIES FOR CAREER PATTERN VARIABLES: LINE V. ASPIRING WOMEN

	Adv	Trng	PlacNot	ProPub	WrdMou	Filled	Sales	AdmWrd	SpsSup	SpsTim	PrinSup	ColSup
Chi-Square	.389	.522	.744	.141	.427	.912	.789	.438	.351	.644	.153	.483
Yates	.406	.521	.716	.142	.338	.913	.788	.306	.246	.648	.142	.485

	ProfSup	Mentor	MentGen	PromIn	AffAct	PromOut	OneOpn	Court	Visible	Create	SponAct	GASing
Chi-Square	.426	.085	.125	.504	.280	.077	.238	.016*	.060	.037*	.968	.090
Yates	.334	.125	.122	.458	.292	.085	.167	.018*	.059	.041*	.968	.058

	ComWrk	TchOrg	Civic	Respon	GdTch	News	Pursue	ApplSt	NotOut	Cool	Never	SpsFst
Chi-Square	.586	.439	.043*	.156	.658	1.00	.078	.036*	.101	.000*	.486	.767
Yates	.523	.399	.015*	.085	.519	1.00	.050*	.016*	.087	.000*	.435	.776

* p < .05

KEY: Adv = advertised openings, Trng = district trains aspiring administrators, PlacNot/ProPub/WrdMou = college placement notices, professional publications and word of mouth as sources of informations about administrative openings, Filled = positions seem to be filled before being advertised, Sales/AdmWrd = salespeople and administrators as source of information about administrative openings, SpsSup = support of spouse, SpsTim = spouse concern about time devoted to job, PrinSup/ColSup/ProfSup = support of principal, colleagues and college professors, Mentor = has respondent had a mentor, MentGen = gender of mentor, PromIn = district promotes from within, AffAct = program to promote women and minorities, PromOut = district promotes from outside, OneOpn = one or more administrative openings in past two years, Court = in-house applicants interviewed as a courtesy, Visible = was a coach, band director or counselor, Create = administrative slot was created for respondent, SponAct = voluntarily sponsoring activities, GASing = telling administrator of desire for administrative position, ComWrk = voluntary committee work, TchOrg = active in teacher's organization, Civic = active in civic or religious activities, Respon = respondent expressed desire for more responsibility, GdTch = does a good job as teacher, News = activities written up in newspaper, Pursue = actively pursues administrative openings, ApplSt = applied for latest in-district opening, NotOut= has not applied outside district, Cool = failure has cooled desire to seek positions, Never = has never applied for opening, SpsFst = spouse's career comes first.

TABLE XXII

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES FOR SIGNIFICANT CAREER PATTERN VARIABLES: LINE V. ASPIRING WOMEN

| Court | Job Status of Women | | Row Totals | Cool | Job Status of Women | | Row Totals | Civic | Job Status of Women | | Row Totals |
	Line	Aspiring			Line	Aspiring			Line	Aspiring	
Never	5 (11.3)	13 (6.7)	18	Never	48 (40.4)	21 (28.6)	69	Never	6 (3.8)	0 (2.2)	6
Sometimes	30 (25.1)	10 (14.9)	40	Sometimes	10 (14.6)	15 (10.4)	25	Sometimes	17 (19.5)	14 (11.5)	31
Mostly	17 (16.3)	9 (9.7)	26	Mostly	4 (2.9)	1 (2.1)	5	Mostly	17 (13.2)	4 (7.8)	21
Always	24 (23.2)	13 (13.8)	37	Always	3 (7.0)	9 (5.0)	12	Always	38 (41.5)	28 (24.5)	66
Column Totals	76	45	121	Column Totals	65	46	111	Column Totals	78	46	124

| Pursue | Job Status of Women | | Row Totals | ApplSt | Job Status of Women | | Row Totals | Create | Job Status of Women | | Row Totals |
	Line	Aspiring			Line	Aspiring			Line	Aspiring	
Never	26 (21.1)	8 (12.9)	34	Never	50 (43.8)	21 (27.2)	71	False	66 (66.4)	34 (33.6)	100
Sometimes	21 (19.8)	11 (12.2)	32	Sometimes	1 (.62)	0 (.38)	1	True	9 (8.6)	4 (4.4)	13
Mostly	11 (14.9)	13 (9.1)	24	Mostly	0 (.62)	1 (.38)	1	Column Totals	75	38	113
Always	17 (19.2)	14 (11.8)	31	Always	23 (29.0)	24 (18.0)	47				
Column Totals	75	46	121	Column Totals	74	46	120				

Key: Court = in-house applicants interviewed as a courtesy, Cool = failure has cooled desire to seek position, Civic = active in civic and religious activities, Pursue = actively pursues administrative openings, ApplSt = applied for latest in-district opening, Create = administrative slot was created for respondent.

and Buxton study reported on the responses of female secondary principals and is partially contradicted in this study. For women aspiring to line positions pursuit of openings was generally reported at a higher rate than expected. The respondents were asked if they had applied for the latest in-district administrative opening. Only a third of the line women had applied for the latest opening; less than would be expected. Somewhat more than half of the aspiring women reported applying for the latest opening; more than would be expected.

Chi-square probabilities for career pattern variables for women in line positions against men in line positions are reported in Table XXIII. Of the 36 variables tested, 12 resulted in statistically significant differences. The observed and expected frequencies for the significant variables are reported in Table XXIV.

Women were less likely than men to rely on college placement notices (PlacNot) and salespeople (Sales) coming to the school as sources of information about administrative openings. Men were more likely than women to report that their spouses were dissatisfied with the amount of time they devoted to their jobs (SpsTim). Women reported support from the principal (PrinSup) and from colleagues (ColSup) at a rate greater than expected. Women were more likely than men and more likely than expected to report they had always been good teachers (GdTch). Women were generally more likely than men and more likely than expected to report they had expressed the desire for more

TABLE XXIII

SUMMARY TABLE OF CHI-SQUARE PROBABILITIES FOR CAREER PATTERN VARIABLES:
LINE WOMEN V. LINE MEN

	Adv	Trng	PlacNot	ProPub	WrdMou	Filled	Sales	AdmWrd	SpsSup	SpsTim	PrinSup	ColSup
Chi-Square	.971	.989	.004*	.189	.142	.085	.000*	.077	.759	.048*	.001*	.006*
Yates	.971	1.000	.003*	.183	.137	.084	.000*	.073	.759	.046*	.001*	.005*

	ProfSup	Mentor	MentGen	PromIn	AffAct	PromOut	OneOpn	Court	Visible	Create	SponAct	GASing
Chi-Square	.355	.000*	.000*	.661	.146	.940	.181	.571	.035*	.165	.765	.627
Yates	.348	.000*	.000*	.661	.222	.940	.269	.568	.052	.267	.765	.623

	ComWrk	TchOrg	Civic	Respon	GdTch	News	Pursue	ApplSt	NotOut	Cool	Never	SpsFst
Chi-Square	.064	.325	.431	.031*	.006*	.200	.489	.539	.002*	.297	.343	.004*
Yates	.060	.322	.428	.029*	.003*	.197	.489	.445	.004*	.281	.452	.001*

* $p < .05$

KEY: Adv = advertised openings, Trng = district trains aspiring administrators, PlacNot/ProPub/WrdMou = college placement notices, professional publications and word of mouth as sources of informations about administrative openings, Filled = positions seem to be filled before being advertised, Sales/AdmWrd = salespeople and administrators as source of information about administrative openings, SpsSup = support of spouse, SpsTim = spouse concern about time devoted to job, PrinSup/ColSup/ProfSup = support of principal, colleagues and college professors, Mentor = has respondent had a mentor, MentGen = gender of mentor, PromIn = district promotes from within, AffAct = program to promote women and minorities, PromOut = district promotes from outside, OneOpn = one or more administrative openings in past two years, Court = in-house applicants interviewed as a courtesy, Visible = was a coach, band director or counselor, Create = administrative slot was created for respondent, SponAct = voluntarily sponsoring activities, GASing = telling administrator of desire for administrative position, ComWrk = voluntary committee work, TchOrg = active in teacher's organization, Civic = active in civic or religious activities, Respon = respondent expressed desire for more responsibility, GdTch = does a good job as teacher, News = activities written up in newspaper, Pursue = actively pursues administrative openings, ApplSt = applied for latest in-district opening, NotOut= has not applied outside district, Cool = failure has cooled desire to seek positions, Never = has never applied for opening, SpsFst = spouse's career comes first.

TABLE XXIV

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES FOR SIGNIFICANT CAREER PATTERN VARIABLES:
LINE WOMEN V. LINE MEN

PlacNot	Women	Men	Row Totals	Sales	Women	Men	Row Totals	SpsTim	Women	Men	Row Totals
Never	39 (29.4)	25 (34.6)	64	Never	41 (27.1)	18 (31.9)	59	Never	36 (28.0)	27 (35.0)	63
Sometimes	16 (26.2)	41 (30.8)	57	Sometimes	23 (28.5)	39 (33.5)	62	Sometimes	23 (28.4)	41 (35.6)	64
Mostly	8 (8.7)	11 (10.3)	19	Mostly	6 (13.8)	24 (16.2)	30	Mostly	4 (6.7)	11 (8.3)	15
Always	10 (8.7)	9 (10.3	19	Always	5 (5.5)	7 (6.5)	12	Always	4 (4.0)	5 (5.0)	9
Column Totals	73	86	159	Column Totals	75	88	163	Column Totals	67	84	151

PrinSup	Women	Men	Row Totals	ColSup	Women	Men	Row Totals	Respon	Women	Men	Row Totals
Never	20 (21.7)	24 (22.3)	44	Never	7 (9.3)	12 (9.7)	19	Never	12 (12.9)	15 (14.1)	27
Sometimes	10 (10.4)	11 (10.6)	21	Sometimes	15 (14.6)	15 (15.4)	30	Sometimes	16 (14.8)	15 (16.2)	31
Mostly	8 (15.8)	24 (16.2)	32	Mostly	15 (22.9)	32 (24.1)	47	Mostly	17 (24.3)	34 (26.7)	51
Always	34 (24.2)	15 (24.8)	49	Always	41 (31.2)	23 (32.8)	64	Always	29 (22.0)	17 (24.0)	46
Column Totals	72	74	146	Column Totals	78	82	160	Column Totals	74	81	155

Key: PlacNot & Sales = college placement notices and outside salespeople as sources of information about openings, SpsTim = spouse concern about time devoted to job, PrinSup & ColSup = principal's and colleagues' support, Respon = respondent expressed desire for more responsibility.

TABLE XXIV (Continued)

GdTch	Women	Men	Row Totals	SpsFst	Women	Men	Row Totals	MentGen	Women	Men	Row Totals
Never	0	0	0	Never	31 (31.6)	41 (40.4)	72	None	30 (42.8)	61 (48.2)	91
Sometimes	1 (.47)	0 (.53)	1	Sometimes	21 (26.4)	39 (33.6)	60	Opposite	28 (16.0)	6 (18.0)	34
Mostly	3 (9.3)	17 (10.7)	20	Mostly	8 (3.5)	0 (4.5)	8	Same	20 (19.2)	21 (21.7)	41
Always	73 (67.2)	71 (76.8)	144	Always	5 (3.5)	3 (4.5)	8	Column Totals	78	88	166
Column Totals	77	88	165	Column Totals	65	83	148				

Mentor	Women	Men	Row Totals	Visible	Women	Men	Row Totals	NotOut	Women	Men	Row Totals
False	35 (46.9)	65 (53.0)	100	False	38 (31.5)	32 (38.5)	70	False	26 (35.7)	49 (39.3)	75
True	43 (31.0)	23 (34.9)	66	True	33 (39.5)	55 (48.5)	88	True	52 (42.3)	37 (46.7)	89
Column Totals	78	88	166	Column Totals	71	87	158	Column Totals	78	86	164

Key: GdTch = does a good job as a teacher, SpsFst = spouse's career comes first, MentGen = gender of mentor, Mentor = has respondent had a mentor, Visible = was a coach, band director or counselor, NotOut = has not applied outside district.

responsibility (Respon). More women than men and more women than expected had a mentor. The vast majority of repondents reported no mentor. When men did report having a mentor, the mentor was a another man in almost every case. Much fewer men than expected were mentored by a woman. Women were about as likely to have a male mentor as a female mentor. Women were more likely than men and more likely than expected to put their spouse's career ahead of their own (SpsFst). Men were much more likely than women and much more likely than expected to apply outside their employing district for an administrative position. Men were also much more likely than women and much more likely than expected to have been coaches, band directors, counselors and other highly visible people (Visible) prior to their promotions.

Chi-square probabilities for career pattern variables for women in aspiring positions against men in aspiring positions are reported in Table XXV. Five of the 36 variables produced statistically significant differences. The observed and expected frequencies for these variables are reported in Table XXVI.

Like women in line positions, women in aspiring positions were less likely than expected to rely on salespeople (Sales) as a source of information about administrative openings. Salespeople appear to be a more frequently relied on source for aspiring men. Women in aspiring positions were less likely than expected and less likely than aspiring men to be in highly visible positions such as coaches, band directors

TABLE XXV

SUMMARY TABLE OF CHI-SQUARE PROBABILITIES FOR CAREER PATTERN VARIABLES:
ASPIRING WOMEN V. ASPIRING MEN

	Adv	Trng	PlacNot	ProPub	WrdMou	Filled	Sales	AdmWrd	SpsSup	SpsTim	PrinSup	ColSup
Chi-Square	.242	.370	.575	.374	.286	.446	.010*	.841	.637	.690	.670	.071
Yates	162	.530	578	.358	.151	.410	.007*	.842	.645	.682	.669	.080

	ProfSup	Mentor	MentGen	PromIn	AffAct	PromOut	OneOpn	Court	Visible	Create	SponAct	GASing
Chi-Square	.515	.479	.167	.425	.310	.733	.294	.180	.026*	.360	.351	.037*
Yates	.531	.658	.119	.425	.280	.691	.273	.156	.052	.604	.355	.042*

	ComWrk	TchOrg	Civic	Respon	GdTch	News	Pursue	ApplSt	NotOut	Cool	Never	SpsFst
Chi-Square	.025*	.710	.096	.269	.123	.667	.615	.102	.333	.038*	.715	.335
Yates	.025*	.706	.088	.281	.118	.674	.603	.083	.480	.029*	.613	.272

* p < .05

Key: Adv = advertised openings, Trng = district trains aspiring administrators, PlacNot/ProPub/WrdMou = college
placement notices, professional publications and word of mouth as sources of information about administrative
openings, Filled = positions seem to be filled before being advertised, Sales/AdmWrd = salespeople and as source
of information about administrative openings, SpsSup = support of spouse, SpsTim = spouse concern about time de-
voted to job, PrinSup/ColSup/ProfSup = support of principal, colleagues, and college professors, Mentor = has
respondent had a mentor, MentGen = gender of mentor, PromIn = district promotes from within, AffAct = program to
promote women and minorities, PromOut = district promotes from outside, OneOpn = one or more administrative open-
ings in past two years, Court = in-house applicants interviewed as a courtesy, Visible = was coach, band
director or counselor, Create = administrative slot was created for respondent, SponAct = voluntarily sponsored
activities, GASing = telling administrator of desire for administrative position, ComWrk = voluntary
committee work, TchOrg = active in teacher's organization, Civic = active in civic or religious activities,
Respon = respondent expressed desire for more responsibility, GdTch = does a good job as teacher, News =
activities written up in newspaper, Pursue = actively pursues administrative openings, ApplSt = applied for
latest in-district opening, NotOut = has not applied outside district, Cool = failure has cooled desire to seek
positions, Never = has never applied for opening, SpsFst = spouse's creer comes first.

TABLE XXVI

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES FOR SIGNIFICANT CAREER PATTERN VARIABLES: ASPIRING WOMEN V. ASPIRING MEN

Sales	Women	Men	Row Totals	GASIng	Women	Men	Row Totals	ComWrk	Women	Men	Row Totals
Never	26 (19.5)	4 (10.5)	30	Never	10 (10.7)	6 (5.3)	16	Never	1 (3.3)	4 (1.7)	5
Sometimes	10 (13.7)	11 (7.3)	21	Sometimes	1 (4.0)	5 (2.0)	6	Sometimes	8 (9.3)	6 (4.7)	14
Mostly	5 (7.2)	6 (3.8)	11	Mostly	6 (6.0)	3 (3.0)	9	Mostly	10 (11.3)	7 (5.7)	17
Always	2 (2.6)	2 (1.4)	4	Always	29 (25.3)	9 (12.7)	38	Always	27 (22.0)	6 (11.0)	33
Column Totals	43	23	66	Column Totals	46	23	69	Column Totals	46	23	69

Cool	Women	Men	Row Totals	Visible	Women	Men	Row Totals
Never	21 (25.3)	17 (12.7)	38	False	26 (22.1)	8 (11.9)	34
Sometimes	15 (11.3)	2 (5.7)	17	True	11 (14.9)	12 (8.1)	23
Mostly	1 (2.0)	2 (1.0)	3	Column Totals	37	20	57
Always	9 (7.3)	3 (3.7)	11				
Column Totals	46	23	69				

Key: Sales = outside salesperson as source of information, GASIng = telling administrator of desire for administrative position, ComWrk = voluntary committee work, Cool = failure has cooled desire to seek positions, Visible = was a coach, band director or counselor.

and counselors (Visible). Women were more likely than men and more likely than expected to tell an administrator of their desire for an administrative position (GASing). Aspiring women were much more likely than men and much more likely than expected to be involved in voluntary committee work (ComWrk). Women were more likely than men and more likely than expected to be discouraged by failure to secure a sought after position (Cool).

Research Questions

What does this all mean in relation to the research questions? As stated earlier, three of the questions (#s 2, 4, & 12) did not lend themselves to analysis with the survey method used and are not included in this summary.

Question one stated, "Why are women not more aggressive in pursuing administrative openings?" This study provides evidence that women are pursuing openings. The survey items that address this issue include numbers 31, 32, 33 and 35. The items asked whether the respondent had actively pursued administrative openings (Pursue); had applied for the most recent opening in the district (ApplSt); had applied outside the district (NotOut); or had never applied for a position (Never). Significant differences in pursuit of administrative openings were found between line women and line men on the variable, NotOut, with men more likely to apply outside the employing district. Significant differences were found between line women and aspiring women on two of the four variables, Pursue

and Applst. In this case aspiring women were more likely than line women to actively pursue all available openings. There is evidence to support the finding that women are actively pursuing openings at about the same rate as men. The question this raises is why women are far less successful in that pursuit?

Question three asked, "Does fear of failure, or the perception of failure, prevent women from pursuing administrative openings?" Item number 34 of the survey addresses this issue, asking if failure to get a sought after position has cooled the respondent's desire to try again (Cool). This question is a bit more difficult to answer than question one. Fear of failure does not seem to discourage either men or women in line positions. For aspiring women, whether compared to aspiring men or line women, the fear of failure seems to dampen the desire to try again. Since the majority of these respondents indicated that this occurred only sometimes it is reasonable to assume that after a period of time these women will in fact, try again.

Question five asked, " Does the presence of women on selection committees increase the likelihood of the selection of a woman for the position?" For all groups compared women fared better when the selection committee was all male. A woman on the selection committee would likely be a woman in a line position or on the school board. One respondent wrote that women who have gained positions of power are unwilling to risk their fragile perch by helping other women join them.

The respondent may have been more prophetic than she realized.

Question six asked, "Are position announcements made to all simultaneously?" and question seven asked, "If position announcements are not made simultaneously to all, what is the protocol for those announcements?" Item number one asked that question most directly, but several other items dealt with the issue of gaining information about potential openings. Although no significant differences were reported for item one, when line women were compared to line men, the chi-square probability was .084. The only items that produced chi-squares of $p < .05$ were items related to sources of information. College placement notices and outside salespeople were more likely to be sources of information for line men than for line women. Outside salespeople were also more likely to be sources of information for aspiring men. It appears that formal announcements of positions are made simultaneously but that men and women access the informal pipeline in different ways. One explanation for this could be that men in all groups compared reported holding highly visible positions much more frequently than did women. These highly visible positions often provide more outside contacts than less visible positions.

Question eight asked, "Does the lack of female incumbents prevent sponsorship of female candidates?" It is again necessary to look at several items to answer this complicated question. Women certainly fared better when the incumbent was a woman which partially explains the continued concentration

of line women in elementary positions. The issue becomes
less clear when the data for mentoring are examined. Women
were far more likely to have a mentor and further, the mentor
was as likely to be male as female. Far fewer men had mentors
and when they did, the mentors were almost exclusively male.
Since men are much more successful than women at securing line
positions, it appears that Dodgson (1986) was correct in de-
claring that women definitely need mentors to advance in
administration. It further appears that Lovelady-Dawson
(1980) missed the mark in stating that the white male estab-
lishment in administration looks to mentor only other white
males.

Question nine asked, "Does the school district's commit-
ment to selecting minority and women candidates increase the
success of those candidates in seeking positions?" The answer
to this question is no. No significant differences were found
between groups on the issue of affirmative action. Generally
respondents reported that affirmative action programs were
either non-existent or were wholly ineffective.

Question 10 asked, "Are females less likely to be identi-
fied as proteges because they lack personal attributes that
are reflective of the sponsor who is almost always male?"
The answer to this question must also be no. Returning to
the data on mentoring, women have mentors more often than men
and the mentors are as likely to be male as female.

Question 11 asked, "Are efforts at GASing, Getting the
Attention of Superiors, similar for men and women?" Women

were slightly more likely than men to tell their superior that they wanted more responsibility and that they wanted to be an administrator. Women were also more likely than men to volunteer for committee work. Nevertheless, GASing efforts showed a remarkably similar pattern between men and women.

Question 13 asked, "Do professors in educational administration champion women student for available positions?" No differences in support from college professors were noted for any of the groups compared.

Question 14 asked, "Do people who attain line administrative positions share background variables, career histories, and childhood experiences that better prepare them for positions of leadership?" No significant differences were noted for demographic variables between any of the groups compared. Background variables and childhood experiences appear to be similar for school people. Differences do surface when career information and career patterns are compared. Once in the school setting the careers of men and women diverge and the fast-track is definitely reserved for men.

Summary

This chapter has included a summary of descriptive statistics, selected demographic variables by position, data analysis and research questions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS,

AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the nature and extent of the formal and informal organizational barriers in Oklahoma that tend to thwart women's efforts to secure line positions in public schools. Further, the study attempted to support the belief that the identified barriers present greater obstacles for women than for men.

Fourteen research questions were posed for consideration. Two related questions were considered but were not presented in the form of research questions.

A direct approach to the questions posed was not possible so a three-part study was undertaken. The theoretical framework suggested by Bonuso and Shakeshaft (1981), was followed as closely as possible. Interviews were conducted for the purpose of developing a usable and valid instrument. The instrument devised was piloted in phase two of the study. Further refinement of the instrument resulted from the pilot study. In the final phase, data were collected over a six-week period.

Of the 500 surveys sent to administrative certificate
holders in Oklahoma, 322 (64.4%) were accounted for with 235
(47%) being included in the final analysis. Of the 278 sur-
veys not returned, it is reasonable to assume that at least
a small percentage were forwarded to a new address and the
intended respondent failed to return it because the deadline
had passed. Of the surveys accounted for, 15.8% had been
returned either with new addresses or as undeliverable. The
same percentage of unreturned surveys could explain the
absence of an additional 28 subjects. The title included on
the instrument specifically targeted public school adminis-
tration which could account for roughly 20 more unreturned
surveys, assuming that those employed in other kinds of in-
stitutions, or those already retired, were represented at the
same rate (11%) as those returning the instrument. The
population contained approximately three men for every woman
Women returned the instrument at a slightly higher rate than
men, 51.5 percent to 48.5 percent. It is a very real possi-
bility that this study held more interest for women than for
men and therefore reduced the rate of response from men.

While the usable sample was somewhat smaller than what
was projected as ideal, the results and conclusions drawn
from the study still have considerable support. Many res-
pondents included comments, suggestions and in some cases,
letters. A representative sample of this correspondence is
included in Appendix I.

Interview Data

The interview protocols (Appendix A) included demographic questions, career pattern questions and hiring process questions. Some of the questions were forced-choice while others were more open-ended. Both levels of job status, line and aspiring, were represented in the interviews. Ten men and eight women were interviewed.

Interviewing officeholders at all levels of job status proved to be an easier task than identifying and interviewing aspirants. Officeholders at all levels were interviewed. Both men and women aspiring to the elementary or secondary principalship were interviewed. Three aspiring men indicated a desire for a superintendency. None of the women interviewed expressed interest in gaining a superintendency.

Of those interviewed, four women were in line positions, eight men were in line positions, four women were aspiring and two men were aspiring. Seventeen (94%) of the respondents were white. One male respondent was Hispanic. Sixteen of the 18 (89%) interviewees were married. Interviewees represented school districts that ranged in size from 300 students to 18,000 students.

The average age of the total sample was 43 years old, slightly younger than the study sample. The interview group averaged 11.2 years of classroom teaching experience and 5.5 years administrative experience, less than the study sample in both cases. Five of the interviewees were in at least their second line administrative position. Fourteen of the 18

interviewed held a master's degree with nine of those in administration. All but one of those interviewed held at least a provisional administrator's certificate.

Of those interviewed, four reported that positions are not always advertised. Somewhat more suggested that intermediate positions, those defined in this study as aspiring positions, were often not advertised and that this was the route for admission into administration if you had been targeted by superiors for promotion. Five interviewees reported that many advertised positions are filled at least informally before interviews take place and that the process of advertising and interviewing is a formality to meet affirmative action policies. Contradictions in reporting information about the hiring process were apparent. All of the men in line positions reported they had been sought out for their positions or that the position had been created for them and several reported they had never been interviewed. Women, on the other hand, had actively pursued openings in every case and many reported being left out of serious consideration because a man was "groomed" for the position.

Six of the men and two of the women interviewed reported having had a mentor. Of those, four men and one woman had a male mentor and two men and one woman had a female mentor. All interviewees believed a mentor was helpful for those aspiring to administrative positions. One man indicated that a mentor could speed the process of gaining a position in administration and often allowed promotion with minimum credentials.

One man suggested seeking out a mentor and assuring that the mentor had sufficient political clout.

Critique of Instrument

Even though the instrument was carefully developed from a series of interviews and a pilot study with revisions made at each step, there are further revisions that, in retrospect, would have been helpful. Specifically, there appeared to be some confusion about the question (#9 in the demographic section) that dealt with population of primary residence as a child. This question needs to be reworded to clarify that the researcher wishes to know the population of a community, not a household as was sometimes the understanding of the respondent.

In the section dealing with career information it would have been helpful to include more space so that all certificates held could have been listed. A more complete set of data for this topic would have been helpful when comparing the preparation of women and men.

Several revisions are recommended for the career pattern questions. In the first section that dealt with interview committees and incumbents, question number one would provide more complete and accurate information with the addition of, "D. never received interview". Many respondent wrote in this phrase. Question number two would yield more complete information with the addition of, "C. new position". Again, many respondents added this phrase.

Several revisions are recommended for the second section of career pattern questions. Questions 14 and 15, regarding mentoring, presented some coding problems. If 14 were answered in the negative, 15 should have been left blank. This was not always done and required backtracking through the data for congruence. These questions would have been better addressed, with more explanation given, in the first section of career pattern questions. Question 30, "There have been news articles written about activities I sponsor.", should be eliminated from the survey. The question did not yield useful information and was confusing to respondents. Questions regarding support from others and pursuit of openings should be separated from each other and scattered throughout the section to avoid answers based on a mind-set. Finally, question 36, " My spouse's career comes before mine.", solicited lots of negative comments, more from men than women. This question, still considered worth asking, could perhaps be couched in less direct terms. Interestingly, of those who did respond to the item, men more often than women indicated that their spouse's careers never took precedence over their own.

Summary of Findings

Women represented 52.8 percent (N=124) of the respondents; men represented 47.2 percent (N=111). Line administrative positions were held by 149 of the respondents. Of the line positions, 63 (42.28%) were held be women and 86 (57.72%) were held by men. The majority (65%) of line positions

occupied by women were elementary principalships or assistant principalships. Seventy-one respondents were employed in positions defined in Chapter One as aspiring. Women occupied 61 (85.91%) of these positions, with 28 aspiring from the classroom, 15 aspiring from a building-level staff position and 18 from a district-level staff position. Ten male respondents (14.08%) were aspiring from district-level staff positions. There were no men in building-level staff positions or in the classroom.

Chi-square probabilities failed to indicate statistically significant differences between groups on demographic variables. However, women tended to be older, have more classroom experience and less administrative experience than their male counterparts. The average age of all respondents was 46.5 years and an overwhelming majority (90.64%) were white. The vast majority of all respondents held a master's degree (90.64%) with more than half (55.70%) of those in a field other than administration.

The average female respondent was almost 38 (37.946) before securing an administrative job. Average tenure as an administrator was 5.120 years after 12.828 years as a classroom teacher. The typical male respondent taught for 11.904 years, moved into administration at 33.991 years and has been in an administrative position for 11.413 years.

Two questions related to the study but not posed as research questions were considered. The first question sought to discover if career paths were similar for men and women.

The results indicated that career paths were very dissimilar for the two groups. Many more men were in at least a second line position. More men than would be expected had gained the superintendency from a previous superintendency or a secondary line position. Very few men reported gaining their present position from the classroom. Very few women were in second line positions and the majority had gained their present line positions from the classroom, from elementary staff positions, from counseling positions and from outside agencies. The second question dealt with mentoring experiences of respondents. Women were more likely than men to have a mentor and the mentor was equally likely to be male or female. Men who reported having had a mentor almost exclusively reported that the mentor was male. The clear indication of this research, however, is that very little mentoring is taking place in public school administration.

First of all, three of the research questions (#s 2, 4, & 12) did not lend themselves to analysis with the survey method used and are not included in this summary. They are:

2. Given the same performance, are men and women judged as having performed equally?

4. Is failure to secure a sought-after position perceived as a threat to future promotion, or as a chance to learn and develop experience?

12. Is GASing, Getting the Attention of Superiors, interpreted correctly for women by their male supervisors?

Question one stated, "Why are women not more aggressive in pursuing administrative openings?" This study provides evidence that women are pursuing openings but that they are less successful in gaining positions except at the elementary level.

Question three asked, "Does fear of failure, or the perception of failure, prevent women from pursuing adminis- trative openings?" This question is a bit more difficult to answer than question one. Fear of failure does not seem to discourage either men or women in line positions. For aspiring women, whether compared to aspiring men or line women, the fear of failure seems to dampen the desire to try again.

Question five asked, " Does the presence of women on se- lection committees increase the likelihood of the selection of a woman for the position?" For all groups compared women fared better when the selection committee was all male.

Question six asked, "Are position announcements made to all simultaneously?" and question seven asked, "If position announcements are not made simultaneously to all, what is the protocol for those announcements?" There is evidence that formal announcements of positions are made simultaneously but that men and women access the informal pipeline in differ- ent ways and that males are encouraged and rewarded more fre- quently than females. The interview portion of the research indicated that men are frequently targeted for promotion and promoted, circumventing the formal hiring process. It was not possible to ascertain if this finding held for the larger

study, but it does raise an additional question worth pursuing in future research.

Question eight asked, "Does the lack of female incumbents prevent sponsorship of female candidates?" Women certainly fared better when the incumbent was a woman which partially explains the continued concentration of line women in elementary positions. Very few women occupied the secondary principalship or the superintendency and there is definitely a shortage of female incumbents in these areas. However, it is also possible that these positions have become sex-typed jobs with men perceived as the natural ascendants.

Question nine asked, "Does the school district's commitment to selecting minority and women candidates increase the success of those candidates in seeking positions?" The answer to this question is no. No significant differences were found between groups on the issue of affirmative action. Generally respondents reported that affirmative action programs were either non-existent or were wholly ineffective.

Question 10 asked, "Are females less likely to be identified as proteges because they lack personal attributes that are reflective of the sponsor who is almost always male?" The answer to this question must also be no. Returning to the data on mentoring, women have mentors more often than men and the mentors are as likely to be male as female.

Question 11 asked, "Are efforts at GASing, Getting the Attention of Superiors, similar for men and women?" Women were more likely than men to tell their superior that they

wanted more responsibility and that they wanted to be an administrator. Women were also more likely than men to volunteer for committee work. Nevertheless, GASing efforts showed a remarkably similar pattern between men and women.

Question 13 asked, "Do professors in educational administration champion women student for available positions?" No differences in support from college professors were noted for any of the groups compared.

Question 14 asked, "Do people who attain line administrative positions share background variables, career histories, and childhood experiences that better prepare them for positions of leadership. No significant differences were noted for demographic variables between any of the groups compared.

Conclusions

The analyses of the data lead to several conclusions about not only the research questions, but also the related questions.

Women pursue line positions at about the same rate as men. There was some evidence that women pursue the secondary principalship more ardently than do men. In the interview portion of the research none of the men had pursued openings while all of the women had had actively sought promotion. If the number of respondents in line positions is indicative of the population of secondary principals and assistant principals, then there was also evidence that women are less successful than men in that pursuit. There was support for

the conclusion that Neidig's (1980) question regarding aggressive pursuit of administrative positions should be reworded to ask why women are not more successful as a result of their aggressive pursuit of positions.

The presence of women on the selection committee did not appear to increase the likelihood that women would be selected for a position. For all positions except the secondary principalship, men were favored regardless of the composition of the selection committee. A woman on the committee does appear to increase a woman's chances for selection to the secondary principalship, but if the respondents in this study are typical, most selection committees a e composed of men only and men outnumber women in every position identified except elementary principal and classroom teacher.

Research questions six and seven dealt with the issue of the protocol for position announcements. Women generally believed positions were filled before they were advertised and men agreed on this point. A contradictory finding indicated that women got more information about potential positions from word-of-mouth or the office grapevine than did men.

Again assuming a representative sample, it appears that a lack of female incumbents has not hampered women's sponsorship. A much larger percentage of women than men reported mentoring relationships. Of the mentors reported by women, half were men. Men reported far fewer mentoring relationships and those that were reported were almost exclusively

male to male.

Either active affirmative action plans are not successful or there are too few to make a substantial difference in the administrative prospects of women and minorities. The first proposal could be interpreted as a lack of commitment, the second as a perpetuation of the bias of invisibility. There was some evidence to support both. When respondents reported the presence of an active program, they were most likely to still be aspiring and they were very likely to be female or a member of a minority group or both. On the other hand, very few respondents reported an active program of affirmative action.

Men reported more support than women from college professors. Maienza (1986) and Shakeshaft (1987) both found reason to suggest that most departments of educational administration fail to adequately address the needs of women students. An equally plausible explanation could be revealed by an examination of the breakdown of advanced degrees by field. This study showed that men were more likely than women to pursue degrees in administration. If this held across the population of administrative certificate holders, then it seems reasonable that male or female professors would have a difficult time championing non-existent students. It also seems unlikely that a curriculum or reading professor of any gender would have the expertise or contacts to affect the promotion to administration of one of their students.

The results of this study suggested that GASing efforts

were quite similar for men and women. In fact, women at some levels of administration engaged in more activities that could be defined as GASing than men in similar positions. The exceptions were the two levels of the principalship, where men led in GASing efforts. The scope of this study did not provide any clues for determining if women's GASing efforts were viewed correctly by male superordinates.

The attempt to compare background variables for those who had attained line positions with those still aspiring was somewhat frustrated by the lack of male respondents in aspiring categories. A comparison was nevertheless attempted and the results revealed that differences, though not statistically significant, existed between genders. Women at all reported levels had similar backgrounds, both personally and professionally. Likewise, men shared similar backgrounds with each other. This finding is not out of line with much of the literature in the field and may be in keeping with what others have suggested about the differences in the ways men and women pursue positions. The finding that women line administrators are older than their male counterparts could be in keeping with Horner's (1972) view that women begin to reassert their desire for professional success in midlife when the pressures of family obligations begin to lessen. However, this study found that men in all positions were more likely to be married and to have more children than women.

Another major difference between the backgrounds of men and women in the study was the educational attainment of the

spouse. The spouses of men had less education than the spouses of women except in the case of district-level staff positions where the spouses of men were better educated than the spouses of women. It appears that an educated spouse is a very important source of support and encouragement for women line administrators.

Women did encounter more barriers than men or perhaps the barriers were more difficult for women to overcome. The net result is that women are a rarity in all line positions except the elementary principalship. Even there, the advent of more women is recent if weighed against the evidence that males in those positions were largely in at least a second appointment Taken together, the evidence seems to suggest that breaking into administration is more difficult for women than for men. At this point, the advent of women in line positions is too recent to determine if, once there, their progression parallels the patterns of men's progression. If there is a trend to be found, it appears that avenues to line administration are more available to women now than in the past twenty years, but it could also be that the appointment of women represents a token response to the letter but not the spirit of affirmative action regulations. For line positions in this study, women were more often in assistant positions. The question becomes, "Will they languish there or will they be promoted to the top positions? This researcher believes the evidence points to the former.

Since the gender distribution of the selection committee

did produce significant differences, but not in the predicted direction, can it be determined that there is bias on the part of all committees or is it possible that the men in-involved were truly more qualified than the women? There is no simple answer to these questions. Bar-Tal and Frieze (1977), found that men were perceived by both sexes as being able to perform at higher levels than women. Another study found that men simply enjoy more status than women on the basis of membership in the group most often found in po-sitions of power and prestige (Fennell, Barchas, Cohen, Mc-Mahon, Hilderbrand, 1978). An analysis of the data in this study showed that men were more likely than women to have the appropriate certificates or be eligible for them, making them more marketable at the outset. However, until August of 1988, if one did not secure an administrative position within three years of receiving initial certification, then one stood to lose the certificate. Prior to this time a provisional admin-istrative certificate could not become standard and could not be renewed unless the holder had worked one year as an admin-istrator at the level of the provisional certificate. This rule could, arguably, delay application for the certificate until a position was assured. One interviewee indicated that she was, in fact, waiting to apply for certification until it appeared there was a position for her. The newly instituted exclusion of the one year of experience rule may well result in more women certificate holders.

The bottom line of this research is that women have more

difficulty than men breaking into line positions, and nothing suggested that this is likely to change rapidly.

<p style="text-align:center">Recommendations for Action</p>

How will aspiring administrators of both sexes find their way into line positions? It is apparent that every available position must be pursued. Women must decide earlier in their careers to target administration and prepare themselves with certification.

School boards and others charged with selection decisions need to be made aware of an apparent predisposition for placing more value on men than women. This could be accomplished through the training programs designed for school board members.

Departments of educational administration need to recruit women for their programs. Once in the program, women need to be encouraged and supported in their efforts to gain a position in administration. These departments need and should hire more women professors to serve as role models.

Since the jury is not in regarding affirmative action plans, it is suggested that these programs either be increased and more effort expended to make them successful or that they be completely eliminated. Within-district training programs produced much better results for women and these should be expanded. If training programs produce good results, it follows that internship programs should be included as part of certificate or degree completion. Women need

opportunities not only to test new knowledge and skills while a support system is in place, but they also need the opportunity to demonstrate their competence and establish their credibility.

<div align="center">

Recommendations for

Further Research

</div>

Many questions remain unanswered. The principalship in general and the secondary principalship specifically tended to defy categorization for the variables in this study. An exploration of the secondary principalship and the experiences of women in their pursuit of these positions is a study worthy of consideration.

A study of the perceptions and attitudes of superordinates about GASing efforts by subordinates, both men and women holds the possibility of producing useful results. A study of this question would be particularly interesting if the methods used were qualitative rather than quantitative.

A longitudinal study of men and women in assistant positions could produce a better understanding of patterns of progress once initial appointment to a line position is obtained. What are the factors that come into play once the entry-level is obtained? Are the determiners of continued success the same for men and women?

Summary

This study represents a beginning or a starting point from which to examine the representation of women in decision-making positions in the public schools of Oklahoma. Satisfactory explanations were not found for every question posed, nor was the evidence all inclusive for those questions that were partially answered. What is apparent from this study is the confirmation that women face tremendous obstacles when seeking line administrative positions and that barriers for women are more numerous and less easily overcome than the barriers encountered by men.

All stages of this study indicated that the formal hiring processes and actual hiring practices are often less than congruent. This lack of congruence favors men over women. For women to become equitably represented in line positions requires that process and practice either become congruent or women will continue to be excluded from line positions. Continued exclusion of women can only result in a further waste of talent at a time when schoolpeople are being called on to use all available talent and resources to improve the education of our young people.

REFERENCES

Adkison, J. A. "The structure of opportunity and adminis-
    trative aspirations." Urban Education, Vol.20, No.3
    (1985), pp. 327-347.

Arney, L. K., Hyle, A. E., & Stern, A. K. "The Oklahoma
    administrator testing program: early results and analy-
    ses." (Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting
    of the Oklahoma Education Research Association. Edmond,
    OK, December 4, 1987).

Bach, L. "Of women, school administration, and discipline."
    Phi Delta Kappan. Vol.57, No.7 (1976), pp. 463-466.

Bahr, J. E. "Mentoring experiences of women administrators in
    baccalaureate nursing education." (Unpub. Ed.D. disser-
    tation, Oklahoma State University, 1985.)

Barnes, T. "America's forgotten minority: women school
    administrators." NASSP Bulletin, Vol 60, No.399 (1976),
    pp. 87-93.

Bar-Tal, D. & Frieze, I. H. "Achievement motivation for males
    and females as a determinant of attributions for success
    and failure." Sex Roles, Vol. 3, No. 3 (1977), pp. 301-
    313.

Baruch, R. "The achievement motive in women: implications
    for career development." Journal of Personality and
    Social Psychology, Vol.5, No. 3 (1967), pp. 260-267.

Bell, C. S., Chase, S. E., & Livingston, M. "Women in the
    superintendency: their views on opportunities, barriers,
    and choices." (Unpublished paper presented at the Annual
    Meeting of the Oklahoma Education Research Association.
    Edmond, OK, December 4, 1987.)

Bonuso, C. & Shakeshaft, C. "The influence of gender in the
    selection of secondary school principals." Paper pre-
    sented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational
    Research Association. (March 19-23, 1982); NY,.NY.:
    American Educational Research Association, 1982.

Byrne, D. R., Hines, S. A. & McCleary, L. E. The Senior
    High School Principalship, Volume I: The National Sur-
    vey. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secon-
    dary School Principals, 1978.

Cirincione-Coles, K. "The administrator: male or female?" *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (1975), pp. 326-328.

Condry, J. & Dyer, S. "Fear of success: attribution of cause to the victim." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (1976), pp. 63-83.

Couch, S. "Employer perceptions of male and female applicants for administrative positions in vocational education." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Vocational Association (December 5, 1981); Atlanta GA.

Cronin, J. M. & Pancrazio, S. B. "Women as educational leaders". *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 60, No. 8 (1979), pp.583-586.

Dodgson, J. "Do women in education need mentors?" *Education Canada*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (1986), pp. 28-33.

Edson, S. K. " 'If they can, I can': women aspirants to administrative positions in public schools." In P. A. Schmuck, W. W. Charters, Jr. and R. O. Carlson (Eds.) *Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials*. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1981.

Epstein, C. F. "Encountering the male establishment: sex-status limits on women's careers in the professions." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 75, (1970), pp. 965-982.

Erickson, H. L. "Conflict and the female principal." *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 66, No.10 (1985), pp. 288-291.

Fansher, T. A. & Buxton, T. H. "A job satisfaction profile of the female secondary school principal in the United States." *NASSP Bulletin*, Vol. 68, No. 468 (1984), pp. 32-39.

Fennell, M. L., Barchas, P. R., and Cohen, E. G., McMahon, A. M. Hildebrand, P. "An alternative perspective on sex differences in organizational settings: the process of legitimation." *Sex Roles*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (1978), pp. 589-604.

Forsyth, P. "The predominant gender hypothesis: some evidence." *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (1984), pp. 115-123.

Fulton B. F. "Access for minorities and women to administrative leadership positions: influence of the search committee." *Journal of NAWDAC*, 1983, 47(1), 3-7.

Galvin, G. A., Plake, B. S., Powers-Alexander, S., Lambert, D. J., "Causal attributions for success: lucky women, skillful men?" _Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership_, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1984), pp. 203-218.

Gray, C. F. "A study of the effectiveness of the sex equity workshops designed for vocational educators in Oklahoma." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1983.)

Greiner, J. M. "A comparative study of the career development patterns of male and female library administrators in large public libraries." _Library Trends_, Vol. 34, No. 2 (1985) pp. 259-289.

Horner, M. S. "Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women." _Journal of Social Issues_, Vol. 20, No. 2 (1972) pp. 157-175.

Howard, S. _Why aren't women administering our schools? The status of women public school teachers and the factors hindering their promotion into administration_. Washington, D.C., National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1975.

Johnston, G. S., Yeakey, C. C., & Moore, S. E. "An analysis of the employment of women in professional administrative positions in public education." _Planning and Changing_, Vol. 11, No. 3 (1980) pp. 115-132.

Jones, E. H. & Montenegro, X. P. "Factors predicting women's upward mobility in school administration." _Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership_, Vol. 3, No. 3 (1983) pp.231-241.

Kimmel, E. & Harlow, D. "Women as managers: a summer institute for potential educational administrators." _Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin_, (Winter, 1977): pp. 9-12.

Kimmel, E., Harlow, D. & Topping, M. "Special programs to promote women into educational administration." _Phi Delta Kappan_, Vol. 60, No. 8 (1979) pp. 586-589.

Kohl, J. P. & Stephens, D. B. "Expanding the legal rights of working women." _Personnel_, Vol. 64, No. 5 (1987) pp. 46-51.

Kuh, G., McCarthy, M., & Zent, A. "Supply and demand for school administrators. _Educational Research Quarterly_, Vol. 8, No. 2 (1983) pp. 2-18.

Lester, P. & Chu, L. "Women administrators: feminine, masculine or androgynous?" _Journal of Educational Leadership and Equity_, Vol. 1 (1984) pp. 171-179.

Lockheed, M. E. & Hall, K. P. "Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristic: applications to leadership training strategies." <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, Vol.32, No. 3 (1976) pp. 111-124.

Loring, R. & Wells, T. "<u>Breakthrough: Women Into Management.</u>" Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, NY, 1972.

Lovelady-Dawson, F. "Women and minorities in the principalship: career opportunities and problems." <u>NASSP Bulletin</u>,Vol 64, No. 440 (1980) pp. 18-28.

Lyon, C. D. & Saario, T. N. "Women in public education: sexual discrimination in promotions." <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, Vol. 55, (1973) pp. 120-123.

McCall, C. H. <u>Sampling and Statistics Handbook for Research in Education</u>. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1980.

McDade, T. & Drake, J. M. "Career path models for women superintendents." <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, Vol. 75, (1982) pp. 210-217.

Maienza, J. G. "The female superintendent: another perspective." <u>Journal of the National Association of Women Deans,Administrators and Counselors</u>, Vol. 49, No. 3 (1986) pp. 30-36.

Massengill, D. & Di Marco, N. "Sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics: a current replication." <u>Sex Roles</u>, Vol. 5, No. 5 (1979) pp. 561-570.

Metzger, C. "Helping women prepare for principalships." <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, Vol.66 No.10 (1985) pp. 92-96.

Neidig, M. "The other half of the talent bank: women administrators." Unpub. paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, (64th, Miami Beach, FL, Jan. 11-15, 1980).

Oklahoma State Department of Education. List of people currently certified as school administrators: superintendents and/or principals. Computer list compiled September 4, 1987.

Paddock, S. C. "Male and female career paths in school administration." In P. A. Schmuck, W. W. Charters, Jr. and R. O. Carlson (Eds.) <u>Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials</u>. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1981.

Pavan, B. N. "Certified but not hired : women administrators in Pennsylvania." Unpub. paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Research on Women in Education Conference (11th, Boston, MA, October, 1985).

Pearson, W. Equal rights for women in education: an overview of federal court decisions affecting equal rights for women in education. Report Number 70, Denver, CO: Equal Rights for Women in Education Project, Ford Foundation Grant, Education Commission of the States, 1975.

Pharis, W. L. & Zakariya, S. B. The Elementary School Principalship in 1978: a Research Study Arlington, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals. 1979.

Pope, B. W. Factors influencing career aspirations and development of women holding administrative positions in public schools. Palo Alto, CA: R & E Research Associates, Inc., 1982.

Rosser, P. "Women fight 'old boys' for school administrator jobs."Learning: the Magazine for Creative Teaching, Vol.8, No. 7 (1980), pp. 31-32, 34.

Schmuck, P. A. "Deterrants to women's careers in school management." Sex Roles, Vol. 1, No. 4 (1975), pp. 339-353.

Schmuck, P. A., Charters, W. W., & Carlson, R. O., eds. Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1981.

Shack, S. "No females need apply." EducationCanada, Vol. 15, No.4 (1975), pp. 28-31.

Shakeshaft, C. "Women in educational administration: a descriptive analysis of dissertation research and paradigm for future research." In P. A. Schmuck, W. W. Charters, Jr. and R. O. Carlson (Eds.) Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1981.

Shakeshaft, C. "The training of women in the principal's office." (Unpublished paper presented at the Thirtieth Anniversary Convention of UCEA. Charlottesville, VA, Oct. 30 - Nov. 1, 1987)

Shakeshaft, C. Women in Educational Administration. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1987.

Stewart, J. "Understanding women in organizations: toward a reconstruction of organizational theory." Review essay of Kanter's Men and Women of the Corporation and Hennig and Jardim's The Managerial Woman, Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 2 (1978), pp. 336-350.

Teran, R. C. & Licata, J. W. "Moving up in school administration: grapevine structure, nonverbal behavior, and promotability." Urban Education, Vol. 20, No. 4 (1986), pp. 419- 442.

Tetenbaum, T. J. and Mulkeen, T. A. "Countering androcentrism: putting women into the curriculum in educational administration." (Unpublished paper presented at the Thirtieth Anniversary Convention of UCEA. Charlottesville, VA, Oct. 30 - Nov. 1, 1987)

Tracy, S. J. "Career patterns and aspirations of elementary school principals: the gender difference." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Vol. 49, No. 1 (1985), pp. 23-28.

Valverde, L. "Promotion socialization: the informal process in large urban districts and its adverse effects on nonwhites and women. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, Vol. 1, No. 1 (1980), pp. 36-46.

Van Alstyne, C., Withers, J. & Elliot, S. "Affirmative inaction: the bottom line tells the tale." Change, Vol. 9, No. 8 (1977), pp. 39-41, 60.

Wiersma, W. Research Methods in Education: An Introduction, 4th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1986.

Wilkinson, L. SYSTAT: The System for Statistics. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT, Inc., 1987.

Woo, L. C. "Women administrators: profiles of success." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, No. 10 (1985) pp. 285-288.

Yeakey, C. C., Johnston, G. S., & Adkison, J. A. "In pursuit of equity: a review of research on minorities and women in educational administration." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 22, No. 3 (1980), pp. 110-149.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

BEGINNING TIME: _____   DATE: _____

Hello--This is Cheri Quinn--I am a professor at Cameron
University and a candidate for a doctorate in educational
administration at Oklahoma State University. As part of my
research I would like to interview you because you hold
administrative certification. The interview will take
approximately 10 minutes and we can do it over the phone. Would
that be agreeable?

Directions: I would like to tell you a little about my research
before we get started on the actual interview. As a public
school teacher and a university administrator I have had an
ongoing interest in examining the processes involved in securing
administrative positions in public schools. Specifically this
research is intended to identify barriers or obstacles to
obtaining administrative positions as viewed by those seeking
these positions. It is hoped this research will provide the
basis for a strategy to overcome some of the barriers to
administrative positions.

I am tape recording the interview so that my reporting can
be accurate. No names of individuals or institutions will be
used in the final copy of the dissertation. I am using an
interview format to keep us focused and to develop consistency

between interviews. Many of the questions involve a set of choices with room to add categories. Other questions are more open-ended and will require brief answers, usually no more than a few sentences.

The first part of the interview was developed so I could get to know you better and collect demographic data. If there are any questions you would rather not answer, please feel free to indicate that to me. Do you have any questions before we begin the interview?

Part I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:

1. Name: _____

2. School District: _____

3. Number of Students in Your District _____

4. Gender: _____   Age: _____   Race: _____

5. Birth Order: Siblings:
   _____ 1st born or only child   _____ older brothers

   _____ 2nd born   _____ younger brothers

   _____ 3rd born   _____ older sisters

   _____ 4th or later born   _____ younger sisters

6. What is your marital status?

   Single _____   Married _____   Widowed _____

   Divorced _____   Separated _____

7. If married, Ask," What is the educational background of your spouse?"

   Elementary school _____   Attended high school _____

   High school graduate _____   Attended college _____

   College graduate _____   Master's degree _____

Specialist's degree _____   Doctor's degree _____

Other (specify) _____

8. If married, Ask, "What do you think is the attitude of your
    spouse toward your work?"

    Strongly approves ____   Disapproves _____

    Approves _____   Strongly disapproves _____

    No opinion _____

9. If widowed or divorced, Ask, "How do you think your spouse
    felt about your work when you entered the field of education?"

    Strongly approved ____   Disapproved _____

    Approved _____   Strongly disapproved _____

    No opinion _____

10. How many children do you have?   _____

11. Degrees held?

    Bachelors _____   Subject Area _____

    Masters _____   Subject Area _____

    Specialist _____   Subject Area _____

    Doctors _____   Subject Area _____

12. Certificates held?

    Elementary _____   Elem. Principal _____
                                      Provisional _____
                                      Standard _____

    Elementary-Secondary _____   Secondary Principal _____
                                      Provisional _____
                                      Standard _____

    Secondary _____   Superintendent _____
                                      Provisional _____
                                      Standard _____

PART II. CAREER PATTERN QUESTIONS:

13. How many years of classroom experience do you have? _____

14. Do you plan further formal study? yes _____   no _____

15. If no, why not? Check one or more.

Responsibilities of job too demanding _____
No desire to continue going to school _____
Not enough pay for the time and effort involved _____
Marriage and family come first _____
Opportunities for promotion are limited so further
study is not worthwhile _____

Too old _____
Financially unable to pursue further study _____
Other (specify) _____

IF THE INTERVIEWEE HOLDS A **PROVISIONAL** ADMINISTRATOR'S
CERTIFICATE ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. IF THE INTERVIEWEE
HOLDS A **STANDARD** ADMINISTRATOR'S CERTIFICATE SKIP TO
QUESTION #21.

16. Which of the following best desribes what you need for your
certificate to become Standard?

completion of required coursework _____

experience under the provisional certificate _____

both of the above _____

17. How many years have you been qualified to hold a provisional
certificate? _____

18. How many years have you held the provisional certificate? ___

19. Are you in danger of losing your provisional certificate?
yes ___ no ___ Which of the following best describes why
you may lose your provisional certification?

failure to complete required coursework _____

failure to complete the experience requirement _____

both _____

20. Have you actively pursued administrative openings?

yes _____   IF YES, ASK "WHAT HAVE YOU DONE TOWARD THAT
               GOAL?"

no _____   IF NO, ASK "WHY NOT?"

21. What do you consider your best source of information about

administrative openings?

college placement notices _____

word of mouth in my school district _____

administrators sharing information _____

job notices at State Employment offices _____

OTHER _____

22. Are you currently an administrator?

yes _____

no _____

IF ANSWER TO #22 IS NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 27, IF ANSWER IS YES,
CONTINUE.

23. Which of the following best describes your present position?

building administrator _____

central office administrator _____

24. Which of the following is the most accurate title you hold?

assistant principal _____

principal _____

supervisor _____

director _____

coordinator _____

specialist _____

assistant superintendent _____

superintendent _____

other _____

25. How many years have you held your present administrative
    position? _____

26. How many total years have you been an administrator? _____

27. In your quest for an administrative position do you consider

that you have had a sponsor or mentor?

yes _____   if yes, more than one? _____

no _____   How many? _____

IF ANSWER TO #27 IS YES, CONTINUE, IF ANSWER IS NO, THEN SKIP
TO QUESTION #30.

Directions: If you have had more than one mentor, focus on the
one who was most helpful in promoting your quest for an

administrative opening.

28. What was the gender of your mentor?

     female _____

     male _____

29. Ask, "Which of the following apply to an identified mentor?"

     older than you _____   your building principal _____

     younger than you _____   a colleague _____

     your age _____   other administrator _____

     other (specify) _____

30. Do you believe a mentor is necessary to become an administrator?

     yes _____   IF YES, ALSO ASK, "HOW WOULD YOU
                        RECOMMEND SOMEONE WITHOUT A MENTOR
                        GET ONE?"
     no _____

PART III. HIRING PROCESS QUESTIONS:

31. Are all openings in your district advertised?

     yes_____

     no_____

32. Do some positions get filled in your district without being
     opened to everyone?

     yes_____

     no_____

33. Have you ever told the building principal you were interested in becoming an administrator?

    yes_____

    no_____
34. Do you volunteer for extra assignments?

    no_____

    yes_____   if yes, Ask, "Which apply?"

                                      sponsoring activities_____

                                      committee work_____

                                      gate duties_____

                                      coaching_____

                                      report writing_____

                                      other (specify)_____

                                      _____

35. For the last position you sought, was there an interview or selection committee?   yes _____   no _____

36. What was the composition of the committee?

    _____ # of women   _____ superintendent

    _____ # of men   _____ building principal

                              _____ classroom teacher(s)

                              _____ school board members

                              _____ others (specify)_____

                              _____

37. Does your school district offer training/staff development for aspiring administrators ? yes _____   no _____

IF YES TO #37, GO TO #38   IF NO TO #37, GO TO # 40

38. Did you have an opportunity to participate in this training?
    yes _____   no _____

39. What is the process for selecting people to participate in this training? _____

40. Is there any visible attempt in your school district to recruit women and minorities for administrative positions?   yes _____   no _____

IF YES TO #40, ASK #41   IF NO TO #40, GO .o #42 OR #43

41. Will you briefly explain the process for recruiting these groups? _____

42. TO BE ASK OF CURRENT ADMINISTRATORS. "Will you recount the circumstances of getting your present position?"

    POSSIBLE PROBES   "Was the position opening announced publically before you
                            a. were approached
                            b. sought the position?

                          "Do you believe there were any factors working in your favor? against you?"

43. TO BE ASKED OF ASPIRING ADMINISTRATORS. "Will you recount one or two of your efforts to secure an administrative position?"

    POSSIBLE PROBES   "How did you hear about the opening?"

                          "Will you share what you learned from the experience that should help you in future quests? Is there something you would do differently if applying again?"

APPENDIX B

PILOT INSTRUMENT

Part I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:

1. Please provide the following information by filling in the blanks.

Gender: _____ Age: _____ Height: _____ Weight: _____ Race: _____

2. Birth Order: Were you the   Siblings:
   (check one)   (number of each)
   _____ 1st born or only child   _____ older brothers
   _____ 2nd born   _____ younger brothers
   _____ 3rd born   _____ older sisters
   _____ 4th or later born   _____ younger sisters

3. Your birthplace   Population of community
   _____   where you grew up (check one)
     city   state   country

                                  Under 2,500   _____
   Size of high school graduating class   2,500-9,999   _____
   (check one)   10.000-99,999   _____
                                  100,000-249,000   _____
     Under 50 _____   250,000-1,000,000 _____
     50-99   _____   Over 1,000,000   _____
     100-199   _____
     200-299   _____
     300-399   _____
     400-499   _____
     Over 500 _____

4. (check one)   (check one)   (If yes, number of each)

   Single   _____   Children   Boys   _____
   Married   _____   Yes _____   Girls _____
   Widowed   _____   No _____
   Divorced _____
   Separated _____

   If you checked other than single above, check one in each group below.
   Spouse or former spouse's occupation   Highest level of education
                                         attained by spouse/former
     White collar   _____   spouse.
     Blue collar   _____
     Service worker   _____   Elementary school   _____
     Farm worker   _____   Some high school   _____
     Other (specify)   _____   High school graduate   _____
     Farm worker   _____   Some college   _____
     Other (specify) _____   Bachelors degree   _____
                                         Some graduate work   _____
                                         Masters degree   _____
                                         Post masters work   _____
                                         Doctorate   _____
                                         Other (specify) _____

Please provide the following information by completing the blanks.
5. Age when you first started teaching?   _____

6. Number of school districts in which you have taught?   _____

7. Total years of classroom teaching experience?   _____

8. (check one in each group)

Father obtained college degree   Mother obtained college degree

        yes _____   yes _____
        no _____   no _____

Father's occupation	Mother's occupation	Parent who influenced most
White collar _____	Housewife _____	Father _____
Blue collar _____	White collar _____	Mother _____
Service worker __	Blue collar _____	Both equally _____
Farm worker _____	Service worker __	
Other _____	Farm worker _____	
(specify)	Other _____	
	(specify)	

9. Please respond to all that apply by placing a checkmark next to each
degree you hold; then DESCRIBE major area.

    Bachelors degree   _____   _____
    Masters degree   _____   _____
    Specialists degree _____   _____
    Doctors degree   _____   _____

Part II. CAREER PATTERN QUESTIONS

10. Please place a checkmark in the appropriate place for each certificate
you hold.

Certificates held: **Type:** _____

Elementary, teaching	Provisional _____	Standard _____
Elementary, principal	Provisional _____	Standard _____
Elementary, counselor	Provisional _____	Standard _____
Secondary, teaching	Provisional _____	Standard _____
Secondary, principal	Provisional _____	Standard _____
Secondary, counselor	Provisional _____	Standard _____
Reading specialist	Provisional _____	Standard _____
Superintendent	Provisional _____	Standard _____

11. Place a checkmark in the blank next to the title that best describes
your present position.

Type of School	Elem	Mid Sch	Jr H	HS	Dist Level
Classroom teacher					
Counselor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Assistant Principal	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Principal	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Director	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Supervisor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Coordinator	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Specialist	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Assistant Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (describe)_____					

If you checked *classroom teacher* or *counselor* in number 11,
    SKIP to number 18.

Please respond to the following questions by filling in the blanks.

---

12. Age when you got your first administrative position?   _____

13. Number of years you have held you present administrative
    position?   _____

14. Total number of administrative positions have you held?   _____

15. How many total years have you been an administrator?   _____

---

16. Place a checkmark next to the title that best describes the position you
    held immediately PRIOR to your present job.

Type of School	Elem	Mid Sch	Jr H	HS	Dist Level
Classroom teacher	____	____	____	____	____
Counselor	____	____	____	____	____
Coach	____	____	____	____	____
Athletic Director	____	____	____	____	____
Assistant Principal	____	____	____	____	____
Principal	____	____	____	____	____
Director	____	____	____	____	____
Supervisor	____	____	____	____	____
Coordinator	____	____	____	____	____
Specialist	____	____	____	____	____
Assistant Superintendent	____	____	____	____	____
Superintendent	____	____	____	____	____
Other (describe)_____					

Please respond to the following questions by filling in the blanks.

---

17. Were you a classroom teacher in the same district where you
    are now an administrator?   _____

---

18. Approximate student enrollment in your school?   _____
                    . . . in your school district?   _____

19. Approximate size/type of the community.(check one)
        Small town/rural area (population under 2,500)
        Small city (population 2,500-20,000)   _____
        Medium city (population 21,000-99,000)   _____
        Suburb of metropolitan area   _____
        Large city (population 100,000 or more)   _____

---

20. If you consider that you have had a mentor or someone to help you gain
     recognition and promotion please respond to the following set of
     questions, focusing on that one person who has helped you most.

     Gender of your mentor? (check one)   _____ male   _____ female

20. cont. To further describe your mentor check one in each column.

Older than you	_____	Your building principal	_____
Younger than you	_____	A colleague	_____
Your age	_____	Other administrator	_____
		Other (specify)	_____

21. If you plan more formal study, place a checkmark next to those areas you plan to pursue.

       Standard certificate program   _____
               Principal   _____
               Superintendent   _____
               Other (specify)   _____

       Advanced degree   _____
               Masters   _____
               Specialist   _____
               Doctorate   _____

22. If you DO NOT plan further formal study, place a checkmark next to those reasons that are applicable.

       Responsibilities of job too demanding   _____
       No desire to continue going to school   _____
       Not enough pay for the time and effort involved   _____
       Marriage and/or family come first   _____
       Opportunities for promotion too limited to be
         worthwhile   _____
       Too old   _____
       Financially unable to pursue further study   _____
       Other (specify)_____

23. Place a checkmark next to the sentence that best describes your administrative career or your pursuit of an administrative career?

       My career was (will be) developed in a single district
       because I am unwilling to relocate.   _____

       My career has developed in a single district, but I am
       willing to relocate for advancement.   _____

       My career was (will be) developed in more than one district. _____

Please respond to the next set of questions by circling the response that comes closest to your beliefs, feelings or impressions about your experiences. Use the following scale: SA = Strongly agree, A = Agree, N = No opinion, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree.

24. My spouse is always supportive of my career.	SA	A	N	D	SD
25. I have actively pursued administrative openings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
26. A mentor is necessary to get an administrative job.	SA	A	N	D	SD
27. All openings in my district are advertised.	SA	A	N	D	SD
28. As a classroom teacher I told an administrator in my district I was interested in being an administrator.	SA	A	N	D	SD

29. My present district offers training for aspiring administrators.	SA	A	N	D	SD
30. I have sponsored activities in my school.	SA	A	N	D	SD
31. My district attempts to recruit women and minorities for administrative openings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
32. The people responsible for hiring recognize and appreciate my contributions to the district.	SA	A	N	D	SD
33. My district always promotes from within the district.	SA	A	N	D	SD

34. I applied for the last administrative opening in my district.	SA	A	N	D	SD
35. My spouse expresses concern about the amount of time I devote to my job.	SA	A	N	D	SD
36. Colleagues have told me I should be an administrator.	SA	A	N	D	SD
37. College placement notices are a good source of information about administrative openings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
38. I have volunteered to work on committees in my district.	SA	A	N	D	SD

39. For the last interview I had, the committee was composed of men only.	SA	A	N	D	SD
40. I would be content to retire in my present position.	SA	A	N	D	SD
41. I have been qualified to hold administrative certification for more than five years.	SA	A	N	D	SD
42. I have been active in civic organizations in my community.	SA	A	N	D	SD
43. I have made it clear to my superiors that I am a team player.	SA	A	N	D	SD

44. Word of mouth in my school district is a good source of information about administrative openings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
45. Some openings in my district are informally filled before the job is formally announced.	SA	A	N	D	SD
46. The best way to be targeted for promotion is to do a good job in the classroom.	SA	A	N	D	SD
47. A male superior who is older than you is the best mentor.	SA	A	N	D	SD
48. There is a formal program in my district designed to recruit women and minorities for administrative openings.	SA	A	N	D	SD

49. I have never applied for an administrative opening outside my district.	SA	A	N	D	SD
50. My district often hires administrators from outside the district.	SA	A	N	D	SD
51. There has been at least one administrative opening in my district in the past two years.	SA	A	N	D	SD
52. Positions that are upgraded in my district are open to everyone for application.	SA	A	N	D	SD
53. My district always interviews all in-district applicants as a courtesy.	SA	A	N	D	SD

54. Salespeople that come to the school often know of administrative openings in other districts.	SA	A	N	D	SD
55. My spouse's career comes before mine.	SA	A	N	D	SD
56. Do a good job and work hard and you will be targeted for promotion.	SA	A	N	D	SD

57. The best stepping stone to the principal's office in my
    district is a counseling position.   SA A N D SD
58. Professional publications are a good source of informa-
    tion about administrative openings.   SA A N D SD
59. I am (was) active in my professional teacher's organ-
    ization.   SA A N D SD
60. Failing to get a sought after position has cooled my
    desire to try again.   SA A N D SD
61. Administrators in my district have let me know about
    position openings.   SA A N D SD

62. To be promoted within the district you must share the
    philosophy of the current administration.   SA A N D SD
63. To be promoted you need to lay the groundwork early.   SA A N D SD
64. It is important to be willing and available for extra
    assignments if you seek promotion.   SA A N D SD
65. There is little turnover among administrators in my
    district.   SA A N D SD
66. An administrative position was created for me in the
    district.   SA A N D SD

67. You need to belong to the politically savvy crowd in
    the district to be promoted.   SA A N D SD
68. My family comes before my desire for promotion.   SA A N D SD
69. I am not interested in a position outside my present
    school district.   SA A N D SD
70. I have never applied for an administrative job.   SA A N D SD
71. I have made an effort to make my work known to
    administrators.   SA A N D SD

72. I would be reluctant to apply for an opening for
    fear a rejection will hurt future opportunities.   SA A N D SD
73. I apply for all openings that hold interest for me,
    knowing that even if I do not get the position I
    have gained exposure and interview experience.   SA A N D SD
74. My education administration professors have encouraged
    me in my pursuit of administrative positions.   SA A N D SD
75. There is only room for one women in the top admin-
    istrative ranks in my school district.   SA A N D SD
76. People in highly visible positions, such as coaches
    and band directors, are more likely to be targeted
    for administrative positions than classroom teachers.   SA A N D SD

APPENDIX C

SURVEY COVER LETTER

Route 5, Box 651
Duncan, OK 73533
August 12, 1988

Dear Colleague:

The purpose of this letter is to request a few minutes of your time in order to improve hiring practices for administrative positions. I am Assistant to the Director of Teacher Education at Cameron University and a candidate for a doctorate in educational administration at Oklahoma State University. As part of my research I would like your reaction to the enclosed survey instrument. Your name was randomly selected from a list of all persons who hold administrative certification in Oklahoma. It will take approximately ten minutes to complete the survey and I have included a stamped, return envelope for your convenience. I have coded the return envelopes so that I can follow-up where necessary, but I assure you the envelopes will be discarded before working with the data to ensure your privacy. I am naturally working on a deadline and would appreciate it if you could return the survey as quickly as possible, but no later than August 26.

Specifically, the purpose of this research is to identify gender specific barriers to obtaining adminstrative positions, as viewed by those in the applicant pool. If it is possible to identify the barriers, then it may be possible to devise a strategy to enhance the opportunities for obtaining administrative positions.

I want to thank you beforehand for taking the time to share your experiences and knowledge with me. I realize you are a busy person. I would be happy to share the results of my study with you and have included a request slip for that purpose.

Sincerely,

Cheri L. Quinn

(cut off and return with survey)

Yes I would like to see the results of this study.

Name   _____

Address   _____

          _____

APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

BARRIERS TO PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN OKLAHOMA: GENDER SPECIFIC OBSTACLES, AS VIEWED BY MEN AND WOMEN IN THE APPLICANT POOL

PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY IN THE ENCLOSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE TO CHERI L. QUINN, ROUTE 5, BOX 651, DUNCAN, OK 73533

Part I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please provide the following information by filling in the blanks.

1. Gender _____ 2. Age _____ 3. Race _____

4. Birth order. I was number _____ of _____ child/ren.

5. Marital status _____ 6. Number of children _____

7. Highest level of education obtained by:

    A. spouse/former spouse _____

    B. father/father figure _____

    C. mother/mother figure _____

8. Size of your high school graduating class _____

9. Population of your primary residence as a child. _____

10. In what type of institution are you currently employed?

    Public or Private? _____

    Dependent/Independent? _____

    Enrollment/# Served? _____

    Other? (state agency, etc) _____

Part II: Career Information

Please provide the following information by filling in the blanks.

1. List highest degree obtained _____

   and major field _____

2. Number of years of classroom experience _____

3. Number of years of administrative experience _____

4. Age when you got first administrative position _____

5. Your current title _____

6. Your title just prior to current position _____

7. Were you employed by the same district prior to your current position? _____

8. List the administrative certificates you hold _____

_____

8. List any administrative certificates you are eligible to hold

_____

Part III: CAREER PATTERN INFORMATION

The word "district" will be used generically as a designation for any type of institution where you are employed. Your responses will be paired with the type of institution you identified earlier.

Please complete the following by selecting the response that comes closest to your experiences.

_____ 1. When I was last interviewed for an administrative position, the selection or interview committee was composed of

    A. both men and women

    B. men only

    C. women only

_____ 2. For the most recent administrative position I filled the incumbent was a

    A. man

    B. woman

Please complete the following by checking or crossing out the box to the right that comes closest to your beliefs, understandings, and impressions about your career experiences.

If any of the statements do not apply to you, leave them blank.

Use the following scale to respond:

A = ALWAYS OR TRUE
B = MOST OF THE TIME
C = SOME OF THE TIME
D = NEVER OR FALSE

EXAMPLE:

A B C D

IF TRUE OR FALSE IS THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THERE WILL BE ONLY TWO RESPONSE BOXES TO THE RIGHT OF THE STATEMENT.

EXAMPLE:

A B C D

```
KEY
A = ALWAYS OR TRUE
B = MOST OF THE TIME
C = SOME OF THE TIME
D = NEVER OR FALSE
```

A B C D

1. Openings in my district are advertised.

2. My district offers training for aspiring administrators.

3. I rely on college placement notices for information about administrative openings.

4. Professional publications have been a good source of information about administrative openings.

5. Word of mouth within the district has been a good source of information about administrative openings.

6. Some positions seem to be filled before the opening is formally announced.

7. Salespeople that come to the school share information about openings in other districts.

8. My principal or superintendent informs me of anticipated openings in the district.

9. My spouse is supportive of my career.

10. My spouse is unhappy about the amount of time I devote to my career.

11. My principal encouraged me to pursue administrative openings.

12. Colleagues encouraged me to become an administrator.

13. My college professors have helped me pursue administrative openings.

14. I have had a mentor (or sponsor) to help promote my career.

15. My mentor is/was the same gender as myself.

16. My district promotes from within.

17. There is a formal program in my district designed to target women and minorities for promotion.

18. My district hires administrators from outside the district.

A B C D

19. My district has had at least one administrative opening in the last two years.

20. In-house applicants are interviewed as a courtesy.

21. I was a coach, band director, counselor or other highly visible faculty member before I became an administrator.

22. An administrative slot was created for me.

23. I volunteer(ed) to sponsor student activities and associations.

24. While a classroom teacher, I told my principal or superintendent I was interested in being an administrator.

25. I volunteer(ed) for committee work.

26. I am (was) active in my local teacher's organization.

27. I am involved in civic and religious organizations in my community.

28. I have indicated my desire to my superiors for more responsibility and recognition.

29. I work(ed) hard and do/did a good job as a classroom teacher.

30. There have been news articles written about activities I sponsor.

31. I actively pursue administrative openings.

32. I applied for the most recent administrative slot in my district.

33. I have not applied outside my district for an administrative position.

34. Failing to get a sought after position has cooled my desire to try again.

35. I have never applied for a promotion.

36. My spouse's career comes before mine.

Thank you for the time you have taken to help me with my research. Please feel free to write any comments or share any experiences pertinent to the topic on a separate sheet of paper.

APPENDIX E

POSTCARD MESSAGE

August 26, 1988

Dear Colleague:

In the middle of August you received a request to respond to a survey. Your experience and expertise is essential to my study. Please take the time to respond. Your contribution could make all the difference.

Thank you,

Cheri L. Quinn

APPENDIX F

VARIABLE MAP

TABLE XXVII

VARIABLE MAP

Variable Abbreviation	Numeric Coding	Explanation
Gen	1-female 2-male	Gender of respondent
Age	Continuous	Age of respondent
Race	1-white 2-black 3-Asian 4-Native American 5-Hispanic	Race of respondent
BOrd	1-first or only 2-not first or last 3-last	Birth order
MStat	1-single 2-married 3-divorced 4-widowed	Marital status
Child	Continuous	Number of children
SpsEd) FaEd) MoED)	1-L.than high sch 2-high school 3-some college 4-BA/BS 5-MA/MS 6-Ed Spec 7-EdD/PhD	Spouse's highest level Father's highest level Mother's highest level
Grad	Continuous	Size of AUs high school graduating class
Town	Continuous	Size of AUs home community
Instit	1-public independent 2-public dependent 3-other	Type of institution where employed

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Variable Abbreviation	Numeric Coding	Explanation
SchPop	Continuous	Size of school district
Degree	1-BA/BS 2-MA/MS 3-EdSpec 4-EdD/PhD	AUs highest degree held
Field	1-administration 2-other	Major area for highest degree
Exper	Continous	Years of classroom experience
AdmExp	Continuous	Years of administrative experience
FstAdm	Continuous	Age when first administrative position obtained
Title) PreTitl)	1-superintendent 2-asst superintendent 3-district other 4-mid/JH principal 5-mid/JH asst prin. 6-other 7-HS principal 8-HS asst principal 9-other 10-elem principal 11-elem asst principal 12-other 13-other agency 14-classroom teacher 15-counselor 16-retired	Current title Position (title) just before current one
SamDst	1-yes 2-no	Was previous position in same district?

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Variable Abbreviation	Numeric Coding	Explanation
AdmCrt))) Elig))	1-prov elem 2-stan elem 3-prov secon 4-stan secon 5-prov supt 6-stan supt	Administrative certi- ficates currently held Administrative certi- ficates qualified to hold
Comm	1-men and women 2-men only 3-women only	Composition of most recent interview commitee
Incumb	1-man 2-woman	Incumbent's gender; for job AU sought
Adv	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Advertised openings
Trng	4-true 1-false	District trains aspiring adminis- trators
PlacNot	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	College placement notices
ProPub	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Professional publi- cations
WrdMou	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Word of mouth
Filled	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Positions seem to be filled

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Variable Abbreviation	Numeric Coding	Explanation
Sales	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Salespeople as source of information
AdmWrd	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Administrators tell of openings
SpsSup	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Spouse's support of career
SpsTim	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Spouse unhappy about time for AUs job
PrinSup	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Principal encouraged
ColSup	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Colleagues encouraged
ProfSup	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Professors encouraged
Mentor	4-true 1-false	Mentor
MentGen	4-true 1-false	Gender of mentor

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Variable Abbreviation	Numeric Coding	Explanation
PromIn	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	District promotes from within
AffAct	4-true 1-false	Program to promote women and minorities
PromOut	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	District promotes from outside
OneOpn	4-true 1-false	District had one or more openings in past two years
Court	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	In-house applicants interviewed as courtesy
Visible	4-true 1-false	AU was coach,counselor or band director
Create	4-true 1-false	Administrative slot was created for AU
SponAct	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU volunteers to sponsor activities
GASing	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU told administrator of desire for promotion

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Variable Abbreviation	Numeric Coding	Explanation
ComWrk	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU volunteered for committees
TchOrg	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU active in teacher's organization
Civic	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU involved in civic/ religious activities
Respon	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU expressed desire for more responsibility
GdTch	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU did/does good job as teacher
News	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU's activities written up in news
Pursue	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU actively pursues administrative openings
ApplSt	4-true 1-false	AU applied for latest in-district slot
NotOut	4-true 1-false	AU has not applied outside district

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Variable Abbreviation	Numeric Coding	Explanation
Cool	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	Failure has cooled AU to seeking positions
Never	4-true 1-false	AU has never applied for administrative position
SpsFst	4-always 3-mostly 2-sometimes 1-never	AU puts spouse's career first

APPENDIX G

COLLAPSED AND CREATED VARIABLES

TABLE XXVIII

COLLAPSED AND CREATED
VARIABLES

Variables	Value Assigned
Age	1 = < = 29
	2 = 30 - 39
	3 = 40 - 49
	4 = 50 - 59
	5 = > = 60
Grad	1 = < = 50
	2 = 51 - 200
	3 = 201 - 400
	4 = > = 401
Town	1 = < = 2,500
	2 = 2,501 - 20,000
	3 = 20,001 - 100,000
	4 = > = 100,001
SchPop	1 = < = 300
	2 = 301 - 599
	3 = 600 - 999
	4 = 1,000 - 2,999
	5 = 3,000 - 9,999
	6 = > = 10,000
Exper	0 = 0
	1 = 1 - 5
	2 = 6 - 10
	3 = 11 - 15
	4 = 16 - 20
	5 = 21 - 25
	6 = 26 - 30
	7 = > = 30
AdmExp	0 = 0
	1 = 1 - 5
	2 = 6 - 10
	3 = 11 - 15
	4 = 16 - 20
	5 = 21 - 25
	6 = 26 - 30
	7 = > = 30

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Variables	Value Assigned

FstAdm
```
              0 =        0
              1 = 22 - 29
              2 = 30 - 39
              3 = 40 - 49
              4 =  > = 50
```

Pos		
	1 = woman supt. or asst.	7 = male supt. or asst.
	2 = woman secon. prin./asst.	8 = male secon. prin./asst.
	3 = woman elem. prin./asst.	9 = male elem. prin./asst.
	4 = woman dist. lvl. staff	10 = male dist. lvl. staff
	5 = woman bldg. lvl. staff	11 = male bldg. lvl. staff
	6 = woman teacher	12 = male teacher

PrePos		
	1 = woman supt. or asst.	7 = male supt. or asst.
	2 = woman secon. prin./asst.	8 = male secon. prin./asst.
	3 = woman elem. prin./asst.	9 = male elem. prin./asst.
	4 = woman dist. lvl. staff	10 = male dist. lvl. staff
	5 = woman bldg. lvl. staff	11 = male bldg. lvl. staff
	6 = woman teacher	12 = male teacher

Job Status   1 = Line Positions
                 Superintendent or asst.
                 Secondary principal or asst.
                 Elementary principal or asst.

             2 = Aspiring Positions
                 District-level staff
                 Building-level staff
                 Classroom teachers

APPENDIX H

SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE

SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE

Many of the respondents included notes penciled in the margins of the survey. Some repondents included letters in an effort to further explain the way they responded to the questions posed. Others wrote to express experiences they believed to be unique. Some seemed to write in order to provide catharsis for experiences that were frustrating in their inexplicability. Both men and women wrote, seemingly eager to share pieces of their own lives. A representative sample is included here in the hope of adding insights impossible to discern by multiple regression, means and standard deviations.

From a woman in an urban school district

Applicants in my district are required to take an expensive workshop . . .since completion of this workshop is required to be considered for an interview I will be prohibited from seeking administrative positions in my district.

There were stories of success

Female assistant elementary principal-- . . . my present position is the first one I applied for . . . and it was outside my district.

Female elementary principal--I really have enjoyed it (the principalship) and with all the situations I must deal with--the good and the pleasure outweigh the problems and disgust.

Concern was expressed about the year of experience needed to make a certificate standard (this has since been repealed)

Female teacher in a small school--my superintendent allowed me to complete my certificate by giving me the title and duties of assistant principal but I was given no extra pay, no authority and no release time from the classroom.

Female library media specialist--I was to be the assistant principal and it was to count as the one year of experience for getting a standard certificate, but the dis-

trict was not paying me for the extra duties and the State Department said no. This setback has made me decide to wait a while before completing the certificate program.

Much of what was sent cried out with frustration

Female reading specialist--My work is administrative but I don't get the salary or the title.

Retired male principal (not included in the data set for the study, but interesting nonetheless)--if you are female and Black you are favored for promotion in _____. White males should forget it. Hiring practices in _____ are written, but not followed in practice or spirit.

Female classroom teacher--I have never gotten an interview . . .yet a man from outside the district who had no certificate and no masters degree was hired. I have been here 16 years, have two masters degrees and full certification for the principal's position.

Female counselor with full certification--I was told I might not want to apply for the elementary principal's position because I might be embarrased if I didn't get it since the superintendent already had someone in mind (a male).

Black male classroom teacher--You are supposed to be selected on your qualifications, not on the color of your skin. It gets a little disappointing.

Female classroom teacher--I was not even interviewed . . .a male basketball coach without a certificate was placed in the position.

Female classroom teacher--My application was not even considered . . .the Board hired a man with no certificate. A school board member said, "We ain't gonna h'are no woman." They didn't.

Female administrative assistant-- . . . the most difficult barrier for women . . . is that lack of experience as an administrator is used as the reason not to hire the female even when degrees and certificates may be superior to the male applicants.

Female classroom teacher--Local positions, when filled within, go to political allies who are always in agreement with the existing power authorities. Our prior superintendent replaced every woman principal during his tenure. A "good old girl" organization is non-existent because women abandon the group in favor of lateral positions with a stronger power base.

VITA

Cheri Sawders Quinn

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: BARRIERS TO WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOL
ADMINISTRATION IN OKLAHOMA: A VIEW FROM THE
APPLICANT POOL

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Bakersfield, California,
March 7, 1949, the daughter of Charles Hunter
and Lillian Frances Sawders.

Education: Graduated from Andrew Hill High School,
San Jose, California, in June, 1967; received
Bachelor of Arts Degree in Social Science from
San Jose State University in December, 1977;
received Master of Science Degree in Educational
Administration at Oklahoma State University in
August, 1983; completed the requirements for the
Doctor of Education in Educational Administration
from Oklahoma State University in May, 1989.

Professional Experience: Classroom teacher, Agra Public
Schools, Agra, Oklahoma, 1979 to 1983; Teaching
Assistant, Department of Curriculum and Instruc-
tion, Fall, 1983; Classroom teacher, Empire Public
Schools, Duncan, Oklahoma, 1984 to 1987; Assistant
to the Director of Teacher Education, Cameron Uni-
versity, Lawton, Oklahoma, 1987 to present.

Professional Organizations: Phi Delta Kappa, Lawton
Chapter; Oklahoma Association of Teacher Educators;
Association of Teacher Educators; Oklahoma Associ-
ation for Colleges of Teacher Education; Associ-
ation for Colleges of Teacher Education; Phi Kappa
Phi.